



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 13, 2015

No. 108

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. EMMER of Minnesota).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

July 13, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM EMMER 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 1:50 p.m.

DON FRISBEE

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, we will gather in Portland to mourn the passing and celebrate the life of Don Frisbee, who died June 26 at the age 91.

Don led an extraordinary life, rising through the company ranks to become the chairman and CEO of PacifiCorp, then the major private utility in the Pacific Northwest.

He was a bold and visionary leader of this important company. He was a

board member of Fortune 500 companies like Weyerhaeuser and First Interstate Bank, now Wells Fargo. He was widely regarded as the most influential business leader in Oregon for 2 decades.

Don's influence, though, extended beyond the business space. He was also on the board of two prestigious Northwest academic institutions, Whitman College in Walla Walla and Reed College in Portland, where he played a critical role in the development of that storied institution.

He helped promote the growth of Portland State University, the Oregon Health Science University, and helped guide the Children's Institute.

Later in his retirement, he worked for 5 years with his daughter-in-law, Denise Frisbee, on a program throughout the State of Oregon to connect people with their public schools.

He cared deeply about the civic infrastructure, how to encourage and empower individuals to make a difference the way that he, himself, had. He was instrumental in the creation and growth of the Oregon Leadership Forum, which now for 30 years has gathered people from all across Oregon on an ongoing, yearlong program to develop leadership capacity and commitment to our State. From its founding to his board leadership, from participating in the very first year's programming, he was the driving force for this unique organization.

The utility executive was passionate about Oregon's special places. He loved the out-of-doors and his own special place, his beloved ranch in Sisters, located in a spectacular setting in central Oregon.

This veteran utility executive didn't think there was a conflict between sound, sustainable business practices and protecting the environment. During the last conversation I had with Don, he talked about how delighted he was with the Pope's encyclical on the environment and global warming.

For all his many accomplishments, his family and friends were central in his life, even more so as the years passed. He lost his beloved wife, Emily, in 2003, after 56 years of marriage. Together, they built a family, a career, and a better community.

A little at loose ends after losing Emily, later in life, he met, wooed, and wed a widow who was his neighbor, Betty Perkins. Together, they found extraordinary happiness. They had an amazing effect on everyone they met, whether on a cruise, on the 60th reunion of Don's class at the Harvard Business School, or just people on the street.

At a time when most their age would be in rocking chairs, they were traveling the world, providing inspiration to all privileged to spend time around them. His was an extraordinary life well lived.

Portland is often regarded as one of America's finest cities, listed on all the best places. Over the last 50 years, no one made it a better place than Don Frisbee.

Our hearts go out to Don's family; his wife, Betty; and to all of those who were touched by this extraordinary man.

TIME TO STREAMLINE SIMPLE IRA ROLLOVERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, in 1966, Federal legislation established a new type of employer-sponsored retirement plan known as a SIMPLE IRA. These plans are designed to give small businesses a retirement option for their employees without the administrative burdens of other employer-sponsored retirement plan types.

SIMPLE IRAs face a 25 percent early withdrawal penalty during the first 2

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5091

years of their existence, compared to 10 percent for other IRAs. In order to prevent accountholders from unknowingly rolling their IRA funds into SIMPLE IRAs and being surprised by an increased early retirement penalty, current law prohibits rolling funds over into a SIMPLE IRA from other retirement accounts.

However, SIMPLE IRAs have the same early withdrawal penalty as other IRAs after that initial 2-year period, and consumers and financial planners have struggled with the rollover restrictions as they attempt to consolidate accounts.

This week, I will introduce legislation to allow for rollovers into SIMPLE IRA accounts that have met the 2-year threshold. The Joint Committee on Taxation has previously estimated this legislation would have a negligible effect on Federal tax revenues. This bill will simplify retirement planning and ensure a complex Tax Code does not prevent sensible financial planning decisions. Individuals should be able to consolidate their retirement funds in a way that best meets their needs.

This legislation is a small but important first step in the long road to ensuring our tax system works for Americans, not against them.

SHORT-TERM HIGHWAY FUND EXTENSIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, 2-year short-term highway fund extensions have become one of Congress' most costly habits. Kudos to the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, which has marked up the highway portion and may come to the floor this week with a 6-year bill.

That bill is not yet paid for, but the Senate is at least making progress toward a 6-year bill, the kind that is needed to make a dent in the backlog of our construction projects in the States.

We should not be deterred by the likelihood of another short-term bill, perhaps going to the end of the year. The goal before the year is out must be a long-term bill.

Congress has taken to authorizing the highway trust fund for 2 years, knowing full well that the trust fund, collecting gas user fees at 1993 levels, would run out even before those 2 years are out; then the waltz begins with endless short-term bills.

The States are disgusted and exhausted. MAP-21 ran out before the end of its 2-year lifetime. The last short-term bill extension was so useless that it has lasted longer than expected because the States could not apply the funds to the backlog of now endless rescheduled projects; 6-month extensions have yielded 6-month projects, usually only patchwork.

This poster goes beyond showing that the short-term extensions have been

useless to the States. These short term bills and extensions are having negative effects on the pocketbooks of our constituents. The highway user fee, which has not been raised for 22 years, costs drivers \$97 a year. The bad roads that are the result cost those same drivers \$515 per year.

Find your State for the cost to your constituents. Here is a random sample: Louisiana, \$514 per year; Oklahoma, \$763 per year; New Jersey, \$685 per driver; Ohio, \$446 per driver; California, \$762 per driver; and Pennsylvania, \$471 per driver.

All the figures are high, regardless of State or region of the country, and those high dollar amounts go out of the pockets of our constituents to patch bad roads, instead of putting the funds into fixing those roads, bridges, and transit.

Congress' short-term attention to our roads, highways, transit and bridges is breaking the bank, not for the Federal Government, but for our constituents. It is no longer the old adage "you can't get something for nothing" rather, not funding the highway trust fund for 6 years costs the people we represent not nothing, but \$515 per driver.

We have got to fund our transportation projects or ask our constituents to pay for their bad roads. The costs to the American people make our options clear what the best thing to do is.

THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE IS DENYING JUSTICE TO VICTIMS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Justice is failing rape victims.

Across America, an estimated 400,000 untested rape kits sit on shelves. Government officials long blamed a lack of resources to test the kits; so Congress fixed this problem in the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act, VAWA, as it is called.

VAWA included the Sexual Assault Forensic Evidence Reporting Act, or SAFER, which allows and mandates that 75 percent of Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant funds go directly to test the long backlog of rape kits.

The bottom line, money has been allocated to fund the backlog of 400,000 rape kits. Funds are required to be made available for audits, so we could find the true number of languishing kits throughout different States and then test them.

The goal of SAFER was to ensure that no rape kit went untested, so all victims had answers and all rapists were brought to justice; yet, Mr. Speaker, it has been 2 years. Kits remain in basements on dusty shelves, and nothing has changed.

The money is there; the law is written, but the DOJ, the Department of Justice, shamelessly ignores this man-

date leaving sexual assault victims waiting for justice. Meanwhile, untested rape kits create an unfair treatment of victims. One thing it does is it allows the guilty outlaws to go free and prevents the innocent from being exonerated.

Also, the statute of limitations may expire. Then, when the criminal is captured, he may escape justice because the kit was analyzed too long after the crime was committed. That is a travesty of justice. It is an insult and shameful treatment of sexual assault victims.

To quote an old legal maxim, "the criminal goes free because the constable has blundered" or, in this case, the constable is incompetent.

Without this SAFER Act, which allowed the implementation of funds to analyze backlogs of rape kits, we would still be in a problem that we had 2 years ago.

□ 1215

But these funds are available for the States to analyze and get the kits tested. Once tested, the results would allow the apprehension of criminals.

This is not occurring. The Department of Justice has yet to even offer the SAFER audit grants to the States. The DOJ cannot show that 75 percent of the funds are going to direct testing and lab capacity enhancement, as required by the law.

To give rape victims justice, DNA often holds the critical key and the only key to learning the identity of the perpetrators. Without this, justice is often delayed or denied forever.

Ignoring SAFER is an affront to sexual assault victims. Mr. Speaker, victims deserve to know who assaulted them. They need to know for peace of mind. It is mental turmoil for rape victims not to know the identity of the perpetrator while sometimes they still fear for their own safety. A rape kit DNA test may prove to be their best and last and only hope in knowing the identity of the rapist.

Bureaucrats should do their job. Quit making excuses for not implementing the law.

In my 30 years as a prosecutor and criminal court judge, I talked to and met a lot of sexual assault victims. Sexual assault, or rape, is, to me, the worst crime in society. And rape victims, more than anything else, want to know who did it. They want to know who did it.

We have the capability of helping rape victims know who the perpetrator in 400,000 cases. Why aren't we doing it?

Not knowing the identity of a rapist is haunting to their victims. It is traumatizing. And to know that the rapist still may be on the loose because the testing kit was not done is inexcusable incompetence.

Each day that goes by, we are running out the clock on the statute of limitations, increasing the chance that criminals may escape the long arm of the law. It is time to analyze the

400,000 rape kits and capture the rapists.

The Department of Justice must live up to its name. Enforce the SAFER Act and follow the law. The Department of Justice must ensure justice for victims. Until then, many rape victims see no justice.

Our country deserves better; sexual assault victims deserve better; and, Mr. Speaker, justice deserves better. Because, justice is what we do in this country.

And that is just the way it is.

ANTIQUITIES ACT ABUSE

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, last week, the President announced his plans to designate, once again, over 300,000 acres, this time of mountains, meadows, and other areas that stretch over 100 miles in northern California, including parts of Yolo, Solano, Napa, Lake, Mendocino, Glenn, and Colusa Counties, as a monument.

This designation now marks the 19th time this President has created or expanded, since taking office, resulting in over 260 million acres of designated lands and waters in monuments or wilderness areas.

This move actually exemplifies the President's complete disregard for the legislative process and his lack of hesitation on using every single political tool to carry out even more of his executive power grabs.

Indeed, the one in Snow Mountain was a bipartisan effort underway, with legislators working on how that might become a designated area. Instead, that has now been usurped by one more round of executive power, kind of like we have seen recently with the Supreme Court exercising its power usurping the legislative process where we, the legislators, are subject directly to we, the people.

Using the Antiquities Act as justification to designate over a third of a million acres in my State overnight is not only a serious abuse of power, it is a serious misrepresentation of the intent of the law itself. This law, the purpose of this law, which was enacted after archeologists years ago noticed small artifacts disappearing or ending up in private collections across different countries, was meant as an emergency option to curb looting in small archeological sites in the Southwest.

The short and what would seem like simple text of the law actually directs the President to limit any designation to the smallest area compatible with proper care and management of the resource or the objects to be protected.

Now, when you see 330,000 acres designated here or 700,000 designated in Nevada or, a few years ago, when President Clinton declared 1 million acres in Utah, are we really protecting a par-

ticular area or zone or is this a widespread power grab?

Indeed, what are we protecting it from? Well, you will hear from the left, from oil and gas development, from timber, from mining, or from all sorts of things that would be devastating to the environment.

Have you noticed how hard it is to get a permit to do any one of those things, by the time you get through the EPA, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, and the whole litany of others that are in the way of doing things that could be done with good environmental stewardship at the same time as developing the resources that people in this country still need? They still need fuel; they still need oil; they still need gas; they still need paper products. Heaven knows, we use enough paper products in this building.

But we need development in this country. We do it more responsibly than anywhere else in the world. Yet these wilderness area designations, these monuments, they don't seek to really protect anything. They just make it off limits to all Americans, even if you just want to go in for hiking or hunting or a little off-roading and, indeed, those that would develop the resources.

This is so absurd, it even has made it difficult for fire suppression in our forested areas, for our various fire agencies to go do the job they need to do, to have the roads in the areas that are needed so they can attack the fires.

And even more so, as we have seen what happened with the loss of life with illegal immigrants in this country, like Kathryn Steinle in San Francisco, illegal immigration, the effort to stop that at the border was made even more difficult, I believe, down in New Mexico when the President designated a bunch of the area along New Mexico as a monument, making it where the Border Patrol can't even patrol the areas because it is now an environmentally protected zone. That is ridiculous, and I think Americans, when they hear about this, say, "What is going on?"

So this is, again, a power grab that is completely inappropriate. It bypasses the legislative process where the legislators are directly accountable to the people.

It is about time that we change the Antiquities Act, or at least if we had somebody in the White House that knew the balance between designating just a small area that actually helps protect a resource and archaeological site versus hundreds of thousands or millions of acres that makes it just off limits to the type of use the public needs and actually makes the assets a safer and healthier one, for example, with our forests, where we can do the work that needs to be done to keep them healthy.

Local residents have very little input, if any, on a designation happening in their backyard. Is this a transparent process? No.

It is power in Washington, once again, ruling over the people, ruling over the stakeholders in those communities that know best how to manage the resource, what that resource needs, and what that could mean to the local economy, whether it is hunting or fishing or hiking, off-roading, even a little gold mining.

We can do these things. We know how to do them environmentally responsibly, and yet we get run over time and time again by left-leaning folks using the Antiquities Act as something for their environmental dreams.

Mr. Speaker, I am highly frustrated by this, and I hope the American public will get behind an effort to help us change the Antiquities Act and make it something that actually works for the American public and protects what needs protecting, not everything else.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

We give You thanks, O God, for giving us another day.

We ask Your blessing upon this assembly and upon all to whom the authority of government is given.

Encourage the Members of this House, O God, to use their abilities and talents in ways that bring righteousness to this Nation and to all people. Ever remind them of the needs of the poor, the homeless or forgotten, and those who live without freedom or liberty. May they be instruments of justice for all Americans.

May Your spirit live with them and with each of us, and may Your grace surround us and those we love that, in all things, we may be the people You would have us be in service to this great Nation.

May all that is done within the people's House this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. MCNERNEY 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.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S POLICIES
DESTROY JOBS

(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, recently, President Obama struck another blow destroying American jobs with his new proposal to raise the salary threshold for overtime. This top-down, burdensome regulation will inhibit job creation, burden small businesses, and penalize hard-working Americans.

By increasing the wage threshold, businesses in South Carolina and across America will be faced with difficult choices: reducing hours for workers and cutting jobs. This change will hurt hard-working employees, who will face a lack of flexibility, limited opportunity for advancement within their jobs, and lower base salaries.

The new mandate joins other harmful administration regulations, including mandatory wages and fixed work schedules, destroying jobs.

The failed liberal welfare state policies of the last 50 years have produced increased poverty, and we should change policies to promote a limited government of expanded freedoms, creating jobs.

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

ADDRESSING FORECLOSURES AND
SHORT SALES IS CRITICAL

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, homeownership is one of the cornerstones of the American Dream; yet, since the 2007 housing crisis, millions of Americans have lost their homes through the foreclosure process, and many more continue to struggle.

Addressing foreclosures and short sales is critical. Accelerating the short sale process for homeowners would be part of the solution.

Unfortunately, in California and across the country, one of the most significant factors that slows down the short sale process takes place when a homeowner's second mortgage lender delays final negotiations on the short sale; and too often, second mortgage

lenders use stonewalling tactics to delay payouts from the first mortgage lenders. This, unfortunately, delays and hurts the homeowners, willing buyers, and the economy at large.

After further investigation on this issue, I will be introducing a bill to address short sales and ask the Federal Housing Finance Agency to provide an update on what it is doing to facilitate short sales and protect homeowners.

WESTERN WATER AND AMERICAN
FOOD SECURITY ACT

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2898, the Western Water and American Food Security Act. This is by Representative VALADAO from California. I appreciate his hard work and bipartisan efforts on this.

California's drought is having devastating effects on agriculture and our food supply nationwide. Last year, drought-related water cutbacks caused an estimated 400,000 acres to be fallowed, costing thousands of jobs and leaving consumers less food choices in the United States.

While the solution is certainly not going to be all encompassed in one bill, this will be a great start towards getting California back where we need to be for drought relief.

We cannot stand by and watch one more family suffer, small businesses and our economy leaving the State, when we should have those jobs right in the valley.

It ends the finger-pointing and blame game, and provides desperately needed short-term relief while advancing commonsense policies to fix the situation in the long term.

It would update Federal laws and streamline water permitting so we could build Sites Reservoir in northern California. Indeed, it also ensures sound and real-time science and water delivery methods so we don't have a situation where we are leasing 15,000 acre-feet twice to benefit less than 30 steelhead fish.

Let's get on with getting California's water supply back on track so that this important legislation is not stalled by the usual suspects on the environmental left.

Indeed, the proof will be in the pudding.

CELEBRATION OF THE HUNT

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

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize two young constituents, Connor Hanson and Schuyler Elaine Frashier, for being among the top students to place in the National Shooting Sports Foundation's annual essay contest.

Connor took the top honors, and Schuyler placed in the top 25, and also received a Learning for Life Award.

In Minnesota, hunting is a way of life. These traditions are often passed down from one generation to the next, teaching many important life lessons along the way.

Connor depicts this in his essay, describing the bonding experience with his father, the spirituality of the hunt, as well as everything that the hunt has taught him about life. Connor writes that the "hunting season allows me to see and experience the truth, through God's creation."

I want to congratulate Connor and Schuyler on not only placing in this competition, but for so accurately portraying how important hunting is to our culture in Minnesota.

Well done.

EPA METHANE REGULATION

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the shale energy revolution, the United States is benefiting from the economic and energy security and, I might add, environmental benefits of a natural gas abundance.

However, the EPA is threatening to take this energy advantage and make it a disadvantage. The EPA is currently trying to further regulate the byproduct of natural gas production, that of methane gas.

The EPA, under the Obama administration, is at its worst. The Obama administration mission is clear: if it is not a "green" energy source that he likes, it should not exist.

And Obama has proven that he will use the EPA to do all he can to make it more difficult and expensive for American families to utilize this incredibly wonderful source of natural gas that we have here in America.

Lower energy prices for Americans, and we have also helped the environment.

So I would urge all of my colleagues to join me in opposing the burdensome mandates that will unnecessarily hinder natural gas production in the United States, thereby dismantling and diminishing the energy advantage that we have today.

CURES FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, Friday afternoon of last week, this House passed what may well be the most important piece of legislation that will be passed in our lifetimes. I am talking about H.R. 6, the 21st Century Cures Act.

This is legislation that is to improve and enhance the discovery, development, and delivery of new medicines,

new devices, lifesaving efforts that can bend the course of someone who is trapped right now in an intractable disease. We all know what they are: Alzheimer's, diabetes, recalcitrant cancers, heart disease.

What if we were to be able to solve one of these riddles? What a boon that would be to the Federal budget because, as we can see, in the outyears of expenses for health care, it is nothing but up.

In May of 2012, Glen Campbell and his family came to the Library of Congress. They came and testified before the Senate, and they gave a very moving presentation on why it was important to deal with diseases such as Alzheimer's. In fact, that night, when Glen Campbell gave a concert at the Library of Congress—you can see him here with his daughter Ashley as they were playing on stage—it was a wonderful reminder just what is at stake here.

What if we could provide one more time for a daughter to smile at her father because we have found, finally, the cure for this intractable disease?

It is time to get the Senate to move and get this done.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 10, 2015.

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

Dear Mr. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 10, 2015 at 12:53 p.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2620.

That the Senate passed S. 143.

That the Senate passed S. 1180.

That the Senate passed S. 1359.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York) at 4 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair

will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANY CAPITAL ACT OF 2015

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1023) to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to provide for increased limitations on leverage for multiple licenses under common control.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1023

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Small Business Investment Company Capital Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. INCREASED LIMITATIONS ON LEVERAGE FOR MULTIPLE LICENSES UNDER COMMON CONTROL.

Section 303(b)(2)(B) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 683(b)(2)(B)) is amended by striking "\$225,000,000" and inserting "\$350,000,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentleman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

When an entrepreneur starts a business, one of the first challenges they face is getting the money they need to produce their new product or patent their great idea.

For small businesses, this has remained a constant struggle. However, we also know that small businesses are vital to our economic growth and, since the recession, have accounted for 60 percent of new net jobs in this country.

For these reasons, over 60 years ago Congress created the Small Business Administration, the SBA, and tasked it with the vital mission of ensuring that small businesses can get the capital they need.

The Small Business Investment Company, or SBIC, program is a public-private partnership that provides small

businesses access to equity and debt financing.

It has been extremely successful over the years providing billions in private capital to help promising businesses grow into household names. Pandora, Whole Foods, Apple, even Nike, were all small businesses that received early financing from the SBIC program.

In fiscal year 2014 alone, SBICs invested \$5.46 billion in small firms that employ approximately 113,000 workers all across America. In my home State of Ohio, more than 2,000 people have jobs today because the SBIC program helped small businesses there in Ohio access the resources that they needed to grow.

Under current law, successful SBICs under common control, frequently called the family of funds, are limited in the amount of funds they can provide to small businesses.

By merely raising this cap from \$225 million to \$350 million, as this legislation would do, we could stimulate up to \$750 million a year in capital that would be available to the next Nike or Apple. Given the volatile fiscal climate, we can all agree that small businesses would benefit from such a valuable increase in private investment.

H.R. 1023 increases this flow of private funds to small businesses at no cost—let me repeat—no cost to the taxpayer. The committee passed this bill with bipartisan support, both Republican and Democrat support.

I want to thank several members of the Committee on Small Business for their support and work on this bill, including Representatives BOST, CHU, CURBELO, GIBSON, HAHN, HANNA, KNIGHT, LAWRENCE, LUETKEMEYER, and MENG.

I would urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1023.

I want to thank ILEANA—I want to thank NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ for her strong leadership on this bill and much of the other bipartisan work that we have done in the committee. ILEANA is another Member who I strongly support and admire greatly.

At this point, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I, too, want to thank the chairman of the Small Business Committee for working in a bipartisan way to craft this legislation.

Indeed, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN is a good friend of mine from Florida. So I don't take any offense.

Small business investment companies have assisted thousands of high-growth companies over the years, providing nearly \$75 billion in capital.

By design, the program fills the gap in the capital markets for business that has outgrown the SBA's 7(a) guaranteed loan program, but remain too small or too risky for traditional private equity markets to bear.

SBICs operate in a unique public-private partnership with SBA. Once managers raise enough private capital, the

agency provides matching funds, which are pooled together and invested in high-growth small businesses.

To maximize the impact of the program, the most successful fund managers are permitted to hold more than one SBIC license at a time, known as a family of funds, with the benefit of drawing additional SBA leverage.

The current leverage caps, implemented in 2010, allow single licensees to draw \$175 million and family-of-fund licensees to draw \$225 million. H.R. 1023, the Small Business Investment Company Capital Act of 2015, would increase that cap by an additional 55 percent to \$350 million.

According to SBA data, only seven SBICs would be able to take advantage of the increase, limiting the actual amount of capital that will reach our small business community. The roughly 150 other SBIC families are unlikely to ever need this increase.

Similarly, concentrating additional taxpayer-backed leverage in just a few asset managers necessitates the need for more oversight. I look forward to working with the chairman to strike the right balance ensuring this capital is deployed efficiently, but with less risk.

The SBIC program has done a lot of good for the small business community over the years. In fact, since 2010, SBICs have quadrupled their output to over \$3.4 billion last year alone, but it is still coming up short in its assistance to women, minorities, and veterans.

These groups receive just 6 percent of total SBIC capital. It is my hope, as we work with the Senate on finalized language, steps can be taken to address this inequity.

Providing ways to get more capital into the hands of small business owners is a top priority for both sides of the aisle in this committee.

I want to thank Chairman CHABOT for introducing this legislation, and I am hopeful the increase in leverage will provide new capital opportunities to entrepreneurs from every walk of life.

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1023, the Small Business Investment Company Capital Act of 2015.

Small businesses serve as America's economic engine, driving essential job creation. In my Western New York district, small businesses provide the good-paying jobs that people need to support their families. However, we need to do more to encourage small business growth.

This legislation aids the SBIC program, which utilizes private investment funds to provide long-term loans and capital to small businesses in need. Without this vital program, many of the small businesses in our country would not be able to succeed.

Since inception, the SBIC program has invested \$73 billion in more than 118,000 U.S. small businesses. In western New York, this program has supported companies like Gemcor in West Seneca and Synacor in Buffalo and is critical to the jobs they provide.

This crucial investment is why I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1023.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Since its creation in 1958, the SBIC program has injected billions of dollars into promising startups and small businesses.

With the help of the SBIC, some of these small businesses grow into Fortune 500 companies. Apple, Inc., was once an SBIC client. Today it is one of the largest companies in the world by market capitalization.

By providing businesses with capital to grow, the SBIC program has also been a driver of job creation. In 2014 alone, the program helped create or retain 113,000 jobs.

I look forward to working with the chairman and our colleagues in the Senate on this legislation. I urge a "yes" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me just reiterate the impact this minor change could have on small businesses all across this country.

H.R. 1023 would increase the amount of capital available to small business and enable well-managed SBICs, at no cost to the taxpayer, to increase investment in small businesses.

This legislation is a commonsense, bipartisan reform, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 1023.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1023, the Small Business Investment Company Capital Act. As a co-sponsor of this bi-partisan legislation and a member of the Small Business Committee, I recognize the importance of supporting small businesses and providing them with resources for success. This bill provides small businesses with such tools by raising the maximum debt that the Small Business Administration can guarantee to borrowers in the Small Business Investment Company, or SBIC program, from \$225 million to \$350 million.

Currently, 30% of SBICs in the program are hitting or approaching the \$225 million cap, thus restricting them from further investment. This bill will allow SBICs to increase its cap by \$125 million, allowing it to invest in many underserved companies, including those led by minorities, women, and veterans.

The Congressional Budget Office has stated that by adopting this bill, there is no expected additional cost to administer the program, nor will there be an additional cost to the taxpayer as businesses participating in the program pay fees that would offset such costs.

In the last five years, SBICs have invested more than \$1.6 billion in my home state of New York. Last year alone, over \$5.46 billion was invested in 1,085 companies and SBICs

supported over 113,000 jobs. As we continue to work to get our economy back on track, we must join together to support small businesses, which drive our nation's economy.

This bill previously passed in the House of Representatives as H.R. 6504 in the 112th Congress. I urge my colleagues to, once again, vote in support of this bill that supports our nation's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1023.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPERSTORM SANDY RELIEF AND DISASTER LOAN PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2015

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 208) to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish a program to make loans to certain businesses, homeowners, and renters affected by Superstorm Sandy, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 208

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Superstorm Sandy Relief and Disaster Loan Program Improvement Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) In 2012, Superstorm Sandy caused substantial physical and economic damage to the United States, and New York in particular.

(2) For businesses and homeowners, the primary means of obtaining long-term Federal financial assistance in the wake of disasters such as Superstorm Sandy is through the Small Business Administration's Disaster Loan Program.

(3) With regard to the Small Business Administration's operation of the Disaster Loan Program after Superstorm Sandy, the Government Accountability Office found that the Administration did not meet its timeliness goals for processing business loan applications.

(4) According to the Government Accountability Office, the Small Business Administration stated that it was challenged by an unexpectedly high volume of loan applications that it received early in its response to Superstorm Sandy.

(5) As a result, many businesses and homeowners affected by Superstorm Sandy were unable to apply for financing from the Small Business Administration.

SEC. 3. REVISED DISASTER DEADLINE.

Section 7(d) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(B) DISASTER LOANS FOR SUPERSTORM SANDY.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and subject to the same requirements and procedures that are used to make loans pursuant to subsection (b), a small business concern, homeowner, or renter that was located within an area and during the time

period with respect to which a major disaster was declared by the President under section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170) by reason of Superstorm Sandy may apply to the Administrator—

“(i) for a loan to repair, rehabilitate, or replace property damaged or destroyed by reason of Superstorm Sandy; or

“(ii) if such a small business concern has suffered substantial economic injury by reason of Superstorm Sandy, for a loan to assist such a small business concern.

“(B) **TIMING.**—The Administrator shall select loan recipients and make available loans for a period of not less than 1 year after the date on which the Administrator carries out this authority.”.

SEC. 4. USE OF PHYSICAL DAMAGE DISASTER LOANS TO CONSTRUCT SAFE ROOMS.

Section 7(b)(1)(A) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b)(1)(A)) is amended by striking “mitigating measures” and all that follows through “modifying structures” and inserting the following: “mitigating measures, including—

“(i) construction of retaining walls and sea walls;

“(ii) grading and contouring land; and

“(iii) relocating utilities and modifying structures, including construction of a safe room or similar storm shelter designed to protect property and occupants from tornadoes or other natural disasters”.

SEC. 5. COLLATERAL REQUIREMENTS FOR SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS.

Section 7(b) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (9) the following:

“(10) **COLLATERAL REQUIREMENTS FOR SMALL BUSINESSES.**—In the case of a loan made pursuant to this subsection in an amount not greater than \$250,000, the Administrator may not require a borrower to pledge his or her primary residence as collateral if—

“(A) other collateral exists, including assets related to the operation of a business; and

“(B) such an option does not delay the Administrator’s processing of disaster applications for a disaster.”.

SEC. 6. REDUCING DELAYS ON CLOSING AND DISBURSEMENT OF LOANS.

Section 7(b) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b)) is further amended by inserting after paragraph (10) (as added by section 5) the following:

“(11) **REDUCING CLOSING AND DISBURSEMENT DELAYS.**—The Administrator shall provide a clear and concise notification on all application materials for loans made under this subsection and on relevant websites notifying an applicant that the applicant may submit all documentation necessary for the approval of the loan at the time of application and that failure to submit all documentation could delay the approval and disbursement of the loan.”.

SEC. 7. INCREASING TRANSPARENCY IN LOAN APPROVALS.

Section 7(b) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b)) is further amended by inserting after paragraph (11) (as added by section 6) the following:

“(12) **INCREASING TRANSPARENCY IN LOAN APPROVALS.**—The Administrator shall establish and implement clear, written policies and procedures for analyzing the ability of a loan applicant to repay a loan made under this subsection.”.

SEC. 8. SAFEGUARDING TAXPAYERS’ INTERESTS.

Section 7(b) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b)) is further amended by inserting after paragraph (12) (as added by section 7) the following:

“(13) **ENSURING ACCOUNTABILITY IN LOAN APPROVALS.**—The Administrator shall establish requirements for the approval of economic injury disaster loan assistance made available pursuant to paragraph (2), which shall include the re-

view of applicant eligibility and shall require that all supporting documentation is submitted prior to loan approval. The Administrator shall require that personnel involved in the approval of such loans be trained on such procedures.”.

SEC. 9. DISASTER PERFORMANCE MEASURES.

Section 7(b) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b)) is further amended by inserting after paragraph (13) (as added by section 8) the following:

“(14) **REPORTING ON DISASTER PERFORMANCE MEASURES.**—The Administrator shall report the average processing time for all other disaster loan applications, including disaggregated data on disaster loan applications that were declined by the Administration’s automated disaster processing system and applications in which the Administrator performed loss verification. For each disaster described in paragraph (2), the Administrator shall report such average processing times on its website and to the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate.”.

SEC. 10. DISASTER PLAN IMPROVEMENTS.

The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall revise the comprehensive written disaster response plan required in section 40 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657l), or any successor thereto, to incorporate the Administration’s response to a situation in which an extreme volume of applications are received during the period of time immediately after a disaster, which shall include a plan to ensure that sufficient human and technological resources are made available and a plan to prevent delays in loan processing.

SEC. 11. REPORT TO CONGRESS ON IMPLEMENTATION OF CERTAIN PROGRAMS.

(a) **INITIAL REPORT.**—The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall report to Congress not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act on the implementation and status of the private disaster loan program established in section 7(c) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(c)), the Immediate Disaster Assistance program established in section 42 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 657n), and the expedited disaster assistance business loan program established in section 12085 of the Small Business Disaster Response and Loan Improvements Act of 2008 (15 U.S.C. 636j).

(b) **REQUIRED CONSULTATION WITH DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS AND CREDIT UNIONS.**—The Administrator shall require the Associate Administrator for the Office of Disaster Assistance to consult with depository institutions (as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813)) and credit unions regarding their potential participation in any of the programs described in subsection (a).

(c) **REPORT ON CONSULTATION.**—Not later than 6 months after date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall report to Congress on the consultation required under subsection (b).

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentleman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

A natural disaster exposes us to the worst of nature. Yet, in some powerful way, it brings out the best in people. Communities ban together. Neighbors help neighbors, and volunteers donate their time and energy all in an effort to rebuild.

In the last decade, America has faced some of its worst natural disasters, with Hurricane Katrina in 2005 and, more recently, Hurricane Sandy in 2012.

In the aftermath of any disaster, it is imperative that the Federal Government programs operate as efficiently and effectively as possible so that victims are able to rebuild and return to their normal lives as soon as possible.

Following Hurricane Sandy, there have been startling reports regarding the Small Business Administration’s inability to properly administer the disaster loan program. The SBA was unwilling to implement and utilize pre-existing statutory authority that would have assisted the agency in its response to Sandy.

□ 1615

Mr. Speaker, despite our living in the Internet era with smartphones, email, and apps, the SBA was shocked and surprised at the volume of electronic disaster assistance applications it received, and the systems were overwhelmed and unable to process applications. In a poor pun, the SBA’s disaster loan program was a disaster itself for the victims of Hurricane Sandy.

The legislation before us, H.R. 208, is a corrective to those who suffered twice—first, by a disaster and, second, by the SBA’s inability to effectively provide disaster assistance.

As Congress did with those who suffered from Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Wilma, this legislation would allow those in the areas affected by Sandy to apply for disaster assistance, irrespective of the artificial and non-binding deadlines imposed by the SBA.

Further, given the struggles that the SBA had in responding to Hurricane Sandy, H.R. 208 makes practical changes to the disaster loan program to help ensure that victims of future disasters do not suffer as those who felt the brunt of Sandy did.

For example, H.R. 208 requires the SBA to update their disaster plan to account for a disaster with extreme application volumes and allows those affected by disasters to use SBA disaster loans to build safe rooms as a mitigating measure against future similar disasters.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation also makes smart changes to create parity among disaster victims by requiring the SBA to establish credit standards so that similarly situated borrowers are treated in an identical manner following a disaster.

These changes, among others, will ensure that the SBA is fully capable of responding to the next catastrophic disaster. Unfortunately, we all know there will be one or probably many.

I want to thank Ranking Member VELÁZQUEZ, once again, for her leadership on this issue and for working with me to develop a bill that strives to ensure those affected by disasters can rebuild quickly.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has broad, bipartisan support. I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on H.R. 208, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, when Hurricane Sandy made landfall in 2012, New York City was one of the hardest hit areas. Thousands of homes suffered damage, infrastructure was disrupted, and our city’s small businesses were impacted physically and economically.

Mr. Speaker, 32,000 New Yorkers lost their jobs that November, losses many economists attribute to the storm’s economic impact. After disasters like these, it is not uncommon for as many as 40 percent of impacted small businesses to fail, depressing commerce and slowing the overall community’s recovery.

The Small Business Administration’s disaster lending functions are meant to provide quick credit to small firms and homeowners that have been impacted by catastrophes. With entrepreneurs’ and homeowners’ livelihoods at stake, it is vital that the SBA’s disaster programs operate effectively. That is why, in 2008, after Katrina, Congress passed reforms meant to improve SBA’s disaster response.

It became evident after Hurricane Sandy that there is still more work to be done. The Government Accountability Office, the inspector general, and reports from Small Business Committee Democrats have all documented long delays in the processing and disbursement of loans.

Our committee found, for instance, that small businesses waited 46 days to get their application processed by SBA, a threefold increase over previous Atlantic storms.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 208 takes steps to address these shortcomings and ensure those affected by Hurricane Sandy are treated fairly. To begin, the bill would allow small businesses to apply again for loans. As SBA was so unprepared for a disaster of this scale, it is important that those impacted have another chance at securing assistance.

The bill would also correct a number of the shortcomings that have held back the SBA’s programs from functioning smoothly. Businesses will no longer be prohibited from posting their assets as collateral. This is important as, previously, many entrepreneurs have had to use personal assets for loan collateral. By reducing closing and disbursement delays, H.R. 208 would ensure funds flow more swiftly to businesses after future catastrophes.

Lastly, the measure takes steps to require SBA to implement reforms Congress passed following Katrina. The fact is the agency has been woefully slow in making these changes, and this law will help hold it accountable.

Mr. Speaker, our small businesses are counting on the SBA in times of crises

to provide badly needed help so they can recover quickly and continue supporting our local economies. This legislation, which enjoys bipartisan support, will help improve that process, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, when disasters strike, getting small businesses back on their feet quickly can help local economies recover. For that to happen, the SBA’s disaster lending initiatives must work as intended, providing American capital to firms that have suffered physical and economic damage.

The legislation we are considering would allow businesses that encountered delays to reapply for assistance and be made whole. It will improve how the agency functions in the future, speeding help to small businesses and homeowners when they are most in need.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bipartisan bill, and it will do much good for entrepreneurs impacted by Sandy and for businesses impacted by future disasters. I thank Chairman CHABOT for his support on this legislation.

I encourage my colleagues to vote “yes,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, in closing, we never know when and where the next disaster will strike, but, unfortunately, we do know that there will be more disasters. Given this, we must ensure that the SBA is truly prepared to help victims in the aftermath of those disasters.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 208 rights the wrongs imposed by the SBA on those who suffered from the effects of Sandy, but H.R. 208 does more than just correct past mistakes; it imposes obligations on the SBA to ensure that the agency learns from history and does not repeat those mistakes so people in this country are actually helped next time and not harmed by the agency.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I was pleased to support the Superstorm Sandy Relief and Disaster Loan Program Improvement Act (H.R. 208). This legislation will provide assistance to both homeowners and businesses that were utterly failed by the Small Business Administration (SBA) in the aftermath of the Superstorm Sandy, opening up assistance eligibility for an additional year and making necessary changes to the Disaster Loan Program.

Last week, I had the privilege of testifying before the House Small Business Committee regarding the hardships now faced by homeowners who applied for SBA disaster assistance due to a complete lack of information and disclosure in the loan process. This bill will help those who did not even have the opportunity to obtain or file a loan application due to SBA’s serious incompetence and disorganization.

As the Government Accountability Office (GAO) reported, SBA missed its timeliness goals by a longshot and is likely still unprepared for another large-scale disaster. SBA was plagued by missed deadlines, decision backlogs, computer systems failures, and in-

sufficient personnel training—problems that should not have come as a surprise in the aftermath of SBA’s abysmal response to Hurricane Katrina. Further, GAO found SBA could once again “be unprepared for a large volume of applications to be submitted quickly following future disasters, which may result in delays in loan funds for disaster victims.”

These failures cannot continue. Here we are more than two and a half years following Sandy, still correcting failures that have slowed the recovery process. In May, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) reopened all Sandy-related flood insurance claims due to widespread fraud and a complete lack of oversight of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). These issues were completely foreseeable but were not addressed, and Sandy victims continue to suffer as a result.

In addition to reopening the loan application process, H.R. 208 will reduce delays in closing and disbursement on loans, allow the construction of safe rooms, modify collateral requirements, increase transparency, establish new performance measures, and require disaster plan improvements, among other commonsense changes. I commend Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Chairman CHABOT for their leadership on this issue, and look forward to working with them to further address necessary reforms to the SBA Disaster Loan Program.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 208, Superstorm Sandy Relief and Disaster Loan Program Improvement Act of 2015. I appreciate the support and assistance of both Chairman CHABOT and Ranking Member VELÁZQUEZ to include my legislation, H.R. 2397, the Tornado Family Safety Act of 2015 as part of this legislation.

The Small Business Administration is currently afforded the authority to issue physical disaster loans for 120 percent of the value of property destroyed but not covered by insurance. The purpose of the additional 20 percent is so that individuals and business can modify structures to reduce damage from future disasters. In Oklahoma, the threat of tornadoes is ongoing, and we are always in between tornadoes. Planning is essential in order to militate against damage and loss of life.

It is for this reason that Section 4 is necessary. It reinforces the intent of Congress that already exists in statute—the SBA should already be including the construction of safe rooms as a use for physical disaster loans because it is mitigating measure. The SBA’s existing interpretation of existing language in the Small Business Act is incorrect.

Because of misinterpretation of this section previously, the SBA should now understand that physical disaster loans can also be used for other types of storm shelters as well, including, but not limited to structures that protect occupants from not only tornadoes, but from other natural disasters such as hurricanes, floods and wildfires.

It is important to note that loans may not be used to upgrade homes or make additions unless as required by local building codes and secondary or vacation homes are not eligible for these loans. The SBA does not duplicate insurance claim payments. Generally, loans are made over 30 years and interest rates are not more than 4 percent for those cannot obtain credit elsewhere and for those that can

obtain alternative credit, the rate does not exceed 8 percent for the loan.

While local and state governments have an obligation to meet the increase in shelter demand, the construction of the shelters is expensive. Under guidelines from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the International Code Council (ICC), a safe room should withstand 250 mph winds and the impact of a 15-pound plank hitting a wall at 100 mph, according to the Insurance Institute for Business and Home Safety.

Safe rooms designed to the FEMA and ICC standards are recommended for both tornadoes and hurricanes. For individual homes, a safe room could range anywhere from \$3,000 to \$12,000.

For anyone who has experienced Mother Nature's most indiscriminate and unpredictable terrors, you can truly understand the extent to which they devastate lives and property.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I support Superstorm Sandy Relief and Disaster Loan Program Improvement Act of 2015. As I have stated before on the floor of the House, I hope every Member reflects on the situation of our fellow Americans during a time of crisis or disaster. While we may hope that our communities remain peaceful and safe from crisis; we certainly must support those that do not escape such natural and man-made calamities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 208, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to improve the disaster assistance programs of the Small Business Administration."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MICROLOAN MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2670) to amend the Small Business Act to provide for expanded participation in the microloan program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2670

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Microloan Modernization Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. WAIVERS OF 25/75 RULE.

(a) WAIVER AUTHORIZED.—Section 7(m)(4)(E)(i) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)(4)(E)(i)) is amended by adding at the end the following: "The Administrator shall by rule establish a process by which intermediaries may apply for and the Administrator may grant a waiver from the requirements of this clause."

(b) CONTENTS OF RULE.—In the rule required by the amendment made by subsection (a), the Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall require any applicant for a waiver to—

(1) to specify how such applicant will use the additional technical assistance; and

(2) provide assurance in a form provided for by the Administrator in the rule that the intermediary will have sufficient funds to provide technical assistance to all of the intermediary's borrowers.

(c) RULEMAKING REQUIREMENTS.—The rule required by subsection (a) shall be promulgated after notice and the opportunity for comment of not less than 60 days. Such regulation shall be codified in the Code of Federal Regulations and shall incorporate any delegation of the Administrator's authority to approve waivers to any appropriate subsidiary official.

SEC. 3. MICROLOAN INTERMEDIARY LENDING LIMIT INCREASED.

Section 7(m)(3)(C) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)(3)(C)) is amended by striking "\$5,000,000" and inserting "\$6,000,000".

SEC. 4. EXTENDED REPAYMENT TERMS.

Section 7(m)(6) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)(6)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(F) REPAYMENT TERMS FOR LOANS TO SMALL BUSINESSES.—The Administrator may not impose limitations on the term for repayment of a loan made by an intermediary to a small business concern or entrepreneur, except that—

"(i) in the case of a loan made by an intermediary of \$10,000 or less, the repayment term shall be not more than 6 years; and

"(ii) in the case of a loan greater than \$10,000, the repayment term shall be not more than 10 years."

SEC. 5. LINES OF CREDIT AUTHORIZED.

Section 7(m)(6)(A) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)(6)(A)) is amended by inserting after "short-term" insert "(including lines of credit)".

SEC. 6. GAO STUDY OF MICROENTERPRISE PARTICIPATION.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall complete a study on and report to the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives on the following:

(1) The operations (including services provided, structure, size, and area of operation) of a representative sample of—

(A) intermediaries that are eligible for participation in the microloan program under section 7(m) of the Small Business Act and that do participate; and

(B) intermediaries (including those operated for profit, operated as non-profits, and those affiliated with a United States institution of higher learning) that are so eligible and that do not participate.

(2) The reasons why intermediaries described in paragraph (1)(B) choose not to participate.

(3) Recommendations on how to encourage increased participation in the microloan program by intermediaries described in paragraph (1)(B).

(4) Recommendations on how to decrease the costs associated with participation in the microloan program for eligible intermediaries.

SEC. 7. OFFICE OF ADVOCACY ECONOMIC STUDY OF MANDATORY SAVINGS REQUIREMENT.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration shall submit to the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report on the economic impact of a mandatory savings requirement on business concerns eligible to participate in the microloan program under section 7(m) of the Small Business Act, including on the benefits and

costs of such a requirement and recommendations on implementation of such a requirement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentleman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the microloan program, overseen by the Small Business Administration, the SBA, is designed to provide credit for those entrepreneurs that would not otherwise have any access to credit, even basic revolving credit.

Among the SBA's capital access programs, the microloan program is unique because it also provides technical assistance to borrowers. It merges the money with the know-how.

To borrow a sports reference, microloans punch above their weight. I know the President has used that phrase on a number of occasions. These small-dollar loans are often the most difficult to receive and typically are the deciding factors in an entrepreneur's ability to start a business. This is demonstrated by the large number of first generation entrepreneurs who have received assistance under the microloan program.

Think about the number of successful individuals who recall starting a business with funds pooled from family and friends. Well, if no one in your family has started a business or has money to lend, then that entrepreneur's dream quickly fades to a distant memory. This is particularly true in traditionally underserved markets.

By making small-dollar loans less complicated and more accessible, we will empower individuals to become entrepreneurs; lift up their families; improve their communities; and, most importantly, create jobs for a whole lot of Americans.

H.R. 2670 does that. This bill enhances the microloan program by allowing microloan intermediaries greater flexibility in providing loans and technical assistance to their borrowers. The expectation is that the greater flexibility will result in greater participation by microlenders in the microloan program, thereby increasing the availability of critical small-dollar loans to these micro-entrepreneurs that punch above their size.

Despite the greater flexibility, H.R. 2670 also provides safeguards to maintain the primary feature of the program, and that is low-dollar loans offered to micro-entrepreneurs, along

with intermediary-provided technical assistance.

By modernizing the microloan program, as H.R. 2670 does, we are allowing the little guy a chance to get off the ropes, use their skills, and create innovative ideas to compete with the heavyweights of American industry. We all strive for a stronger, more competitive economy; and this bill aids in that mission.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has broad, bipartisan support once again.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on H.R. 2670, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, since 1991, the SBA microloan program has provided millions of dollars in financing and technical assistance to small businesses and entrepreneurs.

By providing loans to nonprofit intermediaries, who in turn lend funds to the smallest of small businesses, the program helps borrowers streamline their operations, grow to profitability, and create new jobs.

However, the program remains substantially the same as when it was first enacted. Over the years, we have identified a number of the program elements that could be updated to better deploy capital.

With that goal in mind, I want to thank Congressman MOULTON for introducing this important legislation. The Microloan Modernization Act of 2015 will make a number of targeted improvements to assist small businesses.

For borrowers, SBA set the maximum term of a microloan at 6 years. Particularly for larger microloans, this has caused financial strain due to higher monthly payments and is impeding some businesses from growing.

Today’s bill would allow a repayment period of up to 10 years for loans greater than \$10,000, providing borrowers with the flexibility to better manage cash flow, improve operations, and create more jobs. Similarly, SBA has prohibited lines of credit; yet not all businesses need a fixed-rate term loan.

A line of credit is sometimes the better product for a microbusiness that has cyclic or uneven cash flow. Today’s bill will give borrowers and lenders the flexibility to get them in the right loan product for their needs.

For intermediary lenders, today’s bill would create a new waiver to the 25-75 rule that restricts the use of technical assistance grants. This waiver process will help intermediaries more efficiently deploy technical assistance funding.

Additionally, the legislation will raise the lending cap by 20 percent. By giving successful intermediaries access to an additional \$1 million in SBA funding, they will be able to serve more borrowers in high-demand areas.

The microloan program fills a critical gap in the capital markets, helping underserved businesses that are too

small for the banking sector yet too big to finance with a credit card or loans from friends and family.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. MOULTON for introducing this bill. It will go a long way toward increasing access to capital for our Nation’s small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I just would like to point out the fact that 62 percent of microborrowers are women and minorities, and so this is filling an important gap that exists for these groups to access capital.

□ 1630

I thank the gentleman for introducing this important piece of legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO), who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Energy and Trade of the Committee on Small Business.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Small Business for yielding, and I also thank him for his leadership on all of these important issues. I also want to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON) for his work on this important piece of legislation.

Today, I rise in support of H.R. 2670, the Microloan Modernization Act of 2015. The microloan program is unique due to its focus on merging technical assistance with access to capital. For several micro-entrepreneurs, particularly those in underserved markets, this offers a way to get the small dollar loans, which a conventional bank would otherwise deny, while learning important skills, such as developing a business plan, that will be critical as the company finds success and grows.

Last year alone, the microloan program was responsible for providing nearly \$56 million in capital and aiding small businesses in creating or retaining 15,000 jobs.

However, after listening to several entrepreneurs and microloan intermediaries, it became clear that for the microloan program to truly tap into its potential, changes were necessary.

H.R. 2670 strives to make those changes and better support entrepreneurs. For example, currently, the statute says that microloan intermediaries may make short-term fixed-rate loans to small firms. Short term can mean different things to different people, but according to SBA regulations, short term means 6 years.

While in some instances this may make sense when the loan is a lower amount, this one-size-fits-all approach is not beneficial to small firms. This bill would remedy that by establishing maximum term limits for loans made by intermediaries to their borrowers: 6 years for loans under \$10,000, and 10 years for loans over \$10,000.

While this may seem like a minor change, we all know that allowing bor-

rowers to get the best repayment terms possible is crucial for ensuring low default rates and increasing participation in the microloan program.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, this is a commonsense, bipartisan reform that will increase access to capital for those most challenged to receive—our micro-entrepreneurs.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation, and I congratulate Mr. MOULTON for advancing this bill and Chairman CHABOT for bringing it to the House floor.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2670 and remind them that the reason we in the Small Business Committee work so hard for these entrepreneurs, for these people that are making a difference, is because they hire those in our society, in our communities, that most need jobs. Think of the college graduate who is looking for a job; think of the immigrant who arrived in this country and is looking for a way forward. It is small businesses that oftentimes give these people their first shot at success.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. VELÁZQUEZ for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we often say that small businesses are the engine of economic growth. That is true; and if you look at the data, new businesses—those younger than 5 years old—created nearly all of our economy’s new jobs in the past two decades.

In order to create the conditions for job creation, the Federal Government must increase access to capital so new entrepreneurs with a good idea can take a risk and start a new business. The Small Business Administration’s microloan program fills a critical gap in the capital markets, helping underserved businesses that are too small for the banking sector yet too big to finance with a credit card or loans from friends and family.

The program has provided hundreds of millions of dollars in financing and technical assistance to small businesses and entrepreneurs, but the program is in need of reform. That is why I introduced H.R. 2670, the Microloan Modernization Act of 2015, which will make a number of targeted improvements to the program so more borrowers can benefit from access to capital.

First, the bill increases the loan limit cap for intermediary lenders. Many successful intermediaries have hit the current \$5 million cap and, as a result, deserving small businesses are denied capital through no fault of their own.

Second, the bill extends the loan repayment period for loans greater than \$10,000. This small change will provide borrowers with the flexibility to better manage cash flow, improve operations, and create more jobs.

Third, the bill permits lines of credit, which are currently prohibited by the SBA. Not all businesses need a fixed-rate term loan. Sometimes a more flexible line of credit is the better product for a small business that has cyclic or uneven cash flow.

Fourth, the bill creates a waiver for an overly rigid technical assistance formula known as the 25/75 rule to help intermediaries deploy technical assistance more efficiently.

Lastly, the bill commissions two studies to explore ways to incentivize intermediaries to participate in the microloan program and determine if mandatory savings accounts would benefit entrepreneurs.

The microloan program supported nearly 4,000 small businesses just last year, and two of these successful businesses are located in Lynn, Massachusetts, in my district. Prism Products, an industrial distributor, received a microloan from the SBA to purchase extra inventory. As a result of the loan, owner Lisa Fitzpatrick was able to increase revenue and hire a sales professional with 15 years of experience.

In 2013, local restaurateurs Shawn and Noyan Edmond fulfilled their lifelong dream of opening a Caribbean restaurant in downtown Lynn. The microloan enabled the Edmonds to purchase new kitchen equipment and make renovations to the storefront of Rite Spice Caribbean.

As our economy recovers from the recession, we need more people like the Edmonds and Lisa Fitzpatrick to take a risk and start a business, and we need the SBA microloan program to help them. That is why the Microloan Modernization Act of 2015 is so critical.

In closing, I would like to thank my ranking member, NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ, for her work on this bill; my chairman, STEVE CHABOT; and my colleagues, Representatives CURBELO, CHU, TAKAI, and RADEWAGEN, for cosponsoring this bill.

I urge my colleagues to support America's newest entrepreneurs and vote "yes" on this important legislation.

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

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

The microloan program provides very small loans to start-up, newly established, or growing small businesses. Many of these businessowners come from traditionally underserved markets, where personal and commercial credit is hard to come by.

As a result, the SBA's microloan program is a critical resource that not only injects much-needed capital, but provides the necessary business training that ensures borrowers are equipped with the knowledge needed to succeed.

Since the end of the recession, micro-lending is up 25 percent nationwide. By the way, for the last couple of years, the default rate on microloans is going

down. In fact, SBA requested an additional \$10 million for next year to handle demand. I can think of no better time to make long-sought changes to improve the program's efficiency and capital deployment.

I wanted to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for introducing the Microloan Modernization Act of 2015. It will give borrowers new repayment flexibility and loan choices, provide more flexibility to intermediaries, and inject additional capital in high-demand areas.

I urge a "yes" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, as we work to get capital into the hands of entrepreneurs, we need to keep SBA programs relevant. We also must ensure that our lending partners have the flexibility to manage their loan portfolios in a way that makes the most sense for the borrower. H.R. 2670 does that.

I want to thank Mr. MOULTON and Mr. CURBELO for their leadership on these reforms. And I once again want to recognize the ranking member, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, for her leadership and her cooperation in getting this type of legislation to the floor today so that we can pass this.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2670, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2670.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS ENTREPRENEURSHIP ACT OF 2015

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2499) to amend the Small Business Act to increase access to capital for veteran entrepreneurs, to help create jobs, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2499

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Veterans Entrepreneurship Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. PERMANENT SBA EXPRESS LOAN GUARANTEE FEE WAIVER FOR VETERANS.

Section 7(a)(31) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(31)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(G) GUARANTEE FEE WAIVER FOR VETERANS.—

"(i) GUARANTEE FEE WAIVER.—The Administrator may not collect a guarantee fee described in paragraph (18) in connection with a loan made under this paragraph to a veteran or spouse of a veteran on or after October 1, 2015.

"(ii) EXCEPTION.—If the President's budget for the upcoming fiscal year, submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, includes a cost for the program established under this subsection that is above zero, the requirements of clause (i) shall not apply to loans made during such upcoming fiscal year.

"(iii) DEFINITION.—In this subparagraph, the term 'veteran or spouse of a veteran' means—

"(I) a veteran, as defined in section 3(q)(4);

"(II) an individual who is eligible to participate in the Transition Assistance Program established under section 1144 of title 10, United States Code;

"(III) a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces named in section 10101 of title 10, United States Code;

"(IV) the spouse of an individual described in subclause (I), (II), or (III); or

"(V) the surviving spouse (as defined in section 101 of title 38, United States Code) of an individual described in subclause (I), (II), or (III) who died while serving on active duty or as a result of a disability that is service-connected (as defined in such section)."

SEC. 3. REPORT ON ACCESSIBILITY AND OUTREACH TO FEMALE VETERANS BY THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a report assessing the level of outreach to and consultation with female veterans regarding access to capital by women's business centers (as described in section 29 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656)) and Veterans Business Outreach Centers (as referred to in section 32 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 657b)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentleman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Every day, American soldiers are risking their lives and leaving family and friends and loved ones behind to protect our freedoms and defend the United States. Currently, there are over 21 million veterans living all across the United States. When these brave men and women return home, they strive to transition seamlessly, hopefully, back into their civilian lives.

Veterans face challenges in that transition, one of those being employment. Our most recent veterans who have served in Active Duty at any time since September 2001 have a higher unemployment rate than the average civilian. In particular, our recent female veterans have an unemployment rate that is over twice the national average.

While finding employment upon transition to civilian life is a challenge,

many veterans find that skills learned during military service translate well into entrepreneurship. Yet many veterans have found it difficult to obtain the funds needed to start a small business.

In looking for ways to finance their new businesses, veterans may turn to the Small Business Administration, the SBA, for loan assistance. In fiscal year 2014, veterans received over 2,000 7(a) loans, totaling almost \$600 million, but I believe we can do more to get these loans into the hands of veterans. Already the SBA Administrator is using her authority to waive certain fees charged to veterans.

One way to increase veterans' access to capital is to make SBA loans more affordable for veterans by permanently waiving the up-front fee charged by the SBA to borrowers through the agency's 7(a) express loan program. H.R. 2499 does just that, all at no cost to the taxpayer.

H.R. 2499 strikes a delicate balance between providing a fee waiver to help America's veterans while safeguarding scarce taxpayer dollars by creating an exception to the fee waiver in any year where an appropriation is necessary to cover the cost of the overall 7(a) loan program. This ensures that this fee waiver will never have a cost to the taxpayer.

I believe, as many Americans do, that we must support our veterans, and this legislation provides support to veteran entrepreneurs for years to come at no cost. It is a smart, commonsense approach which had broad bipartisan support and passed out of our committee by a voice vote, meaning basically everyone supported it on the committee.

Further, this bill has support from major veterans' groups who are well aware of the challenges that brave veterans face in transitioning to civilian life.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2499, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1645

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

Veterans play a significant role in the U.S. economy. They own 2.4 million businesses, employ 5.8 million people, and have generated well over \$1 trillion in receipts.

Like most small businesses, access to capital is still hard to come by, yet is vital to their existence, paving the way for growth and continued job creation. As the Federal Government's main provider of small business assistance, the SBA guarantees loans to veteran-owned businesses through a number of lending programs.

In 2013, the agency's 7(a) program provided over 2,000 veterans with loans, totaling \$600 million. This, however, represented only 4 percent overall. In an effort to increase veteran lending volume, the SBA has waived the bor-

rower fees paid by veterans on small-dollar and SBA Express loans.

In 2014, the impact of the waiver was a mixed bag. While veterans saw a 23 percent increase in loans of \$150,000 or less, the program experienced an 8 percent decrease in veteran loans overall. The initiative has had more success this year with veteran lending seeing a 20 percent increase, which is outpacing the 7(a) program's overall growth.

To build on that trend, H.R. 2499 will make the fee waiver permanent for veterans who are seeking an SBA Express loan. It will reduce costs, spur more veterans to borrow, and, in turn, will grow businesses and create jobs.

I want to thank Chairman CHABOT for introducing this bill to keep more dollars in veteran entrepreneurs' hands. We know that every little bit counts when trying to start or to grow a small business, and I cannot think of a group that is more deserving than that of our veterans.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT).

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2499, the Veterans Entrepreneurship Act of 2015.

This will expand opportunities for veterans who return home and want to apply their skills and disciplines in starting businesses.

What we are doing today is talking about letting our leaders who are out in the field and are defending our Nation come home and do the same thing here, bring their entrepreneurial skills and bring their leadership skills to small business, to the business industry, and to do it in the way they have done when protecting the Nation.

Our fighting men and women are uniquely inclined to succeed in business ventures. They are hard workers and natural leaders and are trained to build teams and to think critically in high-pressure environments.

Veteran-owned small businesses make up about 9 percent of all small firms and nearly 4 million businesses, with average annual revenues of almost \$500,000. These are people who know how to succeed. These are people who know how to lead.

This bill is just taking away some of the obstacles, making it a little bit easier for our leaders to come back into the entrepreneurship of America and succeed.

While the economic environment is improving generally, some of our vets are having a tough time getting access to the funds they need to put their skills into action.

Particularly, female veterans are dealing with outsized obstacles in transitioning to the private sector. The unemployment rate for women warfighters who have come home from Iraq and Afghanistan is 11.4 percent, more than twice that of what our male veterans' national average is.

It is time we turned our attention to addressing the problems faced by our

veteran entrepreneurs, who have made such tremendous sacrifices and who want to continue to pursue the American Dream.

This bill takes a prudent, responsible step in harnessing their skills and expertise in order to add value to the economy and in lowering the barriers for these trained leaders to get their ideas off the ground.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, in closing, the 7(a) loan program provides a critical source of capital for our veterans.

This year the SBA lending to veteran-owned firms is on track to exceed \$1 billion for the first time ever. Today's bill will save veterans millions of dollars every year at no cost to the taxpayers.

That means that veteran-owned businesses can invest or reinvest this money into their businesses. Our Nation's veterans are some of the most prolific small business creators, establishing thousands of firms every year.

I would like to thank Chairman CHABOT for taking steps to expand access to capital for this important group of job creators. I look forward to working with him and our colleagues in the Senate to move this legislation forward.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank all of the staff of the Small Business Committee for their hard work, especially a staff member on my side, Justin Pelletier.

I urge a "yes" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. In closing, I would, first of all, like to acknowledge that Mr. KNIGHT, who just spoke, is a veteran himself, and we certainly appreciate his service to our country.

Again, I want to stress that H.R. 2499 will provide greater assistance to our veterans without imposing any additional costs on taxpayers.

The enactment of H.R. 2499 then represents only a small token of the appreciation that we can show to our veterans as they take their skills learned through service to create small businesses that will help create jobs, thus serving our country a second time. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 2499.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2499, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
THROUGH TRIBAL LAND EX-
CHANGE ACT

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 387) to provide for certain land to be taken into trust for the benefit of Morongo Band of Mission Indians, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 387

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Economic Development Through Tribal Land Exchange Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Act, the following definitions apply:

(1) **BANNING.**—The term "Banning" means the City of Banning, which is located in Riverside County, California adjacent to the Morongo Indian Reservation.

(2) **FIELDS.**—The term "Fields" means Lloyd L. Fields, the owner of record of Parcel A.

(3) **MAP.**—The term "map" means the map entitled "Morongo Indian Reservation, County of Riverside, State of California Land Exchange Map", and dated May 22, 2014, which is on file in the Bureau of Land Management State Office in Sacramento, California.

(4) **PARCEL A.**—The term "Parcel A" means the approximately 41.15 acres designated on the map as "Fields lands".

(5) **PARCEL B.**—The term "Parcel B" means the approximately 41.15 acres designated on the map as "Morongo lands".

(6) **PARCEL C.**—The term "Parcel C" means the approximately 1.21 acres designated on the map as "Banning land".

(7) **PARCEL D.**—The term "Parcel D" means the approximately 1.76 acres designated on the map as "Easement to Banning".

(8) **SECRETARY.**—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(9) **TRIBE.**—The term "Tribe" means the Morongo Band of Mission Indians, a federally recognized Indian tribe.

SEC. 3. TRANSFER OF LANDS; TRUST LANDS, EASEMENT.

(a) **TRANSFER OF PARCEL A AND PARCEL B AND EASEMENT OVER PARCEL D.**—Subject to any valid existing rights of any third parties and to legal review and approval of the form and content of any and all instruments of conveyance and policies of title insurance, upon receipt by the Secretary of confirmation that Fields has duly executed and deposited with a mutually acceptable and jointly instructed escrow holder in California a deed conveying clear and unencumbered title to Parcel A to the United States in trust for the exclusive use and benefit of the Tribe, and upon receipt by Fields of confirmation that the Secretary has duly executed and deposited into escrow with the same mutually acceptable and jointly instructed escrow holder a patent conveying clear and unencumbered title in fee simple to Parcel B to Fields and has duly executed and deposited into escrow with the same mutually acceptable and jointly instructed escrow holder an easement to the City for a public right-of-way over Parcel D, the Secretary shall instruct the escrow holder to simultaneously cause—

(1) the patent to Parcel B to be recorded and issued to Fields;

(2) the easement over Parcel D to be recorded and issued to the City; and

(3) the deed to Parcel A to be delivered to the Secretary, who shall immediately cause

said deed to be recorded and held in trust for the Tribe.

(b) **TRANSFER OF PARCEL C.**—After the simultaneous transfer of parcels A, B, and D under subsection (a), upon receipt by the Secretary of confirmation that the City has vacated its interest in Parcel C pursuant to all applicable State and local laws, the Secretary shall immediately cause Parcel C to be held in trust for the Tribe subject to—

(1) any valid existing rights of any third parties; and

(2) legal review and approval of the form and content of any and all instruments of conveyance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) and the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Morongo Band of Mission Indians, a tribe located about 20 miles west of Palm Springs, California, along with the city of Banning and a private property owner who resides in California together have asked Congress to enact H.R. 387, providing for the exchange of certain lands within or adjacent to the Morongo Reservation.

The bill also directs the Secretary of the Interior to grant an easement to the city of Banning for the use of certain lands currently held in trust on behalf of the tribe. The easement will provide the city with the ability to install electric, sewer, water, and related utility lines to accommodate commercial activity in the area.

This bill will accomplish three goals. First, it will promote the consolidation of the tribe's reservation lands. Second, it will resolve a land use dispute between a private landowner, the city, and the tribe. Third and finally, it will facilitate commercial development on lands adjacent to the tribe's reservation, which will be beneficial for the city of Banning and the tribe as well as for the private landowner.

This bill truly represents a win-win agreement without any of the parties having to compromise their desired goals.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I am proud to rise in support of my bill, H.R. 387, the Economic Development Through Tribal Land Exchange Act.

This non-controversial, bipartisan bill passed unanimously out of the House Natural Resources Committee and is supported by the Department of

the Interior. The bill would aid economic development in the city of Banning, California, through a land swap that is supported by all of the parties involved.

Currently, the Morongo Band of Mission Indians and a private landowner, Mr. Lloyd Fields, would like to exchange two parcels of land which are nearly identical in size and value, but they are restrained from doing so because one of the parcels is currently held in trust by the United States on behalf of the tribe.

My bill facilitates an equitable land swap between the Morongo tribe and the landowner to provide more consolidated reservation land for the tribe and commercial development opportunities for the landowner, the city of Banning, and Riverside County.

This bill serves as a model for how land use issues can be addressed by communities coming together while upholding the sacred government-to-government relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes.

I would like to thank Chairman Robert Martin of the Morongo Band of Mission Indians and the city of Banning for bringing this issue to my attention.

I would like to thank my colleague, Representative PAUL COOK from California, for being an original cosponsor, and Senator BOXER from California for introducing the bill in the Senate.

I would also like to thank Chairman BISHOP and Ranking Member GRIJALVA for expediting this bill through committee so that we could bring it to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, this is the type of bill that we can all support for the simple reason that it benefits all parties involved and spurs economic development and job creation.

We passed this bill unanimously on the floor last year. Let's move it once again. I urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 387.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, in closing, this just basically shows that you can actually get some things done at the local, State, and Federal levels.

This battle has been going on for a long while. I used to represent the area when I was in the State House. And when you can finally get all of the parties together and work in a bipartisan fashion, good things can happen.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

This is a clear example, as Representative PAUL COOK said, of two neighboring districts from different parties coming together for the benefit of economic development, for the betterment of our tribes, and for the betterment of our counties.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank my colleague, Representative PAUL COOK, for his support of this legislation, as well as to thank Chairman BISHOP and Ranking Member GRIJALVA for their work to bring this non-controversial bill to the floor before the end of the summer.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES), my friend and colleague, who also sits on the Indian, Insular and Alaska Native Affairs Subcommittee.

□ 1700

Ms. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 387, which directs the Secretary of the Interior to take certain land into trust for the benefit of Morongo Band of Mission Indians.

This legislation is a commonsense approach that will benefit the tribe, the city of Banning, and the larger local economy. Taking land into trust on behalf of tribes is one of the visible and impactful actions our government can undertake to uphold our trust obligations to the 567 sovereign tribal nations around the country.

Indian lands are critical for the exercise of tribal self-governance and self-determination and often represent great spiritual and cultural significance to tribal nations.

This bill represents an opportunity for the Morongo Band of Mission Indians to consolidate their land base and provide for their people while also resolving longstanding disputes that will clear the way for increased private economic development opportunities for the region. This legislation is a win-win for the tribe, the city, and private enterprise.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from California, NORMA TORRES, for her remarks in support of the bill. I would like to thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to again thank Representative PAUL COOK for his support of this legislation.

I would like to thank Chairman BISHOP and Ranking Member GRIJALVA for their work to bring this non-controversial bill to the floor before the end of the summer. I look forward to working together in the future on additional legislation to provide our tribal nations with the tools to create their own economic opportunity through self-determination and self-governance.

I urge my colleagues to come together, once again, and pass this commonsense bill that will create jobs and spur economic development for the Morongo Tribe and the city of Banning. Vote "yes" on H.R. 387.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 387.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

VETERANS ENTREPRENEURSHIP ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2499) to amend the Small Business Act to increase access to capital for veteran entrepreneurs, to help create jobs, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 1, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 434]
YEAS—410

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

NAYS—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—22

Aderholt	Grijalva	Simpson
Brown (FL)	Gutiérrez	Slaughter
Buchanan	Hinojosa	Smith (TX)
Butterfield	Kind	Stutzman
Cleaver	Marchant	Westmoreland
Hurd (TX)	Richmond	Young (IN)
Clyburn	Rohrabacher	
Engel	Rush	
Eshoo		

□ 1856

Ms. DEGETTE changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for the following vote on July 13, 2015. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall vote 434.

PERMISSION TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON H.R. 2898

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Natural Resources be authorized to file a supplemental report on the bill H.R. 2898.

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

There was no objection.

JAMES L. OBERSTAR MEMORIAL POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 179) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 3rd Avenue, NW, in Chisholm, Minnesota, as the “James L. Oberstar Memorial Post Office Building”.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 179

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

SECTION 1. JAMES L. OBERSTAR MEMORIAL POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 3rd Avenue, NW, in Chisholm, Minnesota, shall be known and designated as the “James L. Oberstar Memorial Post Office Building”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “James L. Oberstar Memorial Post Office Building”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TROTT). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

□ 1900

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of S. 179, a bill to name a post office in Chisholm, Minnesota, after a very distinguished former Member of this body, Congressman James Oberstar.

The bill was introduced by Senator AMY KLOBUCHAR, and our colleague Congressman RICHARD NOLAN has introduced House companion legislation.

Mr. Oberstar served in the House for a remarkable 36 years, and I think it is very fitting and appropriate to honor his legacy by lending his name to a post office in his hometown of Chisholm.

Congressman Oberstar was born in Chisholm, Minnesota, on September 10, 1934, and graduated from the high school there in 1952. Four years later, he earned a bachelor of arts from the University of St. Thomas in St. Paul, Minnesota. He later earned a master’s degree from the College of Europe in Bruges, Belgium. A lot of people knew he was very fluent in French and liked to express himself on many trips in French.

Before running for Congress himself, Congressman Oberstar served on the staff for Congressman John Blatnik of Minnesota from 1963 to 1974. In that capacity, he worked with Congressman Blatnik on all of the legislation from the Public Works and Transportation Committee. In the last 3 years he was with Congressman Blatnik, Congressman Oberstar became the chief of staff for that committee.

Congressman Oberstar was first elected to represent the people of Minnesota’s Eighth District in 1974. Among many notable achievements, he served as chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in the 110th and 111th Congresses. In total, he served in 18 Congresses.

Sadly, Mr. Oberstar passed away on May 3, 2014, in Potomac, Maryland. He certainly was a devoted public servant who left a remarkable legacy of service to the citizens of Minnesota and the United States.

Earlier in this Congress, there was another tribute for Congressman Oberstar. At that time, I said this:

It is an astounding figure to think that a man worked on this one committee for 47 years of his life, but he did so with great honor and distinction. In fact, I think most everybody knew that there was no one in the Congress and probably never has been anyone in the history of the Congress who has known transportation issues and understood them and worked on them longer and harder and with more effectiveness than Jim Oberstar did.

At one point, he was chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee. In 1994, after the election, the Republicans took control, and I had the honor of becoming the chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee, and I served for 6 years in that position, which was the maximum allowable on our side.

When I took over as chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee, I frequently heard Jim Oberstar referred to as “Mr. Aviation.” So I went to him and asked for his help, and he

helped me, guided me, and gave me advice that, to this day, I appreciate very much. He did so in a very kind and humble way.

Of course, then he reached the pinnacle and became chairman of that committee, a committee that he loved. He was a great chairman. He worked across the aisle in a very bipartisan way, and I think he tried to help everyone on both sides of the aisle and others in any way that he possibly could.

I just wanted to join in this opportunity to pay tribute to a man who was a great American and a great Member of this body, Congressman James Oberstar.

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

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

I certainly associate myself with the remarks of Mr. DUNCAN.

I am asking my colleagues to join me in supporting S. 179. That is the bill that would designate a United States post office located at 14 3rd Avenue Northwest in Jim Oberstar’s hometown, Chisholm, Minnesota; and it would be called the James L. Oberstar Memorial Post Office.

Mr. Speaker, I am speaking today for a memorial for Jim Oberstar not only because of my position on the committee, but for me, this is an act of love and respect. I am speaking for a man known in this House as one of singular intellect and personal qualities.

Jim was a native of Chisholm. He graduated—and anybody who knew Jim will not be surprised at this—summa cum laude from the University of St. Thomas in St. Paul, Minnesota; then he got a master’s degree in Belgium. That may be where he picked up his French, which he playfully used on us at every opportunity.

Jim was not long out of college when he began working in this House, and working in this House was to determine his destiny for the rest of his life. He first served as clerk of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, as it was then called. He became administrator of the Committee on Public Works—now called Transportation and Infrastructure—when Representative John Blatnik became chairman in 1970.

Four years later, Jim, himself, ran for Congress, succeeding Mr. Blatnik who retired from Minnesota’s Eighth District of Congress. Then Jim served 36 extraordinary years in this House, and he became the longest serving Member from Minnesota in the House of Representatives. During that period, Jim Oberstar became the leading expert on transportation and infrastructure in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, for example, he served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation when it passed legislation, increasing our investment in airports and air security, which we are still benefiting from.

Later, he became ranking member of the full committee. There, he worked

tirelessly for something we are trying to get in this House now, for that gas user fee, which used to be bipartisan and was often raised and helped Jim and those who served with him improve and make our system reliable on the transportation and infrastructure that we so often celebrate today—and I mean, all of it, roads, bridges, and transit alike.

We were very fortunate when in 2007, Jim Oberstar was elected chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. It was during his chairmanship that the economy went down; and we really needed an expert on transportation and infrastructure, since investment in transportation and infrastructure is the best investment for the dollar during a recession and that, of course, was the deepest recession since the Great Depression.

Jim's work during that period is still blossoming in the States. He held 300 hearings and passed almost 300 bills and resolutions out of committee and through the House. Nearly 200 of those pieces of legislation were approved by both Houses, including the Water Resources Development Act, the bill that authorized the maintenance and construction of America's harbors, as well as funding for important wildlife habitat projects.

Mr. Speaker, Jim also was a cyclist. He took transportation seriously. He cycled on the trails that he helped get built and that he so loved. His knowledge of our work was so encyclopedic that Democrats and Republicans alike, when Jim spoke, listened hard because they knew they were getting a once-in-a-lifetime lesson in the complexities associated with transportation and infrastructure in our country. He was a particular leader on intermodalism, which we know as the transportation wave of the future today.

It was with enormous sadness that we learned that Jim Oberstar passed away on May 2, 2014. He was 79 years old. Jim will long be remembered for his dedication to public service and for leaving his mark on transportation in our country. It is a mark that will never be erased.

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN), a sponsor of the House companion of S. 179, a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the gentleman who represents the very same district that Jim Oberstar represented.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Representative DUNCAN and Representative NORTON for the fine tributes to a fine Member and a real credit to this institution.

This bill honors our friend and our colleague, the late Jim Oberstar, in an important way, by naming the United States post office in his hometown of

Chisholm, Minnesota, the James L. Oberstar Memorial Post Office.

I will never forget the first day that Jim walked into the Chamber through one of the side doors over here as a former Member of Congress. As he walked in and proceeded down the aisle, Members recognized him, and they started spontaneously, Democrats and Republicans alike, to applaud Jim Oberstar.

By the time he got to the well, the whole House was engaged in this spontaneous, bipartisan, genuine, loving, and appreciative applause for Jim Oberstar. I, quite frankly, have never seen anything like it. I hope to see a lot more things like it in the days to come, but what a remarkable moment that was.

It was a real genuine spirit of affection for someone who worked really hard, knew his material as well or better than anyone, and was such a good nonpartisan when it came to what is good for America; I have never quite seen anything like it.

Jim received more honors than he could count in life; quite frankly, he received even more in his passing, but I think it is safe to say that no honor would please him more than being recognized by his colleagues in the hometown of Chisholm where Jim grew up.

Chisholm, on Minnesota's Iron Range, is where he learned the value of ideas as a star on his high school debate team. They say he was a pretty good football player, too, but he liked to recall that the editor of his hometown said to him on a couple of occasions, "Jim, you are a really good debater. You really know how to argue. You might want to keep working at that"—and how fitting that he would end up in the Congress of the United States.

It is also in Chisholm where he learned about public service with his first working job for that editor, peddling papers to the miners and to the mining families and learning about the politics of the community. It is also where he learned hard work from his parents. Jim's dad worked in the mines his entire life and hardly ever missed a day's work.

Chisholm is also the place where Jim learned those old-fashioned values that brought him to the House of Representatives.

He believed that a good idea was a good idea, and it didn't matter if it was a Republican idea or a Democratic idea. All that mattered was that someone had offered the idea; and he had such enormous respect for the process and for his colleagues that he gave every good idea an open, an honest, and a fair hearing.

□ 1915

And if it turned out to be something good for the Nation, why, it was good enough for Jim, regardless of the origin.

So, in urging my colleagues to honor Jim by passing this bill, I would like to

ask that we honor him by rededicating ourselves to that spirit of bipartisanship, that spirit of working together, that spirit of getting things done that enabled Jim Oberstar to accomplish the many things that he did that were cited by my colleagues here just a few moments ago. That was the spirit that epitomized Jim Oberstar, and that is how he was so successful in getting things done.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to pass this legislation.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for the time.

I rise to honor the late Jim Oberstar, the Congressman from Minnesota's Eighth District.

For 36 years, Jim Oberstar proudly served the residents of Minnesota's Eighth Congressional District. During his decades of service on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Representative Oberstar made investing in the future prosperity of this country a top priority.

His commitment to laying the foundation for a 21st century transportation system helped make travel safer and kept millions of Americans working on the job and strengthened our economy. He worked and accomplished all of that.

On August 1, 2007, the Interstate 35W bridge collapsed in Minnesota. Thirteen people lost their lives, including some of my constituents, and many more were injured.

Chairman Oberstar moved with incredible speed to draft legislation to respond to the tragedy, and within 48 hours, he had passed a bill on the floor. On August 6, less than 1 week after the disaster, funding for construction of a new bridge was signed into law.

But he didn't stop there. Chairman Oberstar worked to call attention to the epidemic of weak bridges all across our country. He fought to make bridge repair and replacement the focus of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. Because of his commitment, thousands of bridges were thoroughly inspected, repaired, or, in fact, replaced.

Not that Jim's response was anything out of the ordinary, throughout his career, Jim remained committed to fighting for the people he served and the causes he believed in.

It is fitting that the post office in Chisholm, Minnesota, will be named the James L. Oberstar Memorial Post Office, because we know the success of a post office, after all, is inextricably linked with interstate highways, runways, docks, railways, and roads, because that is how the mail gets delivered and that is how we are connected throughout this world.

The imprint left by Congressman Jim Oberstar on every mode of transportation throughout our country cannot be overstated.

And if I may, on a personal note, Jim, both professionally and personally, helped give the new Congresswoman from Minnesota a lot of thanks.

So, with that, I want to just say, again, it is more than appropriate that the post office in his hometown of Chisholm, Minnesota, be known as the James L. Oberstar Memorial Post Office Building, a testament to his life's work.

Jim, we thank you.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 179, to honor the memory of Jim Oberstar, a colleague, mentor, and friend to me and to many more.

From his time serving as a staff member to his tenure as the chairman of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Jim spent every day of his 47 years on Capitol Hill working to improve our Nation's infrastructure and, in turn, the lives of Americans across the country.

I was proud to serve with Jim on the T and I Committee for 4 years and to share in his passion for all the things that help ensure that our quality of life is high and that our economy is strong.

Jim's thoughtful, forward-thinking approach to our Nation's infrastructure needs was built from years of experience and careful deliberation, and it earned him the well-deserved nickname, Mr. Transportation. During his time as chairman, committee members knew that they were going to learn something when they arrived at the committee room, and they are going to leave on a mission.

Jim was truly a visionary when it came to our Nation's infrastructure system, but he didn't just talk about what needed to be done. Whether it was modernizing our Nation's airspace, improving rail safety, moving freight on time, repairing our roads, rehabilitating transit systems, or advancing cycling, Jim got things done. That is because Jim had a tireless work ethic and was as a great leader and friend as he was a policy expert. Jim treated people well, and it didn't matter whether you were Republican or Democrat; he was willing to work with you and help your district and constituents.

My bicycle is a fixture in my office, and its presence reminds me of Jim and the time I spent cycling with him, when I learned more than I ever expected to be able to learn on a bike ride.

Jim was known for his love of the French language, and he spoke it flawlessly. What fewer people know is that Jim perfected his French while serving in a volunteer program that preceded

the Peace Corps. He was teaching French and Creole to Americans helping out in Haiti.

Jim loved helping people. He was a big promoter of adoption and a defender of life. It was all an outgrowth, I believe, of his strong Catholic faith.

Mr. Speaker, Congress and the Nation are better because of Jim Oberstar, and those of us who worked closely with him are better public servants, colleagues, and people because of him. S. 179 is a fitting tribute to Jim Oberstar, and I urge its passage.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the ranking member and the manager of this legislation.

I have had the privilege of being here during the mighty leadership of Jim Oberstar, and I would really call him America's Congressperson.

He would be an eloquent spokesperson today for not isolating his advocacy for his own region or State, but he would rise up on the floor of the House to speak eloquently about the need for the refurbishing, the rebuilding, the restoration of America's infrastructure, transportation infrastructure, from highways and bridges and dams to airports and train stations and tracks.

Mr. Speaker, I just came in today from Philadelphia on Amtrak, and as you know, on trains, we engage with our fellow travelers. I guess we are called passengers, but we are fellow travelers.

It was interesting to engage with these constituents of America who were using this mode of transportation. They made a very valuable point. They said it is not the equipment of Amtrak or whether the Acela can move faster than any other train, it is the infrastructure upon which the train travels. It is the train tracks. It is the investment in that infrastructure to make Amtrak what it needs to be.

Now, Congressman Oberstar certainly did not live in this part of the country, but he could see the general landscape of what America needed.

I was very interested in hearing my colleague from Minnesota speak of that time when the bridge collapsed. What a tragic incident. All of us were appalled and saddened, and it was amazing how "General Oberstar," if you will, took the leadership role to help America.

So I rise today to support this underlying legislation and to simply thank him and to thank his family for sharing Jim Oberstar, the Frenchman, as he would like to say.

And in concluding my remarks, might I say "merci beaucoup" to you, to the late Jim Oberstar, a man who loved America and could be called America's Congressperson.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, Jim Oberstar was a rare Member. He managed to awe us by his knowledge at the same time that he nurtured us with his warmth and his kindness. That is why you have heard Members speak so eloquently about him today. He left his mark in this House.

I am very pleased that, with this bill, he will leave his own mark in his own hometown with a memorial, a post office named for Jim Oberstar. I urge Members of this House to vote for this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I will just close by saying that I am very grateful to Jim Oberstar. He helped me obtain many things for my district. His last year in Congress, in August of that year, he came to my district to dedicate a beautiful new transit center which the city of Knoxville was kind enough to name after me. I always was grateful for his spending that day with me in Knoxville.

I can tell you that I am now in my 27th year in Congress. Twenty-two of those years were spent working with Congressman Oberstar. This Nation, as Mr. LIPINSKI said a few minutes ago, is a better place today because of the work of Congressman Jim Oberstar.

I urge all of my colleagues to support passage of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 179.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, the Supreme Leader's handpicked puppet, Rouhani, prematurely tweeted about what he called a victory of diplomacy and, get this, mutual respect before a nuclear deal between the P5+1 and Iran was actually sealed.

This is the same regime that openly calls for death to America and to our ally, the democratic Jewish State of Israel, and the same despots who support terror all across the globe aimed at U.S. interests.

Now we hear that we may capitulate and end the arms embargo on Iran, its conventional military and ballistic missile program, and that the U.S. will lift all sanctions on day one.

And for what, Mr. Speaker? So that Iran can keep in place every major

piece of its nuclear infrastructure, and Iran can claim victory over the Great Satan and the Little Satan.

This will be more than just a defeat for diplomacy. It will be a disaster that will set in motion a nuclear and conventional arms race in the world's most volatile region. And who knows what dangers that will bring.

VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE SERVICES AND THE ABILITYONE PROGRAM

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Vocational Guidance Services program and the AbilityOne Program and Mr. Tubbs, who visited my office a few weeks ago.

VGS provides employment services designed to promote economic self-sufficiency for people with disabilities in the State of Ohio and has maintained a strong presence in my district, Ohio's Third Congressional District.

The AbilityOne Program harnesses the purchasing power of the Federal Government to buy products and services from participating community-based nonprofit agencies that are dedicated to training and employing individuals with disabilities.

Since 2004, nearly 900 area residents received employment opportunities through the Vocational Guidance Services program. In fact, last year alone, VGS provided employment for over 100 Columbus area people with disabilities.

I commend VGS and the AbilityOne Program team for their dedication and commitment to helping individuals who are blind or have significant disabilities to find employment in Ohio.

□ 1930

WE WANT THE SAME DEAL

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the nuclear weapon agreement with Iran is near. The deal will lift crude oil export sanctions on Iran. This will be a billion-dollar boom to the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism.

Meanwhile, here in America, the administration bans exporting our own crude oil. We can't even export Texas light crude oil to our closest neighbor, Mexico.

The administration has within its power to lift the crude oil export ban. The ban hurts the U.S. economy. Thousands of oil industry workers have been laid off. Half the drilling rigs in Texas have been shut down. This administration seems to be more worried about making Iran happy and wealthy than helping the U.S. economy by creating energy jobs.

Why can't America get the same deal that Iran is getting? While the administration lifts the sanctions on Iranian exports, it should lift the oil export

sanctions on America. And, Mr. Speaker, Texas will even agree not to enrich uranium or develop nuclear sanctions if the sanctions are lifted.

And that is just the way it is.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, we are closing in on yet another deadline and yet another needlessly manufactured crisis at the end of this month: the reauthorization of the highway trust fund.

Two months ago this body passed a short-term extension of the highway trust fund at the very last minute, as is standard procedure nowadays here in the House, temporarily protecting 660,000 jobs and extending 6,000 critical construction projects.

Republican House leadership has had more than a year to craft a bill that would repair our crumbling infrastructure, provide certainty to States, and protect hundreds of thousands of good-paying jobs hanging in the balance.

Enough of this brinkmanship. Enough of this manufactured crisis. Enough of the short-term patches that waste time and money on problems that we create for ourselves.

It is time to pass a commonsense, ambitious, and long-term extension of the highway trust fund that rebuilds, renews, and puts America to work.

We just heard memorialized on this floor the former chair, the late Jim Oberstar, who headed the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. He knew this was a sound investment in America. Let's go forward with that.

REMEMBERING ADAM JAMES LAMBERT

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

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, this morning on the hallowed ground of a hill in Dallas County, Iowa, a hero was laid to rest at the Iowa Veterans Cemetery. This hero and patriot was Adam James Lambert.

Adam was 24 years old. Adam was a marine. He was an honorable young man who put others before himself so that we could be safe and free. He was a dependable and encouraging brother in arms to his fellow Marines.

But long before Adam was a U.S. Marine, he was just a boy. He was a loving son who brought joy and laughter to his mother Jill and father Dean. Adam was a playful protective brother to his sisters McKenzie and Anna. And he made his grandparents so proud. He loved them all so much. And, indeed, they loved him.

Over the weekend I attended a celebration of life service honoring Adam. Indeed, all who attended were moved

and touched in a beautiful way. He will be missed so much, but he will be remembered.

I remember Adam. I remember when I first met him in Van Meter. He walked up to me with a wide grin and a firm handshake. He encouraged me. He spoke to me with kindness. He made me laugh. He made me smile.

Adam leaves a smile on all our faces. He leaves with us memories, and Adam will not be forgotten. May God bless his memory and his family in the days ahead.

IRAN

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, we may be hours away from a deal with Iran. The question before us is not is it a good deal or is it a bad deal or what should the executive branch of government do. The question before us is what should Congress do if we have a President who has signed the deal.

We don't know precisely what is in the deal. But we do know that it has advantages and disadvantages in the first year because it causes the vast majority of Iranian stockpile of enriched uranium and the majority of their centrifuges to be taken off the table. The disadvantage is it provides the Iranian Government with access to \$120 billion plus of its own money.

We do know that, in the next decade, the deal will be unacceptable because next decade Iran will be able to have massive enrichment facilities.

So the question before Congress is, first, how do we prevent this deal from being morally binding on the American people next decade with that administration and that Congress.

And then the tougher issue is whether we want to forfeit the advantages, knowing there are disadvantages, of what the deal does in its first year.

It is this kind of analysis, not partisans screaming about is it a good deal, is it a bad deal, that should guide us in the future.

U.S.-SWITZERLAND SKILLED TRADES COOPERATION

(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, last week U.S. Secretary of Commerce Penny Pritzker and Switzerland's Vice President and Federal Councilor, Johann Schneider-Ammann, signed a joint declaration that will provide a framework for cooperation between our two countries in areas such as work-based training, pathways to career development, and the expansion of existing programs into new industry sectors. This notable agreement comes just 1 month after a similar signing with Germany that was largely focused

on apprenticeships and vocational education and training.

As co-chair of the Congressional Career and Technical Education Caucus, I applaud these international partnerships and recognize their role in helping us to close our Nation's skills gap.

The skilled trades are the hardest jobs to fill in the United States, with recent data citing 550,000 jobs open in the trade and transportation sectors and 246,000 jobs open in manufacturing.

Working with our allies to address this issue will undoubtedly benefit our economy and allow us to remain globally competitive.

I am confident in our ability to make continued progress in the area of workforce development and am grateful for the assistance of our international partners.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we are here tonight to have an important conversation, a conversation that is long overdue, a conversation that is crucial to healing America's deep racial wounds, our topic being the Confederate battle flag and why racial symbols matter.

The Charleston 9 killings focused many of our attention on the significant appropriateness and bigoted history of this flag. In 2015, why do so many still revere a flag that tolerated the shackling of people because of their skin, a flag that allowed human beings to be counted as three-fifths of a person, a flag that was flown during lynchings, the holding of children, and one that symbolized a movement to deny education and equal treatment under our laws?

Fifty years since Selma, we think of the Freedom Riders, marchers, boycotters, protesters, and policymakers who pointed our Nation in a more positive direction. They knew it was time to reject the traditions of the past.

The civil rights movement symbolized the quest of equality and a change in mood for America. Thousands from all backgrounds had the courage to join in peaceful protests, lunch counter sit-ins, and boycotts at the expense of being jailed, beaten, or killed. They did this for one Nation and one flag.

And in the way of these Americans stood those who believed in the perseverance of inequality, who believed in an America of White and colored, an

America of two flags, and the Confederate battle flag represented their America.

Jim Crow America saw States that seceded from the Union, reacting to the growth of the civil rights movement, with the use of the Confederate battle flag as the representation of their resistant movement.

In 1956, the State of Georgia incorporated the battle flag into its official State flag design. The movement continued into the sixties, where it met renewed and intensified opposition, opposition that waved the Confederate battle flag in the name of continued racial oppression.

In 1961, just 2 months after the sentencing of nine students arrested for a lunch counter sit-in in Rock Hill, South Carolina, the Confederate battle flag was raised over South Carolina's State house during a centennial celebration of the Civil War's opening.

That same year, in neighboring Georgia, Charlayne Hunter and Hamilton Holmes were the first two African American students to be admitted to the University of Georgia. Their admission only came after a court order sent from Federal court.

Eleven days after arriving on campus, Hunter and Holmes were attacked by a mob of White rioters who threw rocks and bottles at them while waving the rebel flag. The attacks were so fierce that the dean of students suspended both Hunter and Holmes for their own safety.

Now, even with me highlighting this violence, we are told that the stars and bars are about heritage. That heritage, Mr. Speaker, is not so subtle a reminder to African Americans that they are less than—maybe not three-fifths of a person, but still not equal.

This is a reminder that there are two classes of citizens. And despite our Declaration of Independence clearly stating that all men are created equal, this is a reminder that there is a lesser class and will never be equal.

But why are we honoring the heritage and flag of the hooded night riders of the Klan at our State houses and in this Congress instead of the flag of the Freedom Riders who died for a single, fair, and equal America?

Two years after Martin Luther King, Jr., delivered his "I have dream" speech before 600 civil rights marchers, including our friend and colleague from Georgia, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, a different group of civil rights heroes were greeted by police officers in Selma, Alabama, proudly displaying the Confederate flag on the side of their helmets.

These officers brutally beat the marchers, and their actions were a reminder that Dr. King's speech had not yet resonated in the hearts of those who needed to hear it most.

But it was the undeterred resilience of the protesters who refused to back down and refused to resort to violence that persevered. It was the love, the respect, and the mutual understanding

that displayed what was the strongest symbol of strength, honor, and heritage than the Confederate battle flag.

Mr. Speaker, we have come a long way since 1965, but we still have a ways to go. We must move forward. The needed progress, however, will not come if the Federal Government continues to provide American citizens with reminders of our hateful and oppressive past in a manner that legitimizes such hate.

I am glad to host this important Special Order hour with my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) to talk about where we go from here and why we continue to give energy to symbols of hate and division.

I yield to the kind gentleman from Newark, New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois.

This is a very timely topic, as we have seen what has transpired in our Nation over the past several weeks. It is incredible to me how fast this issue has moved over the past month. But it always seems that it takes a horrific act in this country for us to wake up and realize that maybe something isn't right.

□ 1930

Nine people at church study on a Wednesday night, not knowing their fate, were gunned down in cold blood by someone who actually said: You know, they were so nice to me, I almost didn't do it, but I had to.

Last week in South Carolina, there was a monumental step in removing the Confederate flag from its State capitol, where it had shamefully flown for 54 years; but here in our Nation's Capitol last week, Republicans tried to go back to the future.

House Republicans had to pull a vote on a spending bill because some of their Members opposed a measure that would ban Confederate flags from national cemeteries, and when the Democratic leader, NANCY PELOSI, presented an opportunity for Republicans to do the right thing and immediately remove the Confederate flag from the Capitol Grounds, they punted.

South Carolina, the birthplace of the Confederacy, had the courage to do what the House Republicans did not, remove that dreaded symbol. It is the symbol of an incomprehensible hate, a hate that manifested itself in a massacre. Since that unfortunate day 1 month ago, we, as a nation, have been forced to look inward at who we are and who we want to be.

Mr. Speaker, out of this immense grief of that dark day in Charleston came a resounding call throughout our Nation to remove the Confederate flag and other symbols of racism and racial supremacy. For many, the removal of these symbols is a logical step in the trajectory of our Nation, a necessary action on the path toward the more perfect Union.

For others, calls to remove these symbols of hate are seen as an attack

on the Southern identity, heritage, and culture; but arguing that the Confederate flag is a symbol of Southern pride celebrates a single homogenous culture.

It means listening to only some voices at the expense of others. It means ignoring the African American experience throughout our Nation's history from the dark period of slavery to the civil rights movement to the present day.

According to a report by the Equal Justice Initiative, 3,959 African Americans in 12 States were killed by the terror of lynching between 1877 and 1950, 3,959 Americans lynched.

If we are going to refer to the past and debate over the Confederate flag, certainly, we need to take all of this into account. The Confederate flag has always stood for racial supremacy and bigotry, and if we are to realize our Nation's promise of justice and full equality, we cannot embrace this symbol. Eradicating symbols of hatred, violence, and cruel oppression steeped in racism is a critical step to confronting prejudice in our society.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have all heard complaints that this debate does not matter and that removing the Confederate flag and other symbols of hatred is a distraction from the larger problems facing our Nation, such as rampant gun violence.

I agree that significantly more must be done to address racism and persistent inequality in our Nation. I agree that we need meaningful gun reform from expanding background checks to reducing unchecked online ammunition purchases. I agree that we need to create jobs, reduce wealth disparities, and expand educational opportunities.

But symbols matter; symbols legitimize public opinion and, in doing so, entrench attitudes and beliefs. At the same time, they create a meaning, shape actions, and connect us to one another. Just as a symbol can connect us, they can tear us apart.

Mr. Speaker, as I go to my seat, I was talking to my staff the other day about this and how much we were happy to see that flag lowered. The symbol is gone, but the sentiment remains.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you, Congressman PAYNE, for those words. Right now, it is my pleasure to introduce the Congressman from North Carolina and the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, Congressman BUTTERFIELD.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank you, Congresswoman KELLY and Congressman PAYNE, for your leadership. Your leadership is very much appreciated, and your constituents in your respective districts should be very proud of each one of you. I know the Congressional Black Caucus is proud of you.

For the past several weeks, Mr. Speaker, the Nation has been focused on the Confederate battle flag. Most fair-minded Americans have been ask-

ing the question: Why is this flag continuing to fly on State grounds and Federal lands? And why are policymakers refusing to squarely address this issue?

The Confederate battle flag, Mr. Speaker, represents an era of American history that ended—or at least it should have ended—150 years ago. This flag represents the years following President Lincoln's election. Those years starting in December of 1860 saw 11 Southern States leave the Union.

The fancy name for their leaving the Union, Mr. Speaker, was called secession, but the reality was that these Southern States were rebelling. They were in rebellion against the Union. They organized a so-called government called the Confederate States of America. They took up arms, Mr. Speaker, and they fought against the Union for 4 long years until they surrendered.

They then returned to the Union. The Confederate flag represents that era where Southern States were resisting freedom for 4 million slaves. There continues to be elements today in our society who subscribe to separation of the races—how unfortunate. There continues to be elements in our society who believe in White supremacy.

The question now, Mr. Speaker, is: Do we constructively address the question of hate groups in America? Do we continue to insist that other States remove symbols of White supremacy as South Carolina has done? Or do we continue to simply ignore racism?

Other States continue to display Confederate flags, and even in this Capitol—even in this Capitol—you will find eight statues of Confederate soldiers who fought against the Stars and Stripes.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon every American to bury for good the dark history of slavery and bigotry. We are a great nation, and we will be even greater when we can judge our neighbor on the content of their character and not on the color of their skin.

Let's remove these symbols from our view. I thank each one of the floor managers.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you, Congressman BUTTERFIELD, for those fine words. Many questions, many questions: Why are they still holding on? Is it just heritage and tradition? Or is it something more?

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, the gentlewoman from Illinois, and my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey, for their important leadership they are exercising here this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I have come to speak about why symbols matter and why this symbol, the Confederate flag, must not stop with the flag, but must also go to what to do not only about the flag, but about the guns that took down the Charleston 9.

To be sure, symbols matter, Mr. Speaker. To take two of the most powerful symbols in the world, the cross and the Star of David, we know well these symbols can sometimes mean everything. We also know that the Confederate flag is a symbol of a different and lower order.

A symbol stands for more than itself; the symbol tells a story. The religious symbols evoke tears; they evoke joy, and they evoke their own set of stories. The Confederate flag, when it led to the extraordinary tragedy of the Charleston 9 will always—should always—make us think of the gun that was responsible for the Charleston 9—not just the symbol, but the story behind the symbol.

In the 19th century, the flag signaled the importance of slavery. In the 20th century, it had a different meaning. Robert E. Lee had told his soldiers:

Put down the flag. We are one Union now.

He was, in a real sense, the counterpart to Abraham Lincoln, who was trying to draw us together after Lee had lost that war.

In the 20th century, the flag was revived. It was revived by Southern Democrats—Dixiecrats, as they called themselves. It has been, in the 20th century and, now, the 21st century, a symbol of discrimination and racism. No matter what it stood for in the 19th century about heritage, it lost that meaning when, in the 20th century, George Wallace raised it and said “segregation now” and “segregation forever.” Nobody who now speaks of heritage then said: Wait a minute, Governor Wallace, don't take away our heritage.

Only when African Americans have the nerve to raise the notion, after we lost nine good people in Charleston, does it somehow now become a symbol of heritage.

I will give Senator MITCH MCCONNELL some credit. He wants to remove the statue of Jefferson Davis from the Kentucky State Capitol, but when asked about removing the Jefferson Davis statue from the United States Capitol, Mr. MCCONNELL grew silent.

We have got to come to grips with what this flag meant to this boy who used a gun. I am not going to forget those who died and what we owe those who died.

The Dixiecrats bolted from Harry S. Truman when Truman refused to embrace their racism. These were Southern Democrats, and we owe them the 21st century meaning of the Confederate flag.

Mr. Speaker, why are we talking about this symbol and not another symbol? The other symbol is the gun in America.

The grace of the people of Charleston so overwhelmed the country that there were many who were simply grateful that, instead of bursting forward with rage, they showed their extraordinary Christian heritage, the heritage they undoubtedly shared with the gunman. We were so grateful, all of us, and so proud that we have not talked about

what took the lives of these nine good people.

Well, I want to talk about it because the Confederate flag for me now will always represent those nine people and the gun that took their lives. That 21-year-old kid didn't know anything about them except their Christian love when they invited him into their sanctuary.

But, he knew about what that flag stood for, and he raised that flag before he went into that sanctuary.

□ 2000

We must not forget not only the flag—we cannot live by symbols alone—we must not forget the gun that took down the Charleston 9.

Now, I understand—I read—that Senator MANCHIN and Senator TOOMEY are interested in reviving their gun safety legislation. There are several bills here in the House that do that in one form or another.

We know what happened. There was a breakdown in the background check system, which is why this young man was even able to get a gun. He would have been denied a gun if those who opposed any bill hadn't assured that the bill would have only a 3-day time period, during which, if you couldn't find something on the individual, then he got his gun, no matter who he was. That is how he got his gun.

There are some of us who know full well that the Confederate flag has done more than put the flag back on the agenda—on the Nation's agenda—it has put gun safety once again on the agenda.

I must say, I don't believe we, who celebrate the extraordinary grace of the families of the Charleston 9, owe them only our speeches about the flag. They probably, once they saw it come down, have moved on; and now, they have only their loved ones to think about.

If I were one of them, I would wonder: What are those who celebrate the flag coming down going to do about making sure that, never again, will people like our loved ones have to suffer because of gunfire?

The flag is the symbol that is important to raising our consciousness in the long run. If all we have is our memory of the symbol and not why that symbol became important, then we will leave on the table a real memorial to the Charleston 9.

I appreciate the time.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you, Congresswoman HOLMES. I am so glad that you and Congressman PAYNE brought up the issue of the gun because we cannot forget that either. I look at Charleston as when racism and hate found the gun.

At this time, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE), our former head of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I want to thank my colleagues, Congressman

PAYNE and Congresswoman KELLY, for leading the Congressional Black Caucus Special Order hour tonight.

Mr. Speaker, if you have not noticed, the people of this country are fed up. Quite frankly, so am I. We are at a point in our Nation's history when we can no longer give lip service to equality and opportunities to succeed. We must take action to show we mean what we say; otherwise, it is nothing more than empty rhetoric.

Mr. Speaker, the Confederate flag is more than just a piece of fabric. It is more than just a visual representation of the Confederacy or part of the storied history of the South. If that were true, we would not be having this conversation today. We would not have buried nine Americans murdered because of the color of their skin, and the Confederate battle flag would still be flying in the State of South Carolina.

Let's be honest about the history of the Confederate battle flag. While the majority of this House may want to ignore the facts and rewrite history, we will not be ignored. The Confederate battle flag and any adaptation of it is a painful reminder of intimidation, torture, and murder for all of us in the Black community. It is a flying symbol of hatred and injustice that tells Black and Brown people in this country: Your lives have no value, and you don't matter.

It is an embarrassment to all Americans that the majority of this House introduced a spending amendment which included language allowing the battle flag on Federal properties.

It is just plain shameful that they would go even further and use procedure to stifle a motion to openly discuss a ban of the Confederate battle flag imagery from the Capitol Grounds.

How can the Members of the majority of this House continue to say that they represent all Americans when they refuse to have a real discussion about what is really happening in our country? Have we learned nothing from what has happened in the past few weeks?

In a June Gallup poll, African Americans ranked race relations as the most important issue facing the United States. Will taking down the Confederate battle flag immediately change this perspective? Absolutely not—but it will certainly do more than letting it continue to fly.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we do away with lip service. It is time we listen to our constituents and take real action toward healing the racial wounds of this country. It is time we move forward.

The flag must come down.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman FUDGE for her eloquent words and the truth of what happened in Congress last week and what we need to do to go forward.

At this time, I yield to the gentlewoman from Houston, Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the managers of this very

Special Order and my words to them and to this House. I want you to take note of the spirit in which these Members have come.

If our constituents are seeing us and watching us, if those who agree with us are watching, no one has come with anger and a cry of hysteria. They have come with a reasoned request and pronouncement of the wrongness of the present situation in this House.

Let me say that it was in 1864 that the States were given the call to send forward two statutes to come to represent their States in the United States Congress. In addition, we know that the United States Congress has a number of flags representing various States.

This was to be the people's House, and the people's House would reflect the people of the United States of America. History should be something that grows with the Nation and reflects the goodness of the Nation. Yes, there is history that should be taught, such as the ugliness and violence of the slave history; but it is not to be honored.

I join my colleagues today to be able to call for the taking down of signs of Confederacy in the United States Capitol—in particular, as I am in the House of Representatives, in the people's House.

Let me give you a credible basis upon which to do so, why this Supreme Court decision has been so ignored. Let me cite it for my colleagues, *Walker III v. Texas Division, Sons of Confederate Veterans*, issued on June 18, 2015—ironically, the day after the martyrdom of nine wonderful African Americans practicing their Christian faith.

This particular decision indicates that the State of Texas was to be supported. This was a case that engaged many of our constituents in Texas. We organize and galvanize.

I want to thank Dr. Clark, the president of the Missionary Baptist General Convention of Texas, and Reverend Max Miller, who came up as we argued this case. We were convincing. The Texas Department of Motor Vehicles board agreed that a Confederate license plate issued by the State of Texas would be offensive and would be considered, in essence, a public action or public speech.

For those who want to raise the question of the First Amendment, this cry that we, as members of the Congressional Black Caucus, are making is perfectly constitutional and legitimate. We are talking about flags that are flown on State property or Federal property.

This caucus should be congratulated. It is succinct in its argument; it is detailed in its argument, and no First Amendment opposition can be raised because the Supreme Court of the United States has said that we can deny utilizing the Confederate flag that may be considered State action as it is placed on Federal lands on the Federal property here.

Our colleagues, in particular HAKEEM JEFFRIES and Mr. HUFFMAN and others, understood that when they acted last week. Now, the considerate thing to have done is there are amendments to stay in place, the Interior bill to be voted on, and the right thing would have been done because they argued the point that this was State or Federal action.

We now come again to try and clarify for our colleagues that these flags should come down. In the privileged resolutions that have gone on last week, they made the point very clear that it was an insult to the dignity of the House.

I have introduced H. Res. 342 that I hope will complement, and it is one that talks about the enhancement of unity in America and stands on the Walker decision and, in particular, makes it very clear that divisive symbols—license plates, specialty license plates, replicas, and flags—on public buildings or government property and symbols on State or Federal action, State public speech—that is a speech of those you represent—should not be allowed.

How divisive is that point of view? It is not. The divisiveness is those that stand on a false sense of history, yet want to offend those who likewise have great leadership.

Let me make this point about the battle flag, this Confederate flag. Might I ask the question: Have southerners not fought in the War of 1812, in World War I, in World War II, in the Korean war, in the Hungarian war in the fifties, and in Vietnam and shed their blood under this flag, have they not been honored when they have shed their blood?

Not only that, when Confederate soldiers died, they were honored appropriately in graves where those who desired to honor that shedding of the blood were allowed to do so. We did not run into the funerals of those Southern fallen soldiers and cast upon them and curse them and deny them. They were allowed to be honored appropriately, and they now go into the annals of history.

When you understand what grounds they stood on, what their general stood on, such as Jefferson Davis, who called the individuals who were slaves as unprofitable savages—that is what one general who has been honored has called them, “unprofitable savages”—is that the history that we should be honoring?

Is that what we should be lifting up? Is that what should be placed in the place of honor in the United States Congress? Is that engaged in the uplifting of the dignity of the House? Or is it insulting the dignity of the House?

To my colleagues, I stand with you today to join in trying to create an understanding of the rightness of the work of our colleagues last week on the Interior bill, of the rightness of the Congressional Black Caucus going, as someone would say, on and on and on

about this flag; and my good friend from New Jersey said it is symbols, and we need to bridge the gap of the inequity and wealth, we need education, we need jobs.

Let me be very clear, Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Black Caucus and my colleagues and the Democratic Caucus and good will Republicans are fighting for jobs—or should be—fighting for education. We are not languishing along the side highway of life. We fought to maintain the ObamaCare or the Affordable Care Act. We are not ignoring the other desires of our constituents.

Let me close on this final point, and I am glad that my colleague from the District of Columbia raised it, and Congresswoman KELLY has been a leader, and Congresswoman KELLY, let's rise again, and that is the horror of gun violence.

□ 2015

Let me say to Director Comey, since I am on the Judiciary Committee, thank you for your honesty, but let me make it very clear that we suffered this loophole because of the opposition to the sensibleness of the Brady anti-gun violence legislation.

Imbedded in it was this nonsensical point that, if I don't hear from you, then I am going to sell it. Who is selling it? The gun store.

I have no opposition to our fellow citizens who make their living and provide for their families by selling guns. I do have opposition to the evil and vile perpetrator who went into that Mother Emanuel Church and killed illegally with a gun that he should not have had.

He did so because the 3-day time had expired, because there was a time when the NICS was closed—that is the entity that the FBI relies upon—and the 3 days expired, and the owner said, “I am going to sell the gun.”

This week I will be introducing a single piece of legislation—and I ask my colleagues to join me—I know there are many other bills—to eliminate the 3-day period of discretion, that no discretion will exist. They either answer the question that he or she is eligible or it is denied.

So on the graves of these wonderful martyrs, I stand in honor of them. I mourn them, and I mourn for their families. I say to them: We will never forget.

Once and for all, bring the flag down and remove these items in this place of honor that have denigrated and considered one race of people vile and unequal.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you, Congresswoman JACKSON LEE. Always detailed and insightful. Thank you for all of your work on the Judiciary Committee. It is very much appreciated and hailed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), who took center stage last week as we discussed and worked toward the removal of the flag.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I want to thank my good friend, the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois, ROBIN KELLY, for once again presiding over this important CBC Special Order hour, as well as her co-anchor, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, who is right across the Hudson River, and who so ably serves the communities of Newark and beyond.

Mr. Speaker, this evening we have heard from so many distinguished members of the Congressional Black Caucus, most recently from the gentlewoman from Texas, with whom I serve on the Judiciary Committee, about the importance of the moment in time in which we find ourselves right now related to not just the Confederate battle flag, but perhaps more importantly: What is the legacy that we want to have as Americans, as Members of Congress, in dealing with the complicated issue of race?

It is an honor and a privilege to once again have the chance to come to the House floor to have this conversation.

This is a most distinguished venue from which to speak to the American people, an appropriate one, I would add, given the House's constitutional relationship to the people of America, this, of course, being the only institution that was envisioned by the Founding Fathers as one in which the people serving in the institution would be directly elected by the people.

The Senate's Members, of course, in its original constitutional version, were elected by the State legislature. Then, of course, the Presidency, to this day, is a vehicle through which the individual is selected by the Electoral College.

So this is the people's House, the institution most intimately connected to the people of America and the place where we should be able to speak truth to power.

We witnessed that last week as we were forced, unfortunately, to discuss the issue of the Confederate battle flag at a moment when people of all races—Democrats and Republicans, Blacks, Whites, the extraordinary leadership from the Governor of South Carolina, and the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, JIM CLYBURN—came together.

At the moment when the Confederate battle flag was coming down in South Carolina, there were Members of this House trying to lift it up.

It was quite unfortunate that we needed to detour from this moment that we were having in America, led in South Carolina, to address the battle flag issue on this House floor; but I am hopeful that, as we move forward now in a more productive way, we can begin to confront some of the public policy challenges that we face in America that supporters of the Confederate battle flag have fought against.

As others have detailed during the presentation here today, the battle flag, which met its initial defeat in 1865 at the end of the Civil War, remained

largely dormant in American history until 1954 in the Supreme Court's decision of *Brown vs. Board of Education*.

It was decided that this facade of separate and equal was constitutionally suspect and that African Americans were being denied the opportunity of being educated in quality public schools in the Deep South and in other places in America.

Really, it was in the mid-fifties and then into the early sixties when the Confederate battle flag was resurrected as a symbol of the segregationists who were fighting to uphold Jim Crow.

It was a symbol of those who were fighting to stop the efforts of courageous individuals like Congressman JOHN LEWIS, who in 1965 was the co-chair of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

It was a symbol of those who were trying to fight efforts by JOHN LEWIS and others to make sure that the franchise—the right to vote—was color-blind in nature and that the 15th Amendment could actually be brought to life all throughout America and in the Deep South, where there were those who were trying to prevent African Americans from being able to vote. The battle flag was resurrected in the fifties and in the sixties to stop certain things from happening.

It seems to me that, rather than having the discussion about whether it should come down, no reasonable person can take the position that it should have a place of honor. So it is extraordinary to me that we had to take to the House floor last week and have to come to the House floor today to continue to address this issue.

Hopefully, reason will prevail over the next couple of weeks or the next couple of days—even prior to the August recess—and we can move beyond the Confederate battle flag issue and address some important, substantive issues that many would argue remain as part of the legacy of the Confederacy. We don't want to see the ghosts of the Confederacy invading the United States Congress from a policy perspective.

Those nine souls—God-fearing, church-going African Americans—who were killed simply because of the color of their skin died because of someone who charged into that church with the intention of sparking a race war that was inspired, in part, by the Confederate battle flag.

One of the things that has happened as a result of that tragedy is the battle flag has come down, but that is just the beginning of the work that we need to do in response to that tragedy and the conditions that so many people find themselves in all across America.

As has been mentioned, we have got to confront the gun violence issue that we have in the United States. How can it be that we have 5 percent of the world's population, but 50 percent of the world's guns?

It is estimated that we have more than 285 million guns in circulation.

Nobody can give you an exact estimate because a chokehold has been placed around the Federal agencies charged with preventing gun violence and dealing with gun safety in America. It is an incredible act of legislative malpractice, but it is estimated that we have got over 285 million guns in America.

Isn't it reasonable, particularly in the aftermath of this tragedy in Charleston, South Carolina, that we come together and figure out a way to prevent those guns, consistent with the Second Amendment, from falling into the hands of individuals who would do us harm? It seems to me to be a reasonable thing that we can do as Americans.

It also seems important that we would find a way 50 years after the passage of the 1965 Voting Rights Act to stop trying to prevent Americans from exercising their sacred franchise and participating in American democracy.

Yet, something happened in the aftermath of 2008, a real interesting moment in November of that year, that seemed to have shocked a whole lot of people across this country. As a result, 2 years later, when there was a midterm election, subsequent to that, there was an outbreak with this concern of voter fraud, fabricated because no one can point to any evidence of an epidemic of voter fraud.

Not a scintilla of evidence has been presented anywhere in this country that we have got a problem that needs to be addressed; but we have had all of these voter suppression laws enacted that are consistent with the ghosts of the Confederacy and what those folks stood for who were waving the Confederate battle flag in opposition to the changes of the fifties and sixties.

What shocks me is that even the Supreme Court has gotten into the act by decimating the section 5 preclearance through claiming that section 4 is outdated, and this House refuses to act on fixing the Voting Rights Act.

I would argue that—again, consistent with our democracy and the spirit of coming together—that, perhaps, that is one of the things we can address so that we can take down, on the one hand, the divisive symbol of hatred—the Confederate battle flag—from here in this Capitol and in whatever form it hangs all across America so that we can lift up policies that make Americans safer, policies that are consistent with our values and that everyone—White, Black, Latino, Asian, Democrats, and Republicans—should be able to rally around.

I am thankful for Congresswoman KELLY's and Congressman PAYNE's leadership—this wonderful tandem, R. KELLY and D. PAYNE, who are tremendous advocates here in the Congress—and for their giving me this opportunity to share these thoughts.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you, Congressman JEFFRIES, for reminding us about the Voting Rights Act. Again, thank you for everything you did last

week in this Congress. It was so commendable.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN), who gave a passionate speech on the floor last week about the flag.

□ 2030

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I am honored to be with the team of KELLY and PAYNE tonight. You do outstanding work, and you also provide an opportunity for other Members to have an opportunity to call to the attention of our constituents some of the concerns that we have to address in Congress. I will always be grateful for the wonderful work that you do in Congress.

I am also very grateful and thankful to the many persons who worked to bring down the Confederate battle flag in South Carolina. It was not easy. There are many who said they never thought they would see it happen, but it did, and it happened because of a willingness to forgive and an understanding that we had an opportunity to do something meaningful for a good many people across the length and breadth of this country who saw the Confederate battle flag as a symbol of segregation, a symbol of racism and bigotry, a symbol of slavery. Not all did, but it was painful for a good many who did see it this way, many who suffered the indignation and humiliation of segregation, who suffered knowing that their bloodline had suffered slavery.

So I am here tonight to thank those who worked so hard to get this done. It was not easy, and I want to thank you for what you did. But I also know that there are a good many people now who would like to see us go back to normal. They are ready to get back to the normal things that we have in this great country of ours, the richest country in the world. For them, normal is a very pleasant thing. Normal means new homes. Normal means greater opportunities.

But let's talk about normal for some others in this country because normal is not always the same for everyone. Normal for the month of June 2015 unemployment: normal for Whites was 4.6 percent, that is the unemployment rate. That is normal for Whites. Normal for Latinos was 6.6 percent, and normal for Blacks was 9.5 percent.

Now, I have already heard the arguments about how President Obama ought to resolve this; this is all his fault. Not so, my friends. If you look back through the vista of time, you will find that unemployment for African Americans is usually about twice the unemployment rate for White Americans. This is not something new to President Obama. This is not something that started in 2008 when he was elected or when he was sworn in in 2009. This is not something that is new to us, those of us who know and see the pain and suffering that results from a lack of employment.

We understand that the flag coming down was a great moment for us symbolically. It was symbolism. Now, the

substance is what we ultimately have to deal with, and the substance is the normal life that people lead under conditions that are abnormal for many others in this country.

Let's look at normal as it relates to lending for businesses. Minority businessowners in 2012—this is the latest information that I have from the Federal Reserve—paid interest rates that were 32 percent higher than what Whites paid—32 percent higher. That is normal.

Some people don't want to go back to this normal state of affairs. They see the flag coming down as an indication that we need to move on in other substantive areas. Lending, mortgage lending is an important area. Normal for African Americans meant that in 2013 only 4.8 percent of loans made to buy homes were made to Blacks, when Blacks comprise 13.2 percent of the total population. Normal for Latinos meant that in 2013 only 7.3 percent of the loans made to buy homes were made to Latinos, Hispanics, when they make up 17.15 percent of the total population. That is normal.

Normal in 2013 meant the conventional mortgage loan denial rate was, and this is according to CNN, 10.4 percent for Whites, 13.3 percent for Asians, 21.9 percent for Hispanics, and 27.6 percent for African Americans. There are a good many people who don't live normal lives in this normal climate that we want to get back to—we, in a generic sense.

I, not the personal pronoun for me, I don't want to get back to this. I want to see us move on with substantive change. I appreciate what was done in bringing down the flag. I celebrate its coming down, but it is time for us to initiate greater action in areas where we can integrate the money. I am an integrationist. I think we ought to integrate every aspect of American society, including the money.

Let's talk about normal. Normal means that Black applicants are 2.1 times more likely to be denied loans by mortgage lenders than non-Hispanic Whites. That is normal. For Hispanics, it means that they are 1.7 times more likely to be denied loans. That is normal. For Asians, 1.2 times more likely.

So I am saying to us that we have got to create a new normal. It is time for us, those of us who sit on committees of jurisdiction, to use our influence on these committees of jurisdiction to bring about the substantive change that lowering the flag and placing it in its place of honor, proper place where it should be, lowering that Confederate flag. That means that we must do that, but do it in such a way that we acknowledge that there is more work to be done, and we can do it on our committees of jurisdiction.

So, given that I serve on the Committee on Financial Services, I will be calling to the attention of the committee the need to investigate the mortgage lending culture in banks. We need to understand why it is that Afri-

can Americans and Latinos who are equally as qualified as Whites can go into a bank and not get a loan when a White can. We have got to find out why. I know that there are many people who are uncomfortable with the language of Black and White and Brown, but that is the language we have to use to communicate clearly a message of what is taking place.

So on my committee, I am going to push for an investigation of banks. We need to know why banks consistently do this. Not all banks, but we need to know why those who do it are doing it.

The way you do this is to test, to send people out who are equally qualified of different ethnicities and acquire the empirical evidence. In every instance—maybe with a few exceptions, but in every instance, in a general sense, we find that Blacks and Browns who are equally as qualified as Whites do not receive their loans.

I encourage all of my colleagues to use your committees of jurisdiction to create a new state of normalcy for those who have been suffering continuously.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you so much, Congressman GREEN, for your words, your passion, and your call to action.

I would like to thank all of my colleagues for participating tonight. Symbols of the Confederacy have been an inescapable and often haunting part of life in many Southern States. Every day the Confederate flag is flown proudly in front yards, worn on T-shirts, and you will find them on pickup trucks, and that is the right that folks have.

Many argue this is a symbol of Southern history, tradition, and honor. I would argue against the merits of that. After all, what are we proudly honoring and looking upon nostalgically? The Confederate flag represents a dark time in our Nation's history, full of pain, suffering, and loss.

Why do we allow the mascot of terrorist groups to fly high on the government grounds? Would we permit ISIS the luxury of putting their symbols on our Federal grounds? In modern society, people have made a decision to eradicate materials that do not represent our country's core values: the value of inclusion, the value of non-discrimination, and the value that our Nation can be the beacon of hope for everyone regardless of the color of their skin.

The institution of slavery destroyed families, killed millions, and formed the beginning of a systemic inequality faced by African Americans today. That is what the Confederacy sought to preserve when it seceded from our great Nation. Every time a Confederate flag flies, whether it is the intent of the owner or not, that is what is being celebrated.

Mr. Speaker, we need to take down the flag and we also need to have a serious conversation about gun violence. On behalf of Congressman PAYNE and

me, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus, to discuss tonight's CBC Special Order Hour: "The Confederate Battle Flag: Why Symbols Matter." I stand here today fully acknowledging that the eradication of this hurtful flag from state and federal grounds is only one step in fully addressing race relations in this country; but, just as so many of my CBC colleagues have stood on this very floor to exclaim that "Black Lives Matter," so too do symbols. Symbols of hatred, institutionalized racism and white supremacy, they matter. Symbols like the flags of Apartheid South Africa and Rhodesia, embraced by Dylann Roof, the terrorist responsible for the unspeakable events at Emmanuel AME Church in Charleston last month, Mr. Speaker, they matter.

Last week, the South Carolina legislature voted overwhelmingly in favor of removing—once and for all—the confederate battle flag from their Capitol grounds. I applaud the state of South Carolina for this historic gesture and for the outstanding leadership necessary to ensure that this flag comes down in the aftermath of the "Emmanuel Nine" tragedy. I implore other southern states that still fly the battle flag on state grounds to follow suit and have the flag removed. As a Member of Congress, I pledge my support to any legislation that completely eradicates this symbol from all federal lands.

To understand why the confederate battle flag has been offensive to millions of Americans for so many years requires a proper framing of American History. The version of the confederate battle flag that most people are familiar with today was first used by the Army of Tennessee during the Civil War. Shortly thereafter, it became widely known as the symbol of the Confederacy—eleven states who wished to secede from the Union over the right to own slaves. For the many Americans who deny a basic historical fact by refusing to believe that slavery was a central point of conflict in the Civil War, I quote directly from the declaration of secession from my home state of Texas:

"We hold as undeniable truths that the governments of the various States, and of the confederacy itself were established exclusively by the white race, for themselves and their posterity; that the African race had no agency in their establishment; that they were rightfully held and regarded as an inferior and dependent race, and in that condition only could their existence in this country be rendered beneficial or tolerable."

Similarly, overt references to slavery as a motivation to secede from the Union are also present in the declarations of secession of South Carolina, Georgia and Mississippi.

Repeatedly, throughout the 20th century, the confederate battle flag flew as a symbol of direct defiance to advancements in civil rights. The flag was first displayed at the South Carolina state Capitol in 1938 after angry Members of Congress defeated a bill that would have made lynching a federal crime.

In the 1940s, the flag became the symbol of the Dixiecrats, the segregationist political faction birthed out of its firm stance against the civil rights agenda of the national Democratic party of the time. Members of the Dixiecrats were faithfully devoted to maintaining the segregation of the Jim Crow South, many of

whom stood on this very House floor decades ago, extolling the virtues of an American society that subjugated its black citizens.

In 1962, the flag was raised to the dome of the South Carolina state Capitol after President Kennedy called on Congress to end poll taxes and literacy tests for voting, and the Supreme Court declared segregation in public transportation unconstitutional. The raising of the confederate battle flag flew as a symbol of resistance in South Carolina to two landmark achievements of progress that our country relied on to move forward in its quest for racial equality.

While the confederate battle flag may represent “Southern Heritage” to some, to millions of other Americans it represents an opposition to the racial equality we still fight for today. This flag is a symbol of the painful history that this country has worked hard to overcome; and in order to continue moving forward, it is a symbol that we must finally put behind us.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISIONS TO THE AGGREGATES AND ALLOCATIONS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2016 BUDGET RESOLUTION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, July 13, 2015.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record revisions to the aggregates and allocations set forth pursuant to the Fiscal Year 2016 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget Conference Report, S. Con. Res. 11. The revision is for new budget authority and outlays for provisions designated as program integrity initiatives, pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(B) and (C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (BBEDCA), contained in H.R. 3020, the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016.

S. Con. Res. 11 set the base discretionary 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations at \$1,016,582 million, which is the sum of the fiscal year 2016 discretionary spending limits under section 251(c) of BBEDCA. Section 251(b) of BBEDCA allows for adjustments to the discretionary spending limits for certain purposes including overseas contingencies, disaster relief, and program integrity initiatives.

H.R. 3020, the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016, contains \$1,484 million in budget authority for program integrity initiatives, which is within the allowable limits for this purpose as established in section 251(b)(2)(B) and (C) of BBEDCA. Accordingly, I am submitting an adjustment to S. Con. Res. 11 for an additional \$1,484 million in budget authority to accommodate program integrity funding contained in H.R. 3020. After making this adjustment, H.R. 3020 is within the fiscal year 2016 discretionary spending limits under section 251(c) of BBEDCA and the 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations established by S. Con. Res. 11.

These revisions are provided for bills, joint resolutions, and amendments thereto or conference reports thereon, considered by the House subsequent to this filing, as applicable. For fiscal year 2016, aggregate levels of budget authority and outlays and the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations, established by S. Con. Res. 11, are revised. Associated tables are attached.

This revision represents an adjustment for purposes of budgetary enforcement. The revised allocation is to be considered as an allocation included in the budget resolution pursuant to S. Con. Res. 11, as adjusted.

Sincerely,
TOM PRICE, M.D.,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget.

BUDGET AGGREGATES

(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal Year	
	2016	2016–2025
Current Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,039,215	1
Outlays	3,091,442	1
Revenues	2,676,733	32,237,371
Adjustment for H.R. 3020, Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, Appropriations Act, 2016		
Budget Authority	1,083	1
Outlays	924	1
Revenues	0	0
Revised Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,040,298	1
Outlays	3,092,366	1
Revenues	2,676,733	32,237,371

¹ Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2017–2025 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
(In millions of dollars)

	2016
Base Discretionary Action:	
BA	1,016,582
OT	1,156,644
Global War on Terrorism:	
BA	96,287
OT	48,798
Program Integrity:	
BA	1,484
OT	1,277
Total Discretionary Action:	
BA	1,114,353
OT	1,206,719
Current Law Mandatory:	
BA	960,295
OT	952,912

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1359. An act to allow manufacturers to meet warranty and labeling requirements for consumer products by displaying the terms of warranties on Internet websites, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2620. An act to amend the United States Cotton Futures Act to exclude certain cotton futures contracts from coverage under such Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 14, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2135. A letter from the Acting Undersecretary of Defense, Personnel and Readiness,

Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General John M. Bednarek, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2136. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Noel T. Jones, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2137. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General William T. Grisoli, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2138. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's interim final rule — Partitions of Eligible Multiemployer Plans (RIN: 1212-AB29) received July 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2139. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of

Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Tennessee; Redesignation of the Knoxville 2008 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attainment [EPA-R04-OAR-2014-0870; FRL-9930-49-Region 4] received July 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2140. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Determinations of Attainment of the 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter Standard for the Libby, Montana Nonattainment Area [EPA-R08-OAR-2014-0254; FRL-9930-47-Region 8] received July 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2141. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to the New Source Review State Implementation Plan; Flexible Permit Program [EPA-R06-OAR-2013-0542; FRL-9930-44-Region 6] received July 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2142. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Lead Rule Revisions [EPA-R05-OAR-2013-0193; FRL-9930-41-Region 5] received July 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2143. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Change of Listing Status for Certain Substitutes under the Significant New Alternatives Policy Program [EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0198; FRL-9926-55-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS18) received July 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2144. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-98, "TOFA Bona Fide Offer of Sale Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2145. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-97, "Heat Wave Safety Temporary Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2146. A letter from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2147. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; 2015 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for the South Atlantic Lesser Amberjack, Almaco Jack, and Banded Rudderfish Complex [Docket No.: 120815345-3525-02] (RIN: 0648-XD988) received July 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2148. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs,

NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Recreational Management Measures for the Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Fisheries; Fishing Year 2015 [Docket No.: 150211144-5509-02] (RIN: 0648-BE89) received July 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2898. A bill to provide drought relief in the State of California, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-197, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the union.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky: Committee on Appropriations. Revised Suballocation of Budget Allocations for Fiscal Year 2016 (Rept. 114-198). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Agriculture discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2898 referred to Committee of the Whole House on the state of the union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 3033. A bill to require the President's annual budget request to Congress each year to include a line item for the Research in Disabilities Education program of the National Science Foundation and to require the National Science Foundation to conduct research on dyslexia; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. LEE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. BASS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama):

H.R. 3034. A bill to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of George Henry White; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PITTENGER, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. JONES, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. GRUJALVA, and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 3035. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to clarify Federal law with respect to reporting certain positive consumer credit information to consumer reporting agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MACARTHUR (for himself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 3036. A bill to designate the National September 11 Memorial located at the World Trade Center site in New York City, New York, as a national memorial, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 3037. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to hospice care under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. SHUSTER):

H.R. 3038. A bill to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Natural Resources, Science, Space, and Technology, Energy and Commerce, Homeland Security, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama:

H.R. 3039. A bill to impose penalties on state-sponsors of cyberattacks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Financial Services, 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 Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COSTA, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. STEWART, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. YOHIO):

H.R. 3040. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, to develop guidelines regarding the use by the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs of unofficial sources of information to determine the eligibility of a member or former member of the Armed Forces for benefits and decorations when the member's service records are incomplete because of damage to the records, including records damaged by a 1973 fire at the National Personnel Records Center in St. Louis, Missouri; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself, Ms. LEE, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 3041. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to provide loans and grants for solar installations in low-income and underserved areas; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ESTY, Mr.

GARAMENDI, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 3042. A bill to amend the Act of October 19, 1949 (15 U.S.C. 375 et seq.; commonly referred to as the "Jenkins Act"), to prevent the interstate sale and delivery of electronic cigarettes, cigars, and pipe tobacco to minors in violation of law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 3043. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow allocation of certain renewable energy tax credits to Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 3044. A bill to direct the Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to carry out a collaborative research effort to prevent drunk driving injuries and fatalities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. FARR, Mr. HONDA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 3045. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize certain recycled water projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 3046. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and permanently extend qualified zone academy bonds, and to treat such bonds as specified tax credit bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 3047. A bill to require certain welfare programs to deny benefits to persons who fail a drug test, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. HOYER):

H. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 2nd Annual Fallen Firefighters Congressional Flag Presentation Ceremony; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

77. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 7, urging the President of the United States, members of Congress, and the United States Department of Labor to update regulations implementing an executive order prohibiting discrimination by federally-assisted contractors and subcontractors; 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. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 3033.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 3034.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 3035.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. MACARTHUR:

H.R. 3036.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 3037.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin:

H.R. 3038.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama:

H.R. 3039.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts, and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 3040.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 3041.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 3042.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 3043.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §8.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 3044.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 3045.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 3046.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article XVI of the Constitution—Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes . . .

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 3047.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have the Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debt and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 73: Mrs. LAWRENCE.
 H.R. 169: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 204: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 213: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 282: Mr. KATKO.
 H.R. 300: Mr. GROTHMAN and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
 H.R. 307: Mr. RUIZ.
 H.R. 317: Mr. HONDA.
 H.R. 333: Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 353: Mr. KLINE.
 H.R. 427: Mr. WALDEN.
 H.R. 455: Mr. BENISHEK.
 H.R. 504: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 540: Mr. PALAZZO.
 H.R. 548: Mr. TROTT.
 H.R. 563: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 600: Mr. HURT of Virginia.
 H.R. 649: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 662: Mr. NUNES.
 H.R. 665: Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 680: Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H.R. 700: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H.R. 702: Mr. LABRADOR, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. YODER, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. JORDAN.
 H.R. 707: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
 H.R. 731: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 745: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
 H.R. 750: Mr. MEEKS and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
 H.R. 753: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 757: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
 H.R. 759: Mr. LABRADOR.
 H.R. 793: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia and Mr. KING of Iowa.
 H.R. 815: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS and Mr. BUCHANAN.
 H.R. 821: Mr. KLINE.
 H.R. 842: Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 868: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
 H.R. 879: Mr. DONOVAN.
 H.R. 885: Mr. CARNEY.
 H.R. 913: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
 H.R. 932: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
 H.R. 985: Mrs. LAWRENCE.
 H.R. 986: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.
 H.R. 1062: Ms. BASS and Mr. KATKO.
 H.R. 1086: Mr. GROTHMAN.
 H.R. 1098: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 1100: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ASHFORD, and Mr. VELA.
 H.R. 1148: Mr. BRAT.
 H.R. 1149: Mr. BRAT.
 H.R. 1151: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.
 H.R. 1153: Mr. BRAT.
 H.R. 1157: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California and Mr. KNIGHT.
 H.R. 1188: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 1197: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

- H.R. 1212: Mr. JOLLY and Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 1258: Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 1270: Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 1277: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 1288: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 1300: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1312: Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 1342: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 1354: Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 1356: Mr. KILMER and Mr. ASHFORD.
H.R. 1384: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1391: Mr. TAKAL.
H.R. 1401: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 1415: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1419: Mr. KIND and Mr. McDERMOTT.
H.R. 1424: Mr. ROSKAM and Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 1439: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1441: Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 1453: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1462: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 1475: Mr. KIND, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 1516: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Ms. TSONGAS, and Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 1567: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 1571: Mr. KILMER and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 1599: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 1603: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 1608: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 1622: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1644: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1718: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 1769: Mr. GALLEGRO.
H.R. 1786: Mr. KILMER and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1832: Ms. BASS and Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 1854: Ms. MCSALLY and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1859: Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 1901: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 1919: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1967: Mr. PETERS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1969: Mr. JOLLY and Mr. VELA.
H.R. 1998: Mr. POCAN and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 2017: Mr. WALZ, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 2050: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 2141: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 2156: Ms. GABBARD.
H.R. 2218: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 2293: Mr. KATKO, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. BONAMICI, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 2303: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 2315: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. BARR, Mr. RIGELL, and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 2366: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 2380: Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 2391: Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 2400: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 2404: Mr. DOLD and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 2410: Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2411: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 2464: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 2470: Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 2493: Mr. O'ROURKE and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 2494: Mr. PITTENGER.
H.R. 2500: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 2530: Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 2535: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2568: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS and Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 2615: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 2622: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 2633: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 2646: Mrs. BLACK and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 2658: Mr. ABRAHAM.
H.R. 2675: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 2689: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 2692: Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 2698: Mr. REED.
H.R. 2716: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 2726: Mr. TIPTON, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 2730: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2739: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 2752: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2753: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 2769: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 2770: Mr. DONOVAN.
H.R. 2775: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2799: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 2800: Ms. MCSALLY.
H.R. 2802: Mr. HARPER, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. BLUM, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. MARINO, Mr. BOUTSTANY, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2804: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2805: Mr. KILMER, Mr. KATKO, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2835: Mr. ASHFORD and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 2836: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 2838: Mr. REED.
H.R. 2866: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2873: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2903: Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. DENT, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 2909: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 2923: Mr. RIGELL.
H.R. 2937: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 2939: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2944: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 2964: Mr. BARTON, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. COLE, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. McCLINTOCK, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 2972: Mr. BERA and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 2976: Mr. DELANEY and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 2979: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 2980: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 2983: Ms. HAHN.
H.R. 2994: Mr. COHEN and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 3002: Mr. BABIN, Mr. BRAT, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 3009: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 3029: Mr. SARBANES and Mr. DELANEY.
H.J. Res. 11: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.J. Res. 25: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.J. Res. 51: Ms. BORDELLO.
H.J. Res. 58: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. HUDSON.
H. Con. Res. 40: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Ms. LEE.
H. Res. 12: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. DONOVAN.
H. Res. 139: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H. Res. 140: Mr. YOHO.
H. Res. 193: Mr. LEVIN.
H. Res. 220: Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. BEYER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. CROWLEY.
H. Res. 230: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 291: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Ms. PINGREE.
H. Res. 293: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H. Res. 294: Mr. KATKO.
H. Res. 320: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. TROTT, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H. Res. 354: Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. JOYCE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CROWLEY, Miss RICE of New York, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. TONKO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H. Res. 359: Mr. JONES.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2898

OFFERED BY: Mr. CALVERT

AMENDMENT No. 1: Page 80, line 3, replace "3" with "2" and after line 15, insert the following:

(vi) 1 member shall be a representative of a wildlife entity that primarily focuses on waterfowl.