



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 15, 2015

No. 110

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 15, 2015.

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

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

THE NEW AMERICAN COALITION

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, I was on the HBO show "Real Time" with Bill Maher on a Friday night, and I had a chance to talk with Ann Coulter who, as you might have guessed, I don't have on my speed dial for regular conversations. It was a couple of days after Donald Trump announced he was running for the Republican nomination because he thought Mexican immigrants were criminals, drug dealers, and rapists.

When it was my turn, I told Ms. Coulter—and, by extension, Mr. Trump—that what they were saying about Mexican immigrants would serve as a voter registration machine to turbocharge voter registration in the Latino and immigrant community, all because of their particularly mean and—frankly, let's be honest—racist attacks on Mexican immigrants.

It was particularly important that I was in California for the show because I was watching the Republican Party make exactly the same mistake they made in the 1990s when it lost control of the politics in California.

By supporting extreme anti-immigrant policies to kick kids out of school and cut off families from being part of our society, California went from a purple State that had given the Republican Party important leaders like Richard Nixon and Ronald Reagan and, in just a few years, was transformed into a deep shade of Pacific blue.

Why? It is because millions of immigrants became citizens; millions of immigrant citizens registered to vote; and millions of registered voters voted to punish the Republican Party for being mean, shortsighted, and for offering demagoguery, not real solutions to issues.

This brings me back to Mr. Trump, who is trying to be the standard bearer of the anti-immigrant wing of the Republican Party and trying to define the party as one that will fight against immigrants it sees as murderers, drug dealers, criminals, and rapists.

Jan Brewer has endorsed Trump, and there he was, this past weekend, standing with Joe Arpaio in Arizona. Democrats could not paint a clearer picture if we tried. You should understand that, when Donald Trump said Mexican immigrants are criminals, what do I and other Puerto Ricans hear? I hear him saying all Puerto Ricans are criminals; and, as far as the Republicans are concerned, we all are.

Millions of others here—Hondurans, Colombians, and Dominicans—it is clear to all of us that what he is really saying is that all Latinos are suspect, whether we were born here or not.

Look, Trump's stereotyping is nothing new. Every single wave of immigrants has met the same resistance. They say they are lazy, they are bringing crime and diseases, that they are not like us, and they are coming to kill our sons and rape our daughters.

Whether you came to Chicago from Mexico a decade ago or from Mississippi in the 1950s to escape Jim Crow, you heard the same thing. If you came to New York from Ireland or came from Sicily a century ago, it has always been the same thing.

I say that Latinos should do what the Irish and the Polish and the Italians did, become citizens and vote. To my constituents and anyone today that is offended by what Donald Trump stands for, I have a simple message: Become a citizen—"hazte ciudadano."

There are more than 8.8 million immigrants who hold green cards and meet the residency requirements and are eligible to apply for citizenship today. That includes about 5 million Latinos who can apply to become citizens today.

Mr. Speaker, let me fill you in on a little secret. With fee waivers, up to 20 percent of all of those 8.8 million will pay absolutely nothing for their citizenship application. Becoming a citizen for free so you can make it clear that you are offended by Donald Trump, it is poetic and patriotic. Rather than renew your green card for \$450, become a citizen for about \$230 more, or zero if you are part of the 20 percent.

Look, Mr. Speaker, almost all of the immigrants in this country are going to remain in this country until the day they die. Let's be honest. For the millions who meet the requirements of citizenship, I say take the step, learn the language, learn our history and

□ 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.

H5175

how our government works, and take the test. Every time you see Trump's face on your TV, vow to learn a little more English or a few more history facts so you can take the citizenship test.

Let's turn the ignorance and the hatred of a TV personality running for President and turn it into something that strengthens democracy for all Americans.

You know what, if millions of people naturalize, become citizens, and we add to that the million Latino citizens who this year will turn 18, plus all of our allies in the African American community, the LGBT voters, younger voters, environmental voters, women voters, Asian voters, and union voters that are being pushed away by the Republican Party, all the people they don't want in their coalition constitute a majority of Americans.

Together, we are the new American coalition that will dominate politics for decades to come; and together, we will create a stronger, more inclusive, and more egalitarian Nation.

Let's turn Trump's negative words into something positive. That is how you deal with bullies and bigots.

NEVADA'S BASIN AND RANGE MONUMENT

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

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, the President signed away more than 700,000 acres of Lincoln and Nye Counties, as the Basin and Range National Monument in my district, locking these lands up from economic development the region depends on. This is unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to give a voice to what Nevada's argument is and what Nevada's argument is not. Some on the other side of the aisle wish to paint those who oppose the designation as enemies of our public lands, when nothing could be further from the truth.

Southeastern rural Nevada is in my blood. As a fifth-generation son of farmers and ranchers from Mesquite, Nevada, I am directly descended from the very same mountain men and the settlers whose bravery and resolve blazed the trail for the founding of our great State and who are mentioned in the President's proclamation. I grew up to explore the rugged landscapes of Lincoln and Nye Counties, hunting, hiking, and camping in these one-of-a-kind surroundings.

I love Nevada as much as the next Nevadan, and we refuse to be lectured by those who feel that they are first among equals in matters that concern our future. Our argument is not about whether or not to preserve our national treasures contained on our public lands. I wholeheartedly agree that we have a responsibility; we must protect what needs to be protected.

It comes down to this: The Antiquities Act is antiquated. The law is

rooted in the last century, and it has been manipulated over the years to exceed its original intent. It has become a tool of political patronage, burnishing the legacies of those privileged enough to hold our Nation's highest elected offices. It also furthers the insidious notion that Washington knows best.

The primary orchestrator of this monument maneuver even went so far as to say to the concerned people of Lincoln and Nye Counties: Don't worry. This is going to be great for you.

Despite the Orwellian refrain, the people in Nevada demanded the right to think for themselves, and they strongly disagree.

According to the letter I received from Nye County, the entire county board of commissioners opposes the Basin and Range National Monument designation, stating the dire concerns about the absence of any consultation with the Federal Government and the harmful economic constraints. With 98 percent of Nye County already under Federal control, it can ill afford to lose additional economic opportunities.

As for Lincoln County, the commissioners have expressed grave concerns about having such a large swath of the county administered "for a singular, specific, preferred use, rather than for a multiple-use management resource plan."

Despite what the White House asserts, this outcome would particularly be harmful for a county that is already 97 percent federally controlled.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of the day, there is no doubt in my mind the Antiquities Act is a holdover of a bygone era. We continue to see Presidents pay lip service to the requirement that the boundaries of national monuments should be "confined to the smallest area compatible"—700,000 acres, really?

What I would like to encourage my colleagues and those in the administration to remember is that rural Nevada's culture, the will and resolve of its people, are not things that can be locked away in an outdoor museum. They live on in today's generations who continue to carry on the traditions of those who came before them and respect the land they call home.

With proper consultation across all levels of government and the local buy-in, I am confident that Democrats and Republicans can work together to protect America's natural heritage, while also preserving its people's way of life.

This photograph is a great example of the possibilities. The Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument is a case study of a successful effort to preserve Nevada's national heritage that was given due consideration and that had a widespread community backing. That is why Congress passed legislation to create the Tule Springs Fossil Bed National Monument in Nevada last year.

If I can pose for a picture, smiling wide and holding a sign with the words

"national monument" on it, there must be a right way to go about protecting our public lands.

Mr. Speaker, we need local input; we need votes in Congress, and we need to fix the antiquated Antiquities Act.

IRAN DEAL

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, for 35 years, the United States' relationship with Iran has been frozen in amber, locked in a series of proxy wars and covert struggles.

Circumstances have occasionally thrust us together, like our shared actions against the Taliban after 9/11 or, more recently, working together against some of the most barbarous forces in the Middle East.

Now, no one is under any illusions that the military leadership and hard-line clerics are bad actors opposed to the United States, but that is only part of the story of a complex narrative.

The new and potentially more significant chapter of that relationship is an effort to contain Iran's nuclear ambition, not through force, but a combination of tough, multinational sanctions and diplomacy. This all started in the Bush administration a decade ago and has continued. Congress is now beginning the analysis of this historic agreement.

For the first time, Iran's nuclear activities have been reined in. They have followed what they said they would do for the last 2 years. For the first time in history, we have an agreement that would last for a decade or more, reached not just by the United States alone—we could not have done this alone—but with all five members of the U.N. Security Council, Germany, and the cooperation of potential consumers of Iranian oil like India and Japan.

Now, we must be prepared to hear people, starting with Prime Minister Netanyahu, attack it. We will hear that it is not good enough, that it contains potential downsides.

Iran might well try to cheat. Netanyahu will make his arguments with the same certitude as when he appeared in Washington before the Iraq war and talked about the benefits of attacking Iraq. He would have more credibility with me if he weren't so wrong then and if he had any credible alternative now. He has complaints but no solution.

Indeed, he doesn't even have a peace plan for dealing with Israel's own ongoing festering problems with the Palestinians in the Israeli-occupied territories—a man with no plan and no alternative attacking the best option for America and Israel that we have seen.

With this agreement in place, we will have more tools than we have ever had to inspect, to monitor, and enforce and more allies to make it work. If the United States walks away from this

agreement, it is certain that the countries that helped us reach this point will walk away, too, starting with Russia and China.

Without this perfect alignment of interests for punishing sanctions, they will fall apart, and we will lose this moment.

□ 1015

Now, despite the huffing and puffing, military action is not viable. Talk to your constituents about what their appetite is for another military engagement in the Middle East, particularly, with the horrific costs and consequences that would follow.

Military action would only strengthen the most reactionary evil forces in Iran to unleash the next escalation of global terror, which is frightening to comprehend. An attack will strengthen Iran's resolve to secure their own nuclear weapons, just as North Korea has done. And you cannot bomb away the knowledge that Iran has on nuclear technology.

Ten, fifteen years is a lifetime in international affairs. Who could have imagined what has taken place in the last 15 years of our history? The world was a much different place in the year 2000.

We ought to work to keep this coalition in support of the agreement alive and well and work to implement it and to enforce it, because we can snap back these sanctions if Iran crosses the line. The evidence is that the American public, and especially the majority of Jewish Americans, want to give diplomacy a chance.

Congress should allow it. Reject the alternative for people who have no alternative. Recognize this as a major achievement, and work together to make diplomacy work. Let's seize this once-in-a-generation opportunity.

EGYPT AND THE PERSECUTION OF COPTIC CHRISTIANS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there is a cultural and religious cleansing sweeping across the Middle East. ISIS has made it clear that there is no compromise on religion. It is intolerant of any religious belief different than its own. If a person is not a Muslim, they are forced to pay a tax, convert, or be executed. In the face of this ugly terrorist group that preaches hate, Christians are persecuted.

But ISIS is just one example of groups that are intolerant of Christians. Egypt is a hotbed of persecution of Coptic Christians.

Some people thought after the fall of Mubarak, things would get better, but that hasn't been true for Coptic Christians.

A schoolteacher told a Coptic teenager to hide his cross that was on his necklace. He wouldn't do so, so the teacher encouraged the class to punish

the boy to protect the name of Allah. His classmates beat him to death. He died because he was a Christian.

A mere rumor that a Muslim girl was dating a Christian boy led to church burnings and a curfew for Christians.

Since 2011, the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom has deemed Egypt a "country of particular concern."

In 2013, the Muslim Brotherhood blamed Coptic Christians for the downfall of President Morsi, even though it was the majority of the Egyptians that were tired of Morsi's oppressive rule. So Muslim mobs battered their way into an Orthodox church south of Cairo, tore down the cross, and torched the building. After they looted the church, they set the church on fire with Molotov cocktails and gasoline. When they left, they spray-painted a nearby wall with the words, "Egypt is Islamic."

In all, over 40 Christian churches were destroyed or damaged in Egypt.

Like the Nazi marking of Jewish homes, black Xs are painted on Christian stores so attackers know which shops to target. Dozens of houses, shops, hotels, and vehicles belonging to Christians have been burned and looted.

The military said it would help rebuild churches that were destroyed, but the law requires non-Muslim places of worship to receive Presidential approval before rebuilding a church; and of course, Presidential approval is very difficult to obtain. So this is the government's way of stopping construction of Christian churches across Egypt. The government is still not protecting Coptic Orthodox Christians and their churches.

Coptic Christians are often treated as second-class citizens by the government. Bishop Boulous was charged with blasphemy, or "defaming Islam," in 2009 because he wanted to change his religion on his national identity card from Muslim to Christian.

You see, Mr. Speaker, in Egypt you have to put your religious affiliation on your identification card.

After receiving multiple threats, his wife and his children were forced to flee the country. The prosecutors have ignored court deadlines for his trial, and he remains in prison today.

President el-Sisi has staked his legacy on the fight against terrorism, ISIS, and the Muslim Brotherhood. Ensuring human rights for Christians must be given the same priority.

Four years after the so-called Arab Spring, attacks against Christians have not stopped. In February, 21 Egyptian Coptic Christians were beheaded by ISIS. The brutal mass murder was filmed in a 5-minute, highly produced video and disseminated by ISIS' propaganda arm. When their relatives got permission from the President of Egypt to build a church in the memory of the martyrs, they were attacked by rock-throwing radical mobs.

Coptic Christians just want to be left alone and worship and exercise their

religion. They want to be able to gather on Sunday without fearing the church they are in will be bombed or burned. They want to live in peace without having to hide from radical, intolerant mobs ready to attack them.

These are not unreasonable requests. They are basic freedoms. Our ally, Egypt, must do a better job of protecting all religious groups.

Religious freedom is a human right. We guarantee in our First Amendment, and, Mr. Speaker, it is the first right of the five rights mentioned in the First Amendment. That placement is not accidental.

The right to practice one's religion is a basic human right. Egypt should protect all religious groups, including Coptic Christians, from religious cleansing.

And that is just the way it is.

CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE AWARENESS AND PREVENTION ACT

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share the story of a determined woman who took a traumatic personal experience from her past and is using it to help people.

Erin Merryn is a survivor of childhood sexual assault that began when she was just 7 years old. In her book, Erin shares: "The only message I got as a child came from my abusers, and that was to stay silent or else. I went to bed night after night crying and keeping my secrets locked away in my childhood diary."

Tragically, Erin's is not an uncommon story. Childhood sexual assault is a silent epidemic that exists in every one of our communities, and I am asking us to come together to do something about it. I am asking, as a mom of three boys first and as a lawmaker second, because every 6 minutes a child is sexually assaulted in the United States. One in four girls, and one in twenty boys are sexually assaulted before they turn age 18, and yet only a tenth of children who are sexually abused will tell someone.

Survivors of child sexual assault carry the corrosive burden of this heinous act with them the rest of their lives. Survivors often experience guilt, isolation, problems with self-esteem, and building relationships.

Erin shared her story to educate and protect thousands, if not millions, of children. And today, thanks to her work, policies that require schools to provide age-appropriate sexual abuse prevention education for teachers and students are called Erin's Law.

As Members of Congress, as parents, as neighbors, we owe it to our kids to follow Erin's example and be their strongest advocates. Children, teachers, and parents are on the front line of this problem, but they often don't have the tools necessary to identify it or get kids the help they need.

While Erin's Law is an important step for States that have implemented it, every child in America should benefit from the policies that prevent sexual abuse. Children learn tornado drills, fire drills, bus safety drills in school, but too often they learn nothing about how to protect themselves from predators and how to report abuse.

Congress can and should do more to help, and that is why today I am introducing the Child Sexual Abuse Awareness and Prevention Act. This legislation will help schools implement and expand child sexual abuse awareness and prevention programs by authorizing funding through existing grant programs.

It is common sense that we teach our children to stay safe and how to reach out to an adult when they are in trouble. By passing this bill, we can help schools across the United States protect some of the most vulnerable children in our country.

I am grateful to Representative JOE HECK for partnering with me in the House, and to Senators GILLIBRAND, HELLER, and FEINSTEIN for introducing the bill in the Senate. I am also grateful to the Rape, Abuse, and Incest National Network for their leadership on this issue in ending abuse and violence.

Most importantly, I am thankful for Erin, for her bravery, leadership, and determination. No child should ever feel like they have nowhere to turn when they are being abused, and with the Child Sexual Abuse Awareness and Prevention Act, we can take a critical step toward making sure that they aren't.

IRAN'S NUCLEAR DEAL

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

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss one aspect of this Iran deal which I think is a fatal flaw, in addition to other fatal flaws—but this one, I think, in particular—and that is the issue of inspections.

Now, the crucial part of any type of deal dealing with nuclear disarmament involves inspections. You have got to inspect to make sure that they are not—that, in this case, Iran is not—building a nuclear weapon.

Now, the best way to have done that would be to insist that the sanctions remain in place until Iran affirmatively dismantles their program, and then you have inspectors go in to verify that the program has been dismantled; and then as long as the program is, in fact, dismantled and they don't have a nuclear infrastructure, then the sanctions are relieved. The minute that they are caught trying to rebuild, then the sanctions go back on.

But that is not what this deal is at all. What this deal is is a huge influx of cash, hundreds of billions of dollars up front to the Iranian regime, which will be used, no doubt, much of

that money, to fund terrorism and to expand Iran's influence throughout the Middle East.

And we are affirmatively recognizing Iran's nuclear program. They are not required to dismantle their infrastructure, so they get to keep that. So a huge influx of cash, and they keep the nuclear program.

You are not going to sell me once you go down that road, because I don't think they have a right to any nuclear material. But other people will say, well, as long as we can inspect, then maybe it is going to be okay. And here, in this deal, we don't even have legitimate inspections.

Now, the administration has drawn a lot of red lines with this Iran deal. One of them was, of course we are going to have anywhere, anytime inspections, and they said that repeatedly. Just a couple of months ago, in April, Ben Rhodes, Deputy National Security Adviser, said the deal would include anytime, anywhere inspections. Energy Secretary Moniz said of course you have to have anytime, anywhere inspections.

And then guess what? The deal comes out. Rhodes is asked on TV, what about anytime, anywhere? I thought that was part of the deal. He said we never sought anywhere, anytime inspections. So the administration is recognizing the reality that this deal does not include anywhere, anytime inspections.

What it does have is a convoluted bureaucratic process that, if we or the IAEA or the U.N. suspect that Iran is developing a nuclear weapon in, say, one of their military sites, you actually have to petition to be able to inspect it. Iran gets to weigh in on whether they want to.

There is a convoluted bureaucratic appeals process. Basically, Iran can drag it out for 24 days, and that is even assuming you get a positive resolution, which, by the way, is going to require the assent of Russia and China, and they may not even be willing to give approval. So even if you get that, that is 3-plus weeks where Iran will have the ability to conceal any of the offending conduct that they were suspected of. So the bottom line is a 24-day delay makes the inspections regime utterly useless.

So this is a country that has sponsored terrorism consistently for decades. They have lied to the United Nations for decades. Then we are in a situation where somehow they should be able to block access to their potential weapon sites?

The bottom line is Iran should not be able to interfere with any inspections for any reason at any time. Unless you have that, this is not going to be something that has any chance of success.

And guess what. Not only are the inspections not valid, but you are lifting the arms embargo over a couple of years, and you are relieving sanctions on the Quds Force and Qasem Soleimani. These are designated terrorists. Our country has viewed them as a designated terrorist organization.

□ 1030

So the bottom line is, on its own terms, this deal will not succeed. It is a dangerous mistake. Congress has the ability over these next 60 days to scrutinize it, to debate it, and, ultimately, God willing, to stop it.

THIRTY-ONE GIVES OF COLUMBUS, OHIO

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the Thirty-One Gives Foundation that is a philanthropic arm of Thirty-One Gifts, Inc., which is the 17th largest direct selling company in the world. I am so proud to have both based in my Ohio Third Congressional District.

The Thirty-One Gives Foundation is an organization dedicated to celebrating girls, women, and families by providing them with the support and self-esteem needed to lead to successful lives.

Since its first meeting just in 2012, Thirty-One Gives has donated over \$80 million in product and cash to non-profit organizations committed to their same mission.

They have proudly partnered with many well-known national organizations, such as the Ronald McDonald House, Girl Talk, Salvation Army, the American Heart Association, the Girl Scouts, and the YWCA of Central Ohio to advance this philanthropic mission.

Cleverly built around their name, Thirty-One Gifts, with over 16,000 consultants, volunteer on the 31st day of every month with 31 days.

Mr. Speaker, I salute their volunteers for providing services such as preparing and serving homemade meals to families staying at the Central Ohio Ronald McDonald House, helping to give stability and strength in these families' homes away from homes.

They volunteer also to serve meals at the YWCA Family Center of Central Ohio, which provides emergency shelter and critical services to stabilize homeless families.

As a long-time advocate against human trafficking and one of the sponsors of legislation included in the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, S. 178, which was recently signed into law by President Obama, I salute Thirty-One Gives for assisting over 15,000 women in transition from human trafficking, domestic violence, and homelessness.

Mr. Speaker, during my recent district job tour, I had the opportunity to visit Thirty-One Gifts and meet the founder, CEO, and president, Cindy Monroe.

Today I salute this incredible civic leader, self-starter, and entrepreneur and her team for making a difference in the lives of others and presenting a unique solution to the emotional and economic empowerment of women locally, nationally, and worldwide.

I look forward to welcoming and joining this inspirational organization on Sunday, July 26, when some 16,500 sales leaders from Thirty-One Gifts travel to my congressional district for their annual national sales conference being held right in Columbus, Ohio.

As the members of Thirty-One Gifts know, when we all work together and give a little piece of our heart, we can make a huge difference.

21ST CENTURY CURES

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my deep appreciation to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I was proud to be part of this body last week when together, in a bipartisan fashion, we, in strong numbers, passed the 21st Century Cures bill.

Let me tell you why that bill matters. It matters because of people like this. This is a picture of Rhoda Mull, a woman that I had the opportunity to spend some time with this Monday when we sat together for a period of time, talking about a number of issues, but, most specifically, her life.

Rhoda is an attorney of some distinction. She worked with a major pharmaceutical firm dealing in complex legal issues, traveling throughout the world.

In about 2007, she began to feel a little droop in her foot. It continued to move further up. Ultimately, after numerous consultations with physicians, she was diagnosed with ALS, better known to many as Lou Gehrig's disease, and, thus, began the slow, but continuing, challenge of the ability for her to move about.

But Rhoda, much to the inspiration, didn't allow this to hold her back. Quite the opposite. She embraced the challenge of the moment and reached out to become a voice, a voice for those some 30,000 people in our country every year who are victimized by the disease, Lou Gehrig's disease, ALS. She came to be a voice for those people. It is one of the reasons why what we can accomplish with 21st Century Cures is so important.

Let me talk for a second about the fact that she was a voice. Today this body is very likely to deal with the issue of something called the Steve Gleason Act.

It is an act which will enable the voice recorder that allows Rhoda to speak to be able to be approved in such a manner that they will not have to have these important communication tools capped by a rental policy that has been part of CMS' attempts to try to deal with the costs associated with these devices.

One of the things that we are working on is to allow people to have continued access to these technologies, to see the courage of Rhoda, a vibrant woman in her mind, but who isn't capable of feeding herself or dressing herself, yet is able to speak with me.

Inside this mind, there are tremendous things going on. And as she moved to that voice box and communicated with me, it inspired me to say we have got to continue to fight for people like Rhoda, who has been given a voice.

We must stand here and give her a voice as well, to fight for passage of the Steve Gleason Act today and to reach out to our colleagues on the other side of this building to make sure that we fight for the passage of 21st Century Cures.

ALS is just one of thousands of conditions for which we have no real cure. We have made tremendous advancements in medicine in the last two decades. There is still much we do not know about conditions like multiple sclerosis and Alzheimer's.

I have some good news to share with Rhoda. Just last week the House approved the 21st Century Cures Act that will direct money towards research into cures for conditions like ALS.

It expands lifesaving research into conditions that affect millions of Americans, increasing the budget of the National Institutes of Health by \$10 billion over the next 5 years.

It cuts the red tape and bureaucracy, just as importantly, that stands between us and groundbreaking new treatments and will help train the next generations of doctors, scientists, and researchers. Millions of Americans with conditions like cancer, Alzheimer's, ALS, cystic fibrosis, and others stand to benefit from this research.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on the other side of the Senate to get behind this and pass the 21st Century Cures Act. I urge my colleagues in this House to stand up today and cast an important vote in support of the Steve Gleason Act.

P5+1 NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

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

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the P5+1 nuclear agreement with Iran.

No longer do we have to guess at rumors or wonder what the deal is. We now know. We know that enrichment, despite earlier promises, will continue. We know that the arms embargo will be removed.

We know that the entire sanctions regime, covering problems with human rights abuses, terrorism, and the ballistic missile programs, will cease to exist.

We know that Iran has the capability of usurping an anytime, anywhere inspections program, thanks to required advance permission for each individual inspection, up to 24 days sometimes.

After decades of animosity on the part of Iran toward the American people, we also know that our Americans are still sitting in Iranian prisons. I wonder how many 24-day periods they have been there.

We know that Iran still views the United States and Israel as their enemy, as stated earlier this month by multiple members of the Iranian regime.

We know that Iran's sponsorship of terrorism will continue unabated, only now they will have more money and increased market access to ensure that weapons and funds continue to flow into the very hands of those who wish our death.

President Obama announced, "America negotiated from a position of strength and principle."

Really? That was our beginning position? Well, when did they cease to push that position? All I see is capitulation to a regime which has repeatedly violated the terms of the negotiations, all the while sitting at the very negotiation table.

America's failure to truly lead is what has caused both President Obama and Secretary Kerry to state that this deal had the support of the international community.

Obviously, they forget that our greatest ally, Israel, is part of the international community as well as other gulf coast countries. Aren't they all members of the same international community?

Now it is incumbent upon Congress to seek answers to a number of questions prior to finalizing our votes on an expected resolution.

Number one, do we really believe it will prevent a nuclear armed Iran? Answer: No. Do you really believe it will prevent a nuclear arms race in the Middle East? Answer: No. Do you really believe that the removal of a comprehensive sanctions program that brought a terroristic Iranian regime to the negotiation table in the first place can truly be "snapped back"? Answer: No. Have we lost decades of work? Unfortunately, answer: Yes.

Do you believe this deal makes the world a safer place? As for me, the answer is no. The answer to all of these questions is no. As such, I cannot nor will I support approval of Iran's deal of a lifetime.

All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is it is a good thing President Obama wasn't on the decks of the USS *Missouri* to end World War II because, had he been, we would all be speaking Japanese.

CLEAR LAW ENFORCEMENT FOR CRIMINAL ALIEN REMOVAL ACT

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, sitting here listening to my colleagues, I find it just so incredibly interesting that nearly everyone that is coming to the floor today is talking about an issue that centers on our Nation's security, whether it is our national security writ large in the world, what is happening in the Middle East, or what is happening here at home.

And, as I talk to female constituents, it is amazing to me what comes up over and over: How are we going to be certain that we are safe in our homes, in our communities? How do I know that my children are going to be safe at school? How do I know that we are going to be safe when we are out at events in the community or driving in the car or going to church?

These are questions of concern to so many moms who, like me, worry about their children and their grandchildren.

□ 1045

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the issues that brings me to the floor today. I have legislation that I first filed in 2007. It is called the CLEAR Act. It is H.R. 2964.

The CLEAR Act addresses the issues with the criminal illegal aliens that are in our country and the policies that have arisen around sanctuary cities. These sanctuary city policies and the executive amnesty really have turned every State into a border State and every town into a border town in this country.

Here is why: There are lax, permissive, and liberal policies that have really created an open border society here in our country—and do you know what, it makes Americans less safe every single day.

Now, the CLEAR Act isn't a big bill; it is 20 pages, but let me tell you what it does specifically. It withholds funding from section 241(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to sanctuary States and cities.

That is important to do because, as I said, those lax, liberal, and permissive policies have now allowed over the last 7 or 8 years to create a total of nearly 300 sanctuary cities in this country. This should disturb us because we are becoming a sanctuary country.

I would ask my colleagues: Will you support that provision of the CLEAR Act?

The second thing the CLEAR Act does, Mr. Speaker, is when a State or local law enforcement agency arrests an alien and requests that DHS, Homeland Security, take custody of that alien, the CLEAR Act requires DHS to do two things: take the alien into Federal custody and incarcerate him or her within 48 hours or request that the State or municipality temporarily incarcerate the alien or transport them to Federal custody.

The CLEAR Act requires the DHS to train State and local police in enforcing immigration laws and to repay them for the money that they have spent.

Now, sanctuary cities first started to happen in the United States in 1979. Los Angeles was the first sanctuary city. That means these cities choose—choose—to stand in violation of Federal law and to not comply with Federal immigration law.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is so instructive that the Department of Justice has never taken one of these cities to

court, but if you let a State like Arizona try to strengthen their immigration laws, then the Department of Justice takes them to court. There is something wrong with that.

Another thing that has happened is the illegal alien crime rate which has continued to grow. Do you know what the illegal alien crime rate should be? It is zero—zero.

There should not be tolerance for this. We see it all across our country. Certainly, we saw it on a San Francisco pier. In Tennessee, a Tennessee Highway Patrol officer made a traffic stop on I-40 that led to the arrest of a man with an order of deportation and the recovery of a 19-year-old who may have been a victim of human sex trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to address this issue, and I encourage support for the CLEAR Act.

MOURNING THE LOSS OF JUDGE D'ARMY BAILEY

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, the city of Memphis lost one of its most outstanding citizens on Sunday evening. D'Army Bailey, who had served as a judge in circuit court for nearly two decades, was a national figure, recognized for such in *The New York Times* yesterday with a very large and meaningful obituary.

D'Army Bailey was singularly responsible for the creation of the National Civil Rights Museum in Memphis, Tennessee. There was a time when the Lorraine Motel, which is the site of the National Civil Rights Museum and the site of Dr. Martin Luther King's assassination, was going to be foreclosed and possibly demolished; but D'Army Bailey, then an attorney, saw that as wrong and knew that the National Civil Rights Museum should be built at the site of the assassination of Dr. King and that site should be preserved for generations for people to learn about civil rights and learn about Dr. King.

He got together, Mr. Speaker, and raised money from individuals and the city of Memphis and was able to save the Lorraine from foreclosure demolition.

He then put together the idea of the city, the county, and the State governments funding the beginnings of a national civil rights museum. There was private funding as well, but it was the initial work of D'Army Bailey coming to Nashville, where I was a State senator, and working to get Governor McWhorter and the State legislature on board and then the city of Memphis and the county of Shelby.

Now, there is a phoenix, having risen from the ashes, a great civil rights museum in Memphis, Tennessee; and there is one man who had the idea and refused to see the site destroyed and

sought out the funding when people said it couldn't happen and made sure it happened. That was Judge D'Army Bailey—Judge D'Army Bailey.

He was recognized because he spoke truth to power, and he spoke truth to power in Baton Rouge during the civil rights movement; in Berkeley when Berkeley was an evolving center of thought and questioning of values and where he was the city councilman; and on Beale Street, where he brought students to Memphis to march with Dr. King.

Mr. Speaker, D'Army Bailey was a respected figure in the city of Memphis. He crossed all boundaries in the city, economic and racial, and all because of his gigantic intellect.

Many Members in the House have asked me about his passing. He had an effect on this country and an effect on our city. His was a life well lived, and he will be missed.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I participated in a hearing on criminal justice reform before the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. A second hearing is being held today on this issue in the same committee. At both hearings, conservatives and liberals are joining together to urge that we stop or at least try to slow the growth of our Federal police state.

Conservative columnist George Will wrote a few months ago: "Overcriminalization has become a national plague."

Paul Larkin, senior legal research fellow at the Edwin Meese III Center for Legal and Judicial Studies, wrote in *The Washington Times*: "Today, there are perhaps 4,500 Federal offenses—and more than 300,000 relevant regulations—on the books. No one knows exactly how many. The Justice Department and the American Bar Association each tried to identify every crime and failed."

Mr. Larkin continued: "No reasonable person, not even a judge or lawyer, could possibly know all of these legal prohibitions, although criminal penalties are attached to each."

John Baker, a retired Louisiana State University law professor said: "There is no one in the United States over the age of 18 who cannot be indicted for some Federal crime."

He added: "That is not an exaggeration."

Mr. Speaker, I have special interests in this because, for 7½ years before coming to Congress, I was a criminal court judge in Tennessee trying the felony criminal cases. I believe in being tough on crime, and I have been a very strong supporter of local law enforcement, the people on the front lines who are fighting the real crime, the violent crime that everyone is so concerned about.

I remember in 1993 reading an article in *Forbes* magazine, one of the Nation's most conservative magazines. This article said that we had quadrupled the Justice Department just between 1980 and 1993 and that Federal prosecutors were falling all over themselves trying to find cases to prosecute. We have kept on expanding the Justice Department since then and have had explosive growth in the number of Federal crimes.

We have had far too many cases where overzealous prosecutors have prosecuted high-profile defendants just so that a prosecutor could make a name for himself. I remember the totally unjustified case against Secretary of Labor, Ray Donovan, in which, after he was acquitted, made the famous statement: "Where do I go to get my reputation back?"

Our Federal Government has become far too big, and it is far too powerful. We all have heard how particularly the IRS is running roughshod over individual citizens. *Newsweek* magazine a few years had on its cover: "Inside The IRS—Lawless, Abusive, and Out of Control."

Unfortunately, while there are many good Federal prosecutors, there are far too many of them and, unfortunately, some who, like the IRS, are lawless, abusive, and out of control.

Mr. Speaker, there are now so many laws, rules, and regulations on the books today that people are being prosecuted for violating laws they didn't even know were in existence.

Paul Larkin, whom I quoted earlier, said that we need a "mistake of law" defense. An innocent mistake is not supposed to be criminal, but a zealous prosecutor can make even an innocent mistake look criminal, and there is an old saying that a prosecutor could indict a ham sandwich if he wanted to.

Almost everyone has violated some tax law—they are so convoluted and confusing—and almost every person in any type of business has unknowingly violated some law, rule, or regulation for which they could be prosecuted.

That is why, yesterday, we had at our hearing a conservative Republican like Senator JOHN CORNYN, a former justice of the Texas Supreme Court; and Senator CORY BOOKER, a liberal Democrat; and a conservative like Representative SENSENBRENNER; and a liberal like Representative BOBBY SCOTT—all joining together to urge reform.

Lastly, let me mention one other aspect of our Nation's crime problem. In my years as a judge, I handled over 10,000 cases because probably 97 or 98 percent of the defendants enter some type of guilty plea and then apply for probation.

Every day, for 7½ years, I would read several 8- or 10-page reports into a defendant's background, and I would read, "Defendant's father left home when defendant was 2 and never returned," or "Defendant's father left home to get a pack of cigarettes and never came back."

Mr. Speaker, over 90 percent of the defendants in felony cases in my court came from father-absent households. Drugs and/or alcohol are involved in most cases, but they are secondary to the absent father problem.

Years ago, I read a report that said 57 percent of marriages break up in arguments, disputes, or disagreements about money. As government has grown so much at all levels, Federal, State, and local over the past 40 or 50 years, it has become a major factor in the breakup of the American family by taking so much money and making it so much more difficult for families to stay together.

This, Mr. Speaker, has had a major impact on our Nation's crime problem.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to stand in strong support of a foundational American law and principle that I feel has been woefully neglected recently. I rise in defense of the First Amendment, which in part states: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Due to the recent Supreme Court decision on marriage, I feel that the First Amendment is at risk of being horribly violated in the name of judicial activism. I am deeply concerned for the First Amendment rights of all American citizens and feel strongly that the Court did not act within its limited constitutional constraints.

Due to this decision, Mr. Speaker, there now exists a direct conflict between the law of man and the law of God, and we have tens of millions of Americans who are now facing a dilemma to choose between their faith and their religious convictions and the government. As Christians, we must obey the law of God.

This decision by the Supreme Court is devastating, and it directly ignored the will of the people and the will of most States. It was a direct rejection of previously held decisions; it rejected dozens of State laws and Constitutions, and, yes, it rejected God's law.

In effect, this decision took the people's prerogative and the States' prerogative and threw it out the window in favor of incorrectly defining and interpreting that which is detrimental to our First Amendment, the First Amendment which guarantees not only the freedom of speech, but also the freedom of religious expression without fear of harassment or penalty from our government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we must find different avenues where citizens and lawmakers can get involved to address this egregious offense to our First Amendment. In my home State of Georgia, local legislatures are considering the

Pastor Protection Act which would endeavor to ensure that no pastor or minister or house of faith would be forced to perform a wedding that they believe violates their religious beliefs. That is good, but we must do more. It is a good first step.

Frankly, it is my hope that other States would raise the mantle of our Constitution and protect it and protect not just pastors and ministers, but all citizens, including businessmen and -women.

In addition to State action, Congress also must be heavily involved at this time. As an initial step, I am personally proud to have cosponsored H.R. 2802, the First Amendment Defense Act, offered by my good friend and colleague Representative RAÚL LABRADOR from Idaho.

□ 1100

This bill includes many provisions that would both reaffirm and safeguard our First Amendment rights. It would ensure that the Federal Government could not penalize institutions, churches, and individuals for simply exercising their First Amendment right.

Furthermore, it prohibits the Federal Government from blocking access due to deeply held religious convictions from those who are seeking grants or licenses or contracts or accreditation or tax-exempt status. I believe this bill would help greatly to deal with the uncertainty that currently is held by millions.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope and desire that we can all come together to defend our First Amendment. I think DANIEL WEBSTER said it best when he said:

If we abide by the principles taught in the Bible, our country will go on to prosper, but if we and our posterity neglect its instructions and authority, no man can tell how sudden a catastrophe may overwhelm us and bury all our glory in profound obscurity.

I, for one, Mr. Speaker, will continue fighting for our First Amendment.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

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

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, this body is going to come together and in bipartisan fashion—I think that is normally a good thing, in bipartisan fashion—be able to applaud themselves for fixing the highway trust fund. Like the proverbial magician that takes the shiny object in one hand to distract you, they will, with sleight of hand, with the other hand borrow \$8.1 billion when the American people aren't watching.

I want to refer you to the chart on my left. You will see three lines. I want to talk about the bottom two first.

The very bottom line is the revenue line. That is the amount of money we receive from excise taxes and gasoline taxes to pay for roads and bridges and infrastructure. The red line above it is

the expenditures. That is the money that we are spending. The difference between the two is the deficit. That is the borrowed money. I will show you where it is.

For decades—for decades—we have been adding red ink to the American people's debt. We have been borrowing billions of dollars annually each year to spend on our infrastructure rather than telling the American people the truth: that if we believe as Members of Congress and this body that roads and bridges and airports are important enough to buy, they are important enough to pay for. But we don't want to do that. We don't want to tell the American people we are going to raise taxes.

But I want you to know that this afternoon when we borrow \$1.8 billion to build roads and bridges, we are going to raise taxes. Here is what I mean. We are going to raise taxes on kids, on our children, on my 11-year-old grandson. Do you want to know why? Because we don't want to tell them, we don't want to tell adults today that they have to pay for the roads and bridges that they buy today. What we would rather do is say you can have these things for free. We are going to wave the shiny magic object here. We are going to borrow money while telling the American people it is paid for, and then we are going to ask our children when they grow up to buy our roads and bridges when the bill comes due.

We are perfectly fine on raising taxes on kids, raising taxes on children. Do you want to know why? Because they can't vote. So let's tell them they have got to pay for this stuff rather than us paying for this stuff. Remember, all deficit spending is nothing more than future taxation.

What is the top line here, the hash line? Back in 1992, the last time that we raised the national gas tax, Congress, before I came here and before many of my colleagues came here, decided not to index the gas tax to inflation. So our purchasing power is disappearing because we have left it where it is.

Now, I am going to use a green pen here. All that green is lost opportunity.

I don't know how many of you have flown into LaGuardia, JFK, O'Hare, these international airports. They are the international gateway to the United States economy, and they are also an international embarrassment on a global scale.

We continue to let these places degrade and fall apart, and yet none of us in our own spending would do that in our homes. If the roof leaks, we fix it. If the House needs painting, we paint it. We take care of these things and maintain them because they are our assets. They are what we are passing on to the next generation. We have lost all this opportunity.

What I would much rather see is either we are honest with the American people, Mr. Speaker, and say, if it is

worth buying and worth doing, we should pay for it, and then raise the taxes necessary to do that, like Ronald Reagan did, like George Bush did, like Dwight Eisenhower did—all Republican Presidents. They said it is worth paying for. Let's not burden our children. Let's not tax them. If it is worth doing that, we should do that.

If it is not worth doing that, we should bring our expenditures down to the revenue level and not spend the money in the first place so that we are sending a clear message back to each of the States that are getting Federal largess on highways and roads that we are not going to do that and that you need to raise your taxes to cover the gap.

Both of those ideas would be better than what we are doing right now, which is nothing but a magic trick on children, and we ought to stop it.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I don't know how adequately to express my alarm and outrage over the President's agreement with Iran. It is a breathtakingly dangerous act. Some have compared it to Neville Chamberlain's Munich accord with Nazi Germany, but that does not fully illustrate the danger. In this case, we are talking about a rogue state with all of Nazi Germany's genocidal intentions, but this one will be armed with nuclear weapons.

In its preamble, the agreement asserts that Iran will comply with the nuclear nonproliferation treaty that it signed long ago. Well, wait a second. If it had obeyed this treaty, we wouldn't be having this discussion to begin with now, would we?

The fact is that Iran has a well-established and consistent record of routinely violating international law. Its intention to acquire nuclear weapons is obvious.

The immediate effect of the President's action is to release hundreds of billions of dollars of direct and indirect resources to Iran with which its government can pursue its military and terrorist activities, activities that aren't even addressed in this agreement. It is sobering to consider that Iran's extensive terrorist operations, which reportedly now reach into South America, are about to get a huge infusion of cash.

But lifting the sanctions does far more damage than merely releasing resources to this outlaw regime with which to kill Israelis and Americans, as its leader vowed to do just last week. The sanctions were having a major impact on destabilizing the regime according to all of the Iranian expatriates I have talked with. Relieving those sanctions undermines what had been a rapidly building uprising against the regime from within.

Over the last several years, the Iranian opposition had grown dramatically for two reasons: there was a strong and growing perception among the Iranian people that the Iranian dictatorship was a pariah in the international community, and that the resulting international economic sanctions had created conditions that make the regime's overthrow imperative—that is, until Barack Obama blundered onto the scene.

This agreement cannot be verified. We are now learning that the 24/7 access to inspections promised by the President does not exist. Under this agreement, the regime can stall any inspection for many weeks or even months.

The President's promise that violations will result in a snapback of sanctions is also completely empty. Restoring sanctions would require the assent of China and Russia, something much less likely, given our rapidly deteriorating relations with them.

And even if Iran scrupulously abided by every detail of the agreement, they can continue to run centrifuges for low-level enrichment, continue their research and development of advanced centrifuges, continue their heavy water research, and within 8 years acquire intercontinental ballistic missiles. That means, even under this agreement, within a decade, Iran will have a nuclear breakout capability and the launch vehicles necessary to deliver those weapons anywhere in the world with the solemn vow of its government to wipe Israel and the United States off the map.

Indeed, just last week, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff warned: "Under no circumstances should we relieve pressure on Iran relative to ballistic missile capabilities and arms trafficking." Yet a week later, that is exactly what this agreement does.

The President says there is no alternative. Well, this is utter nonsense. The sanctions were working. The domestic resistance to this Islamic-fascist dictatorship mustered over 100,000 Iranian expatriates at its annual meeting in Paris last month. This movement desperately needs the moral and material support of our Nation to bring down this regime from within. That is precisely what this administration has denied them.

Last month, I fear the Congress became complicit in this agreement by adopting a completely extraconstitutional process for ratification that I believe was a sham. Instead of two-thirds vote of the Senate to approve treaties, it requires an almost impossible two-thirds vote of both Houses to reject it as an agreement. But at this moment in time, nothing is more important to the world than for two-thirds of this Congress to repudiate this dangerous falling.

Despite all of the indignities, retreats, and self-inflicted wounds our country has endured these past 6½ years, the freedom-loving people of the

world still look to us for leadership and support. We are still what Lincoln called the last best hope of mankind. It is imperative that Congress now rise to the occasion.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, President Obama announced that the final framework for a nuclear deal with Iran had been reached.

While I am supportive of a strong deal that would prevent the nuclear armament of Iran and thereby easing tensions with our ally Israel, no deal is better than a bad deal.

One provision of particular concern has been the relief of congressional sanctions that were implemented years ago. By authorizing sanction relief, the Iranian Government will have billions of dollars at their disposal to use for the same secretive activities that we have grown accustomed to seeing them support.

As such, hundreds of Members on both sides of the aisle have expressed their opposition to a deal that does not appropriately address the shortfall of transparency or cooperation that Iran has demonstrated repeatedly. Merely threatening them with snapback sanctions does not go far enough to institute a level of accountability, nor does it prove to be a viable option once sanction relief has been in motion.

Mr. Speaker, as I have stated, I have joined with a significant majority of both Democrats and Republicans communicating expectations to the President on behalf of the American people for any negotiated deal with Iran. I am very concerned these expectations have not been met in this announced proposed deal.

The deal should never provide Iran a pathway to a bomb. This deal does not prevent that but, rather, prolongs the time until Iran develops nuclear weapons.

To achieve security and peace, this agreement must be long-lasting. Any deal that allows Iran to access conventional weapons in 5 years and ballistic missiles in 8 years is anything but long-term, anything but peaceful, anything but appropriate.

Relief of sanctions should be earned by full compliance, access, and transparency regarding the Iranian nuclear program. Sanction relief loaded upfront is unacceptable. This deal fails that requirement. Sanction relief will only provide a financial stimulus to fund the world's number one exporter of terrorism—Iran.

During this 60-day congressional review period, I encourage all of my colleagues and the American people to take a very detailed look at this agreement and determine whether it is a good deal for America.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 14 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DOLD) at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. William Langford, Great Bridge Baptist Church, Chesapeake, Virginia, offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, as we stand here today, we cannot help but first be thankful for Your providential hand that has guided and blessed our country.

Father, I am also very thankful for the Members of this people's House, for their willingness to serve and to represent the citizens who have called upon them. And as they take on the issues of this day, I ask you, Lord, that You would first give them a spirit of humility to recognize our limitations, but to also recognize our need for You.

I pray, Lord, that You would give them a heart to seek Your infinite wisdom, rather than relying on our finite understanding.

I pray, Lord, that You would give them clarity as they discern Your direction, and then I pray that You would give them the courage to follow You and to lead us and protect us in these challenging and increasingly dangerous days.

Father, I pray that You would give us the assurance that whenever we stand resolved to seek Your wisdom to act on Your leadership, that You will indeed bless our tomorrows.

I pray all these things in the name of Jesus, who is eternally faithful and forever trustworthy.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a

quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. KILMER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING REVEREND DR. WILLIAM LANGFORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor today's guest chaplain, Pastor Will Langford. Pastor Langford is the lead pastor of Great Bridge Baptist Church in Chesapeake, Virginia, where I am proud to say I have been a member for over 50 years.

Pastor Langford has served for almost 30 years at churches in Ohio, Kentucky, and Virginia. He received his doctor of ministry and master of divinity at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. He is also an author, speaker, and host of a local Christian teaching radio program, "Real Conviction."

Pastor Langford has dedicated his life to serving his congregation and the community in Chesapeake. I am personally grateful not just for the wisdom he shares from the pulpit, but for his day-to-day example of the impact one can have on his or her community, State, and nation when they personify the teachings of Jesus Christ.

Pastor Langford is joined today by his wife of nearly 30 years, Melissa; and they are the proud parents of two daughters, Brittany Nicole and Bethany Anne.

Please, join me in welcoming Pastor Langford.

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of H.R. 2722, as proposed to be passed under suspension of the rules, be modified by the amendment that I have placed at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, strike line 15 and all that follows through page 8, line 12.

Page 12, strike line 22 and all that follows through page 13, line 6, and insert the following:

(b) DISTRIBUTION.—Subject to section 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code, all surcharges which are received by the Secretary from the sale of coins issued under this Act shall be promptly paid by the Secretary to the Breast Cancer Research Foundation, New York, New York, for the purpose of furthering breast cancer research funded by the Foundation.

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

There was no objection.

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 15, 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 15, 2015 at 9:05 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1300.

That the Senate passed S. 756.

That the Senate passed S. 1482.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the nuclear deal President Obama has reached with Iran is dangerous and delusional. He says it will stop Iran from getting the bomb. Well, I would like him to tell us how it would do so when it puts us at the mercy of Iran.

This deal does not provide for any-time, anywhere inspections. We would have to ask Iran permission, which they could deny.

The idea that Iran will not go nuclear with this deal defies history. Worse yet, it will undoubtedly start a nuclear arms race in the Middle East. I say that as a veteran of two wars.

This deal reflects Obama's disastrously naive foreign policy of appeasing our adversaries and stiffing our friends.

We have a duty to protect American citizens from harm, and that is why I will be voting against this deal.

EXPIRATION OF THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, we are 16 days away from the latest expiration of the highway trust fund. This is nothing new. Over the last 6 years, Congress has passed 33 stop-gap funding bills to extend transportation funding. Today we will vote on the 34th.

Congress has repeatedly failed to provide the long-term investments in transportation that we so badly need. Without serious long-term investments, we simply will not be able to compete in today's global economy. Europe now invests twice as much as we do in transportation. China invests four times as much.

Our crumbling infrastructure, rated a D-minus by the American Society of Engineers, is slowing our economic growth. State and local governments are being forced to cut back on their construction projects. Private sector companies are being forced to stop hiring workers and investing in capital.

It is time to provide American businesses and American workers with transportation funding certainty. It is past time to pass a long-term transportation bill that will grow our economy and create jobs.

TAXPAYERS' DOLLARS

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, the American people have an expectation that the hard-earned money that they pay in taxes will not be wasted or used fraudulently. However, we have seen far too many examples of the Federal Government squandering taxpayer dollars.

Take the IRS, for example. We have learned the earned income tax credit has an error rate of over 27 percent. That means taxpayer money is wasted to the tune of \$15 billion. Compare that to the private sector, where Visa maintains an error rate of 0.06 percent.

In another shocking revelation, it was even discovered that a single mailbox received 24,000 fraudulent tax returns, totaling \$46 million. One mailbox, Mr. Speaker.

In addition to fixing a broken Tax Code by making it simpler and fairer, Washington needs to also be good stewards of taxpayer money, making sure that taxpayer dollars are not wasted, are not misused, and that there is appropriate oversight over the IRS.

ENSURING CAREGIVERS' OPPORTUNITIES

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, older Americans want to spend their golden years living in dignity. For many, that means being able to stay in their own homes.

In concert with the White House Conference on Aging, this week I met with a group of home care workers that turned that wish into a reality. They work tirelessly to cook meals, help with therapies, make sure medication is taken properly, and help people live under their own roof.

The work of caregivers is so valuable, so I want to call on this Congress to actually value them. What does it say when the people who care about our most vulnerable—our parents and our grandparents—are so poorly compensated?

One of the caregivers I met with expressed that her pay was so low she wasn't building up enough in Social Security to retire, herself.

We need to work for better wages and for the notion that, when someone works overtime, they get paid overtime. We need to expand training and apprenticeship opportunities so those working hard in these demanding positions can move up.

Mr. Speaker, I have a grandmother who is now 105 years old. I want the caregivers taking care of her and her generation and future generations to know that we respect what they do, not just with words, but with policies and pay that supports them.

COLLEGE SAVINGS PLANS

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

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss a simple solution to a straightforward problem. A constituent of mine came to me with this issue. He had created college funds for each of his grandchildren in a 529 college savings plan.

Some of his grandchildren decided not to go to college, while others went to college and graduated, but with student debt. While he wanted to use the leftover college savings to pay off those loans, which makes sense because the loans were the same expenses that the 529 plan money is intended for, he was not able to spend that money on the loans without being hit with both the capital gains taxes and an additional 10 percent penalty, the same as if he were using the money for some other purchase.

Today, I am introducing a bill to strike the additional penalty when the 529 college savings plan money is used to pay for student loans that were taken out for qualified educational expenses. In this age of rising college costs, there is no reason to penalize families for paying down student debt.

PROMOTING LITERACY

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as students enjoy summer break, we need to ensure that our kids remain intellectually engaged.

Today we hear so much about our youth being glued to their screens, their tablets, and their gaming apps. It has caused concerns among parents who worry that their kids will remain idle without mental exercise during the summer months.

I know that our kids can be just as enthusiastic about reading as they are about Minecraft.

Last year, I started Robin's Readers, a literacy challenge for students in my district. I was blown away by the response. More than 3,000 kids participated and read over 20,000 books in a 10-week period. This past April, I hosted an awards event for these kids and saw firsthand their passion for reading.

Chicago's mayor, Rahm Emanuel, has also started Rahm's Readers, which will ensure that the love for reading continues to burn strong over the summer months.

I urge my colleagues, especially my Illinois colleagues, to work with me to promote literacy. I call on you to start your own reading programs. Together, we can instill a lifelong love of reading in our children.

□ 1215

ILLEGAL BABY PARTS SALES BY PLANNED PARENTHOOD

(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, yesterday my colleague from Alabama, Congresswoman MARTHA ROBY, spoke eloquently on the floor following the extremely disturbing and unsettling video that surfaced, showing Planned Parenthood's top doctor caught on camera explaining how abortion industry professionals illegally sell the body parts of aborted babies.

I rise today to thank her for her conviction and join her in raising awareness of this horrific development.

Planned Parenthood still is the largest abortion provider in the Nation and still somehow receives Federal dollars.

The video literally states in graphic, horrendous detail the procedure in how she can crush the baby's body without damaging the organs tissue brokers are seeking at the rate of \$30 to \$100 for fetal body parts, allowing this organization to profit off taking the life of an unborn child.

These revelations are not only inhumane and barbaric, they raise many questions of legality and integrity. Federal law explicitly prohibits the harvesting, sale, and use of tissue and body parts of aborted children for payment.

I urge my colleagues not only to watch this video, but to also take a serious look at the practices of this orga-

nization. I will join efforts to demand a congressional investigation into the practices of Planned Parenthood and organizations like that.

GI BILL

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the original GI Bill, the Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944, is one of the most significant laws in our history. It provided education to millions of Americans and created economic opportunity for a generation.

Subsequent GI Bills were signed into law to cover the soldiers of subsequent conflicts, but these benefits came with a catch. They had to be used within 10 or 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, the sacrifice of our soldiers is immeasurable and timeless, and our gratitude should not come with an expiration date. Many returning veterans postpone education to support their families or rehabilitate from war injuries.

A recent VA report found that 21 percent of veterans had not used their educational benefits because their period of eligibility had expired. Moreover, placing limits on educational benefits is out of step with the increasingly competitive global economy. Today many workers will need specific skill training throughout their entire career.

I have introduced the Veterans Education Flexibility Act to remove these outdated deadlines and retroactively restore the benefits to the Americans who earned them. I encourage my colleagues to join on this bill to correct this terrible injustice.

END FEDERAL FUNDING FOR PLANNED PARENTHOOD

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a disturbing video surfaced of Dr. Deborah Nucatola, Planned Parenthood's senior director of medical services, discussing the sale of fetal organs from aborted babies as she casually eats lunch.

The heartless way that Dr. Nucatola describes how Planned Parenthood clinics kill innocent children and then harvest their precious hearts, lungs, and livers to sell is sickening.

In 2014 alone, Planned Parenthood was directly responsible for killing over 350,000 unborn babies in their clinics. It is unconscionable and inexcusable that we are giving the hard-earned money of American taxpayers to an organization that callously kills an innocent, unborn child every 90 seconds.

At its core, Planned Parenthood supports the systematic extermination of the most vulnerable among us. It is past time to end Federal funding of this organization, which views the life of the unborn as a revenue-generator.

IN MEMORY OF PROFESSOR DAVID GROSSMAN

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of a dear friend and mentor who passed away over the weekend.

Professor David Grossman was a talented lawyer, a dedicated teacher, and a passionate advocate. He committed his life to the fair implementation of the law, believing that it applies to all of us and protects each of us.

Throughout his career, he showed how words like "justice" and "fairness" were not just ideas for discussion, but principles that had to be fought for, protected, and defended. He made the law come alive. He gave it a face and a family.

Serving at the helm of the Harvard Legal Aid Bureau for nearly a decade, he trained, supervised, and worked with over 180 law students and served roughly 2,700 low-income individuals and their families.

Through his service, he protected thousands of people in need and inspired hundreds of young lawyers. Our community has lost a champion, but his values and vision live on through all those he touched.

My thoughts and prayers are with Stacy, Lev, and Shayna during this difficult time.

May his memory be a blessing for us all.

HONORING STEPHANIE BURKE

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

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a Granite State teacher who is a leader in our Nation, with her innovative and engaging approach to teaching.

Stephanie Burke, a middle school science teacher at West Running Brook Middle School in Derry, has excelled not just in the classroom, but also in her community. Her work and dedication to educating Granite State youth have earned her the distinct honor of the 2015 Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching. Only 108 teachers nationwide received this honor.

A Granite Stater through and through, Stephanie graduated from the University of New Hampshire and obtained her master's degree from New England College. Throughout her career, she has worked tirelessly to engage and mold the young minds in her classroom.

Oftentimes, our teachers don't get the thanks or credit they deserve. Stephanie Burke represents the best in teaching, and I applaud this incredible and well-deserved accomplishment.

Stephanie, it is because of you that our Nation remains the world leader of innovation, ideas, and excellence.

CENTRAL FIRE COMPANY
CENTENNIAL

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the men and women of the Central Fire Company in Warren, Rhode Island, who are celebrating their 100th anniversary this weekend.

A nonprofit organization, Central Fire Company Number 1 was first registered on July 30, 1915, to provide volunteer firefighting services for the people of the town of Warren.

“The defenders of the North End and protectors of the world,” as they are known, not only serve as critical first responders for the people of Warren, they have also helped to raise thousands of dollars for those less fortunate in their community.

In February 2003, the Central Fire Company provided critical assistance during one of the most destructive fires in our Nation’s history, the Station Night Club fire.

Every day, in cities and towns around our Nation, first responders put their own lives in the line of danger so that they may protect their fellow citizens.

I salute the Central Fire Company on 100 years of service to the people of Warren, Rhode Island.

SECURE THE BORDER NOW

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday at a Judiciary Committee hearing, Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson didn’t know who Kate Steinle was. I hope he sure remembers his own Border Patrol agent Javier Vega, Jr., a father, husband, and south Texan.

Both of these fine Americans were gunned down by illegal aliens who had been deported multiple times, but were back in our country. Mr. Johnson couldn’t tell me what percentage of the border was secure.

Last month I visited the border and talked to some hard-working Border Patrol agents who are very frustrated. They keep apprehending the same people again and again.

They are frustrated with our so-called catch-and-release program, where human smugglers called coyotes and drug smugglers with small loads or less than four or five people are simply let go.

We have got to secure our border to avoid tragedies like Kate Steinle and Javier Vega, Jr. For that matter, we need to secure the borders to keep us safe.

LONG-TERM FUNDING FOR
HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the Republican leadership to bring up a long-term funding transportation bill.

Rather than develop a long-term strategy, Republicans again want to pass a short-term extension for the highway trust fund that fails to make the appropriate infrastructure investments that our economy needs.

Our Nation’s infrastructure is in a bad state, and it is critical that we make the necessary long-term, predictable investments in our country’s roads, transit system, and highways that will create jobs, grow our economy, and offer a certainty for States to invest in larger, much-needed projects.

Mr. Speaker, 42 State chambers of commerce agree that “Our deteriorating national infrastructure is an issue that directly affects our ability to compete in the global marketplace and provide financial security for millions of middle-class American families.”

It is time for the Republican leadership to stop kicking the can down the road with short-term fixes that are costing us more money in the long run, hurting our economy, and costing jobs.

I call on Republican leadership to bring up a long-term funding bill and stop playing games with America’s crumbling infrastructure.

PERSECUTION OF CHRISTIANS

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the glaring issue of the persecution of Christians around the globe.

Our Nation was founded on the principles of religious liberty and tolerance, and the United States continues to promote these ideals. We must remain steadfast in our efforts to help individuals who are persecuted simply due to their faith.

Everyone around the globe, Mr. Speaker, should be free to live a life of faith, to worship as they choose, without fear of persecution from a ruthless regime.

This basic freedom, which was enshrined by our Founding Fathers, must not only be promoted here, but also around the world.

As a shining city upon a hill with the eyes of the world upon us, it is our Nation’s duty to be a leader in the fight against the persecution of Christians.

As ISIS continues to attack Christians in the Middle East, we must continue to show that our Nation will stand up and defend those who cannot defend themselves.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

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

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, less than 2 months ago House Republicans

refused to take the opportunity to extend the highway trust fund and, instead, decided to be reckless and kick the can down the road. Well, to no one’s surprise, today we are back at it, faced with the same predicament.

How long will Republican leadership continuously refuse to govern? They have played the same political games with the funding of the Department of Homeland Security, which keeps our Nation safe from national security threats, and allowed the Export-Import Bank to expire, punishing American businessowners across the Nation. And now they want to gamble with the safety of millions of Americans who rely on our transportation and infrastructure, which is crumbling beneath us.

Enough is enough. We need a comprehensive and long-term surface transportation plan, not a short-term fix. The highway trust fund supports critical projects, which include improving the I-10 freeway in the Inland Empire, as well as countless other projects within the country.

It is time that we start governing and bring a long-term extension measured in years, not months. We don’t need another short-term patch. It is time for real solutions.

IRAN DEAL

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I have deep concerns about the direction the Obama administration has taken in reaching this agreement with Iran.

While I support all diplomatic efforts to promote peace and cooperation, there is little reason to believe this deal will halt Iran’s nuclear program or that the Iranian regime is truly committed to rejoining the international community.

Even during negotiations, Iranian leaders have spewed hateful language toward the United States, Israel, and the Jewish people and have unapologetically continued their state sponsorship of terrorism.

Next week the bipartisan Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing that I am proud to chair will take a closer look at Iran’s role in financing terrorist groups around the world, information that I feel is vital to the administration, to Congress, and the American people when reviewing any nuclear agreement with Iran that includes sanctions relief.

In the end, this announced deal is under congressional authority to review, and I will only support it if it meets the simple benchmark of forever preventing a nuclear Iran.

TITLE VIII NURSING WORKFORCE
REAUTHORIZATION ACT

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2713, the title VIII Nursing Workforce Reauthorization Act, a bipartisan bill that I authored with my Nursing Caucus co-chair DAVID JOYCE.

When President Johnson first signed these programs into law, he observed that the Nurse Training Act of 1964 was the most important nursing legislation in our Nation's history. And, indeed, it has been.

Over the past 50 years, title VIII programs have bolstered nursing education at all levels, from entry-level preparation through graduate study, not only supplying our Nation with needed healthcare providers, but also strengthening the nursing education pipeline to train the nurses of tomorrow.

These programs are targeted to address specific needs within the nursing population, nursing workforce, and America's patient population. Simply put, title VIII nursing workforce programs are a direct investment in our Nation's health.

The Nursing Workforce Reauthorization Act of 2015 is a bipartisan effort to simply ensure that these critical programs are available for years to come. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to cosponsor H.R. 2713.

□ 1230

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about a matter that is critical to the future security of not only the United States, but to our allies and international security.

Yesterday, the President announced a nuclear agreement had been reached between Iran and six other nations led by the United States. Throughout these negotiations, I have been skeptical of the concessions made by this administration to Iran, despite its history of dangerous and defiant behavior.

Iran is the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism and has consistently shown a pattern of noncompliance. I have serious concerns this deal will fail to prevent a nuclear Iran while rewarding the Iranian Government's past actions with billions of dollars in sanctions relief.

Mr. Speaker, as Congress continues to evaluate the deal, I believe we must reject any agreement that further bolsters the Iranian regime; endangers our allies, especially Israel; and fuels instability in the region.

Far too much is at stake to accept a bad deal that puts the security of our Nation and our fight to combat violent extremism at greater risk.

Mr. Speaker, how can you have a deal with someone you can't trust?

THE PARTNERSHIP TO BUILD AMERICA ACT

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

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, today, we are going to be asked to vote on another short-term funding patch for the highway trust fund. We have done this over 30 times, but what we need is a bipartisan plan and a long-term transportation goal that is fiscally responsible. It is what we have always done throughout our history.

Think about it. President Lincoln built the transcontinental railroad, put thousands of people to work, and helped lead an economic boom. President Eisenhower invested in the interstate highway bill, which built our interstate commerce system and transport system and put thousands of people to work and led to an economic boom.

Mr. Speaker, let's think big. That is what we do as Americans. Let's invest in ourselves. Let's come up with a long-term highway trust fund bill that invests in our infrastructure; puts thousands of Americans to work; and lets us lead an economic recovery not just in the United States, but in the world.

That is what we do as Americans; we think big. Mr. Speaker, let's get this done.

THE IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT JEOPARDIZES NATIONAL SECURITY

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

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in response to the Obama administration's announcement of reaching an agreement with the Islamic Republic of Iran, a state sponsor of terrorism, regarding its nuclear program.

This agreement jeopardizes our national security and that of our allies by giving Iran the ability to continue its march towards nuclear capability. Where are the restrictions that the American people and her allies were promised? Where are the "anytime, anywhere" inspections? Where is the dismantling of Iran's nuclear infrastructure? I do not see these restrictions, Mr. Speaker.

Additionally, this deal will hand Iran billions in sanctions relief for it to continue funding terrorism and promoting instability in the region.

This agreement jeopardizes our closest ally, Israel, and relies on the hope that Iran, which has proven to shirk agreements in the past, complies with the terms. In short, this agreement does not stop Iran from being on the doorstep of nuclear capability. We cannot allow that to happen.

Mr. Speaker, any deal that ends in a nuclear Iran is a bad deal and should be rejected.

WEAR RED WEDNESDAY

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today, we wear red to bring back our girls.

This week, Boko Haram said it will free the Chibok girls in exchange for the extremist group's leaders. We who have raised our voices to shout "bring back our girls" knew that this would come.

Mr. Speaker, Boko Haram could not risk killing the Chibok girls, but to hold 219 girls hostage for more than a year and then parade them out only as bargaining chips shows how little Boko Haram values these precious girls.

If I can speak to the girls, I would tell them: We value you. Your friends and family who pray for you daily value you. Your new President who has taken steps to defeat Boko Haram values you. Your friends in Congress who wear red on Wednesdays to bring attention to your values and to your cause value you.

Mr. Speaker, we will continue to tweet, tweet, tweet #bringbackourgirls; tweet, tweet, tweet #joinrepwilson—until we bring back our girls.

DRUG TESTING FOR WELFARE RECIPIENTS ACT

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

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, if you work, you should be better off than if you don't work. That is why, earlier this week, I introduced the Drug Testing for Welfare Recipients Act. This bill is designed to improve welfare programs by requiring recipients who have a known history of drug use to pass a drug test for eligibility.

I am a firm believer that we have a moral obligation to help those in need who cannot help themselves; yet it is critically important to get the incentives right so that these programs are not abused.

Mr. Speaker, most employers require workers to pass a drug test as a condition for employment. The government should expect the same of people who receive welfare benefits. If recipients can't meet the basic standards of employment, in essence, they are trapped in a cycle of welfare dependency.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill is one step in the right direction to improve our welfare programs, and I encourage my colleagues to support this common-sense bill.

THE CARLTON COMPLEX WILDFIRE

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, roughly 1 year ago today, the Carlton

Complex wildfire broke out in Okanogan County in my district. This fire was the most destructive in Washington State's history, burning over 250,000 acres, destroying hundreds of homes and businesses, and devastating the environment.

Communities in the Methow Valley continue to deal with the fire's long-term consequences and are still working to rebuild and recover. One year later, we recognize the heroic efforts of thousands of first responders, firefighters, and volunteers who worked around the clock at great personal risk to fight the blaze.

Mr. Speaker, I saw firsthand how the community pulled together to help one another. Volunteers provided shelter to survivors, cooked meals, and unloaded trucks of relief supplies. The outpouring of support from volunteers from all over the State is a testament to the spirit and determination of Washingtonians.

We must remember the losses caused by this catastrophic wildfire, and Congress must continue to push to improve forest health to ensure that this does not happen again.

FETAL ORGAN HARVESTING AND TRAFFICKING

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today saddened and horrified at recent media reports that Planned Parenthood, as an abortion provider, is harvesting or attempting to harvest and sell baby organs preserved in partial-birth abortion.

It shocks and sickens the conscience of our Nation and each of us as human beings that these providers would use these innocent children, ripped from their mother's womb and their skulls crushed, to sell their organs for profit—organs that they have never even had a chance to use. It is a sad day.

Mr. Speaker, we are becoming a more compassionate pro-life Nation each and every day, and all of us must speak out against these barbaric practices. We must ensure that these providers are prosecuted under the law, and we should pass whatever legislation necessary to ensure that we appropriately punish these heartless acts.

We should also ensure that not one penny of American tax dollars goes to Planned Parenthood or any organization that performs or profits off of abortion. No organization which enriches itself commodifying unborn human life is worthy of hard-earned taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Speaker, let us come together as Representatives of the American people and declare with one voice that we will not tolerate or condone something so despicable.

GREECE

(Mr. STUTZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, in light of the third Greek bailout announced this week, I rise with great concern over our own Nation's finances.

Mr. Speaker, last month, the Congressional Budget Office released their "2015 Long-Term Budget Outlook." This report paints a troubling picture; with interest rates expected to rise, an aging population, increasing healthcare costs per person, and more and more recipients of government payments and subsidies, our Nation's debt held by the public is expected to rise to 100 percent of our economy in just 25 years. Only one other time in our history, the end of World War II, has it ever been higher.

Mr. Speaker, doing nothing about this coming crisis is not an option. We can avoid the very predictable fiscal mistakes that have caused so much turmoil in Europe. We need policies that spur economic growth. Just yesterday, the White House revised down their GDP growth estimates for this year from 3 percent down to 2 percent.

Mr. Speaker, let's rein in our government's out-of-control spending and balance our budget, which will get our economy moving again.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2722

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as the cosponsor of H.R. 2722, the Breast Cancer Awareness Commemorative Coin Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2898, WESTERN WATER AND AMERICAN FOOD SECURITY ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3038, HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING ACT OF 2015, PART II

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 362 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 362

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2898) to provide drought relief in the State of California, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee

on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-23. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3038) 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. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

□ 1245

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, H. Res. 362, providing for consideration of two very important pieces of legislation: H.R. 2898, which is the Western Water and American Food Act of 2015, and H.R. 3038, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015, Part II.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2898 under a structured rule, with eight amendments made in order that are evenly split between Democratic and Republican Members of this body. The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 3038 under a closed rule.

Mr. Speaker, this rule will allow us to consider the Western Water and American Food Act, which is an important bill that will help us respond to the severe water shortages facing California, which I am sure many of you have heard, and much of the Western United States. Many people are confronting the worst drought that they have seen in many, many years, and a growing number of communities across the West have been acutely impacted by these arid conditions.

While this crisis has been caused by the drought, our environmental laws, as well as misguided and outdated regulatory restrictions, have exacerbated the situation. This bill addresses these policy failures and seeks to alleviate the impacts of drought in the short and in the long term.

My own district in central Washington is dealing with serious water supply shortages. Actually, the whole State is declared a drought area. These are impacting the agriculture, energy, and manufacturing sectors, as well as families and small businesses that rely on an adequate and stable supply of water. These conditions are also increasing the threat of dangerous wildfires and increasing the likelihood of catastrophic wildfire, which could destroy homes, businesses, and large amounts of land, as well as crippling many communities throughout the West.

Over the past 2 weeks in my State of Washington, we have already seen wildfire outbreaks across the State in cities like Wenatchee and Quincy and counties such as Benton, Grant, Adams, and Douglas. Sadly, with an extremely low snowpack and continuing drought conditions, we are likely to see even more fires.

Mr. Speaker, as a third-generation farmer, I know firsthand the challenges facing many in our Western agricultural communities and the critically important role that water plays in agriculture's success. In recognition of this fact, earlier this year, I introduced H.R. 2097, the Bureau of Reclamation Surface Water Storage Streamlining Act. This measure will speed up Reclamation's feasibility study process on surface water storage, spurring the development of new projects across the West, and I was very proud to have it included in this essential legislation that we are considering today.

Water is not just a resource, it is the lifeblood of farming and ranching communities all across the West, and we must act swiftly and decisively to mitigate the impacts of this crisis that we are facing. The importance of water to agriculture production cannot be overstated, and we must take steps to support this vital industry that is responsible for feeding billions of people around the globe. In fact, today, I am proud to say, the average American farmer is responsible for feeding upwards of 144 people, a drastic increase from just 50 years ago when that number was around 25.

The reason for this change is simple and complex. Our modern farmers are growing more disease- and pest-resistant crops that require less water, less pesticides, and better conserve our natural resources. Although modern agriculture allows us to use less water for agriculture to flourish, we still must have a reliable supply of water.

Mr. Speaker, the Western Water and American Food Act represents a comprehensive and bipartisan approach aimed at alleviating the drought's impacts through short-term and long-term measures. This bill will address the root causes of the crisis: complex and inconsistent laws, faulty court decisions, and onerous regulations at the State and Federal level that have exacerbated an already devastating drought.

In California and across the West, millions are facing water shortages and rationing, yet many of the drought's damaging effects are preventable. H.R. 2898 aims to fix our broken regulatory system and bring our water infrastructure into the 21st century. This bill gives immediate relief to millions of Americans facing mandatory water rationing and invests in new water storage facilities to prepare for future droughts. Additionally, it will provide farmers with the certainty they need to produce the majority of our Nation's fruits and vegetables, which feed our Nation, as well as people around the world.

This rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 3038, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015, Part II, a bill that will extend Federal surface transportation programs, as well as the hazardous materials transportation program and the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act, until December 18, 2015, and fund these programs at the fiscal year 2014 authorized level. This extension will provide the committee of jurisdiction with additional time to continue their important work towards a long-term highway and surface transportation bill. Mr. Speaker, this extension will provide the House and Senate with time to work out a long-term surface transportation reauthorization bill in a bicameral, bipartisan manner.

Every State transportation department in the country currently has numerous multiyear transportation projects that would benefit greatly

from the increased certainty a 6-year transportation bill would provide. My hope, and I think the hope of everyone in this Chamber, is that this short-term extension gives us time to reach an agreement that can provide certainty for all of our constituents.

Additionally, this legislation will also allow us to work on a resolution for the highway trust fund, which is facing a \$90 billion shortfall. Failing to address the trust fund would have disastrous impacts across our country. If the trust fund were to go insolvent, many State transportation and infrastructure projects would grind to a halt, leading to furloughed workers and lost capital from investments on existing projects. The cost of shutting down and then restarting all of these projects would be astronomical and would end up costing our taxpayers much more in the long run.

Mr. Speaker, another short-term extension is not what any of us would have wanted. Our States need certainty, and that will only come from a long-term transportation authorization. While the bill before us may not be what we all would have preferred, it is a good stepping stone to something greater. I believe passing H.R. 3038 is the right thing to do and will allow us to consider a long-term, 6-year authorization in the very near future.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good, straightforward rule, allowing for consideration of two critically important pieces of legislation. H.R. 2898 will help drought-stricken communities in the West by providing critically needed reforms to the broken regulatory system, as well as bipartisan solutions to help provide relief to families, farms, the environment, and the American economy. H.R. 3038 will ensure that many important transportation programs do not lapse and will extend the highway trust fund expenditure authority, guaranteeing that this vital fund will remain solvent and available for infrastructure projects across the country while working towards a lasting solution.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I support the rule's adoption, and I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying bills.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman, my friend, Mr. NEWHOUSE, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, we already know what H.R. 2898 and H.R. 3038 are called, but they are follow-up legislation to the short-term temporary transportation funding bill that was signed into law last May. I am troubled by a number of issues concerning the rule and underlying bills that we are considering today.

First, as I have stated on numerous occasions, I take serious issue with the manner in which the majority has chosen to consider legislation in this

Chamber. Grouping or combining multiple, unrelated pieces of legislation into one rule has become the new normal, precluding the Members of this body from making informed judgments about the proper floor procedure for each measure and creating often confusing debates about an assortment of unconnected issues. The majority's insistence on the continued use of grab-bag rules prevents the thoughtful deliberation that important legislation requires and does both the Members of this Chamber and the American people an immeasurable disservice.

Next, there are now only 9 legislative days remaining before Congress recesses in August, and much important work remains. For example, millions of Americans continue to suffer dire economic ramifications from the GOP's failure to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, the charter for which expired June 30.

The Ex-Im Bank supported 164,000 private sector American jobs in fiscal year 2014, alone, and over 1.3 million jobs since 2009. What is more, the Ex-Im Bank has received the support of the last 13 Presidents, Republicans and Democrats, including Ronald Reagan, George H. W. Bush, George W. Bush, and Bill Clinton. It is high time Republicans allow a vote on its reauthorization.

In the face of realities such as these, Republicans in Congress continue to put forward legislation for consideration that has very little bipartisan support and stands even less chance of becoming law. Indeed, President Obama has issued a Statement of Administration Policy advising that, if he is presented with H.R. 2898, the Water bill we are considering today, he will veto it.

Mr. Speaker, I include that Statement for the RECORD.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
H.R. 2898—WESTERN WATER AND AMERICAN FOOD SECURITY ACT OF 2015

(Rep. Valadao, R-CA, July 14, 2015)

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 2898, the Western Water and American Food Security Act of 2015, because it fails to address critical elements of California's complex water challenges and will, if enacted, impede an effective and timely response to the continuing drought while providing no additional water to hard hit communities. Like similar legislation in the last Congress, H.R. 2898 was developed with little input from the public, the Administration, or key stakeholders affected by the drought. The urgency and seriousness of the California drought requires a balanced and flexible approach that promotes water reliability and ecosystem restoration.

Specifically, H.R. 2898 dictates operational decisions and imposes a new legal standard which could actually limit water supplies by creating new and confusing conflicts with existing laws, adding an unnecessary layer of complexity to Federal and State cooperation. This additional standard could slow decision-making, generate significant litigation, and limit real-time operational flexibility critical to maximizing water delivery. And, contrary to current and past Federal reclamation law that defers to State water law, the bill would preempt California water law.

In addition, H.R. 2898 directs specific operations inconsistent with the Endangered Species Act (ESA), thereby resulting in conditions that could be detrimental to the Delta fish and other species listed under Federal and State endangered species laws.

The Administration strongly supports efforts to help alleviate the effects of drought in the West; however, the Administration is concerned with section 401, which establishes deadlines for completing feasibility studies for certain water storage projects. The provision is unnecessary and the dates provided in the bill could prevent the participation of non-Federal partners in certain studies and may inhibit the Administration's ability to consider a full range of options for addressing these issues. In addition, financial penalties levied upon the Bureau of Reclamation under section 403 for not meeting these deadlines would only undermine the Department of the Interior's ability to help address the effects of drought in the West.

Much of the bill contains provisions that have little connection to the ongoing drought. The bill includes language constraining the Administration's ability to protect the commercial and tribal fishery on the Trinity and Klamath Rivers, which will have impacts not just in California, but throughout the west coast. The bill would also repeal the San Joaquin River Settlement Agreement, which the Congress enacted to resolve 18 years of contentious litigation. Full repeal of the settlement agreement would likely result in the resumption of costly litigation, creating an uncertain future for river restoration and water delivery operations for water users on the San Joaquin River.

Californians are facing significant drought-related challenges. This is why the Administration has directed Federal agencies to work with state and local officials in real-time to maximize limited water supplies, prioritize public health and safety, meet state water quality requirements, and ensure a balanced approach to providing for the water needs of people, agriculture, businesses, power, imperiled species and the environment. Consistent with the 2015 Inter-agency Drought Strategy, the Administration and Federal agencies have partnered with state agencies in California to improve coordination of water operations in the state. In June, the Administration announced new actions and investments of more than \$110 million to support workers, farmers, and rural communities suffering from drought and to combat wildfires. This builds on the more than \$190 million that agencies across the Federal government have invested to support drought-stricken communities so far this year. Unfortunately, H.R. 2898 would undermine these efforts and the progress that has been made.

For these reasons, if the President were presented with H.R. 2898, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, even more offensive, in a display of colossal incompetence, last week, the Republican leadership was forced to pull their entire Interior Appropriations bill to protect their Conference from having to defend the display of the Confederate battle flag on Federal lands, imagery long recognized as a symbol of hatred and intolerance. As a result, funding for critically important agencies such as the Environmental Protection Agency, whose programs protect wildlife, the environment, and public health, continues to hang in the balance.

This rule first provides for consideration of H.R. 2898, the Western Water and American Food Security Act of 2015, which Republicans claim will alleviate the drought crisis currently unfolding in California and other Western States, but this bill is just another example of the countless partisan attempts made by the majority to roll back important environmental protections while also preempting State laws. Let me put a footnote right there, "preempting State laws." These are the people that argue State rights and now would preempt them in Western portions of our great country, particularly California, reducing water management flexibility.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, this bill undercuts the Endangered Species Act by changing the well-defined standard used to determine when an action negatively affects an endangered species and introduces an untested, undefined standard.

As evidenced by this piece of legislation, the Republicans' solution to the drought crisis is to provide handouts to big agricultural interests at the expense of the environment and everyone else.

I want to make it very clear that I represent agricultural interests as do my colleagues who are Republicans. We represent all of the specialty crops and sugarcane grown, and we understand these dynamics very well.

Not only will this bill scale back desperately needed environmental protections, it will affect thousands of fishing jobs in California and Oregon that local residents depend on.

Given the changing standard of the Endangered Species Act, this bill will dramatically weaken protections for salmon and other fish and wildlife in California's Bay-Delta Estuary.

This bill claims to help California, but even California doesn't want it. California's own Secretary of Natural Resources has said that this bill—and let me quote him—will "reignite water wars, move water policy back into the courts, and try to pit one part of the State against another."

This bill will elevate the water rights for certain agricultural contractors over the existing water rights that benefit refuges and wildlife areas.

In short, this bill circumvents California's groundbreaking equitable water conservation programs and puts the desires of big agriculture over everyone else.

This combined rule also provides for the consideration of H.R. 3038, termed the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015, Part II, because it is yet another short-term, temporary patch to ensure that the highway trust fund does not become insolvent.

It is a patch. It is the ninth time we are patching. If you had a tire and were riding down a highway and if every time you looked up you had to have another patch, pretty soon you would recognize that you would need new tires.

What we need in this country is a 6-year highway bill.

Back in May, Congress passed and the President signed a bill we can now appropriately call the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015, Part I.

At that time, we were assured by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle that a multiyear bill that would provide the long-term funding certainty and stability needed to keep transportation and construction projects operating was on the horizon. That was in May.

We were promised, Mr. Speaker, that if we voted to provide funding through July 31, the comprehensive, multiyear highway bill America so desperately needs would become a reality in time to avoid any insolvency.

Unfortunately, today we find ourselves in the same situation as we did in May. I just heard my good friend from Washington make the argument that, in the next 6 months, we will be able to work together to do the things necessary for a 6-year highway bill. I am paraphrasing what he said.

As we had in May, today we have a rapidly approaching, self-imposed deadline and are frantically seeking an interim fix. Like its predecessor, this highway bill does nothing to address the long-term solvency of the highway trust fund.

There is one thing I have learned here about kicking the can down the road: If kicking the can down the road were an Olympic sport, here in the United States Congress, we would win gold, we would win bronze, we would win silver, and we would win aluminum for kicking the can down the road.

Instead, we are again being asked to vote for legislation that would keep the highway trust fund solvent through December 18.

Note the date of December 18, just before Christmas, so that we can play the game: "If you don't vote for this next patch—if we don't do 6 years—then we will keep you here until Christmas without the necessary assurances that a long-term bill will become a reality."

This is no way to govern. Our insistence on kicking the can down the road does nothing to protect American jobs or to invest in critical infrastructure that every man and woman in this House of Representatives recognizes is desperately needed in this Nation of falling bridges and pock-marked roads.

Finally, investing in our Nation's infrastructure and, indeed, in our Nation's future will require us to make tough choices.

Instead of considering raising the Federal gas tax—I said the ugly words, "Federal gas tax"—which is the primary source of funding for the highway trust fund—and it has not been increased since 1993, people—this bill seeks to cut taxes on liquefied natural gas and liquefied petroleum gas at a cost of \$90 million over the next decade.

Any comprehensive highway bill must consider, in part, addressing the Federal gas tax. Why don't we just face up to that, go to our constituents and explain it to them so they will understand that this is a desperate need for this entire Nation.

Our failure to come together to pass a multiyear transportation bill year after year has resulted in 65 percent of our Nation's roads being rated "deficient." All you have to do is drive around Washington to recognize that.

It has left 25 percent of our Nation's bridges in disrepair, and it has left 45 percent of Americans without access to transit.

This failure has far-reaching and devastating implications and must be addressed with thoughtful and meaningful bipartisan legislation that will provide the certainty and consistency required to fuel jobs and keep the highways and other transportation infrastructure safe.

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

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

I share the gentleman from Florida's enthusiasm for the important work that is in front of this Congress. These combined rules offer us the opportunity to bring forward important legislation at a critical time in as efficient a way as possible.

I am excited, as a freshman Congressman, to be able to be a part of this institution, certainly, but to be able to do this hard work that we have in front of us. We have a lot to do, and doing it in this way allows us to get these important things done very quickly.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO), a young man who shares a very interesting perspective because he is living the drought conditions that we just read about in the State of California. He is the author of this important bill we have before us, and he is a resident of Hanford, California.

Mr. VALADAO. I thank the gentleman from Washington for his help with this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, a little bit on the history of the Valley and the area that I represent. It is an area filled with immigrants.

When you look at my district and when you look at the people I represent, 80 percent of them are minorities. One of the reasons I feel that I had the opportunity to be elected and the honor of being able to represent that district is due to my own background.

My dad came to this country in 1969 as a new immigrant. He didn't speak English as well as he should have, and still, to this day, he speaks with a very strong accent, as does my mom.

When my dad started working in plants and trying to save money so that he could start his own farm someday and give us the opportunity to have the American Dream, he learned to speak Spanish while working alongside a lot of Hispanic folks.

While working really hard and saving his money, he had the opportunity to save enough money to actually buy some cattle and work his way up to the point at which he actually owned some land.

When we look at an opportunity for the American Dream, when we listen to people talk about the opportunity to be successful and protect the small business guy, I am that guy.

I am the guy who had that opportunity because of my parents, because of their hard work. I have been in that struggle. I don't just represent them in Congress, I am that face. I am that person who had that opportunity because of that hard work.

When we see the struggle and when someone claims to tell me or to tell us on our side what those struggles are really like and how this piece of legislation has an impact only for the largest of the large, when you raise the cost of water because you restrict the amount of water that we have delivered to the Valley, it hurts the smallest guy the most.

Those people I represent, that 80 percent minority district, are seeing unemployment numbers as high as 50 percent because those farmers are not getting that water. Those food lines are starting to grow, lines that I stood in, where I helped serve food. It is food that was grown in other countries because we can no longer grow it in the Valley.

These are all people that my friends across the aisle claim to represent, but they don't, because they don't have that background and they didn't have that opportunity to be there to work with them and to grow up in that life where they had to work before and after school like I did—drive a tractor, feed calves, and do all that different type of stuff—because that is what the American Dream is all about: working, saving your money, and having that opportunity.

It is also about having government at their backs. But, right now government is making it more and more difficult for that little guy. Water has gotten so expensive because you have the large cities coming in and spending a bunch of money so that water is going right through the Valley to the southern portion.

All we are asking for in this piece of legislation is for some common sense, common sense that says: "Let's look at what science we are using." If we are going to protect a species, show me the evidence that meets and actually delivers the protection of species.

We have lived through two decades of this, and now we are seeing that the endangered species they claim to want to protect is on the verge of annihilation, almost gone, extinct, after delivering almost no water.

We have gotten an allocation over these past few years of zero percent. We are not asking for a lot of water. We are not asking to be taught how to conserve water. We have done that. We have reached that point.

We are at zero. We have got zero water, and we have got high unemployment numbers. We have got people standing in line, asking for food and begging for help, when all they want to do is work an honest living and provide for their families and for their neighbors.

We have seen too much suffering. It is getting old. We need to pass legislation. We need people who are sincere in this conversation to show up and show some courage and vote for this legislation.

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

When the gentleman speaks of growing up in that area, my father grew up in Griffin, Georgia, on a farm. My first job was on a farm. I picked beans, I stripped celery, and I cut chicory. So I don't need lectures about not understanding farming. I picked beans in Pahokee, Florida, which I am proud to represent now as their Congressperson.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), my good friend.

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, America needs a long-term, sustainably funded surface transportation bill. You know it. I know it. The Governors in all of our States know it. We need it to repair our roads and bridges and to fix our crumbling infrastructure.

Every single one of the 435 Members in this body has needs in his district. Speaker BOEHNER has 136 deficient bridges in his district. Leader PELOSI has 29. In my State of Vermont, we have 252 structurally deficient bridges. A photo of one of them is right here. It is disgraceful and it is unnecessary.

Yet, instead of facing up to this problem that we all share and doing something that a proud and confident country would do—invest in its future—with reckless irresponsibility, we are acting, once again, to dodge our duty with yet another short-term extension of our highway bill.

This time, the plan is a bold extension for 5 months, through December 18. Can our transportation agencies really plan a bridge replacement or a major repair in the next 5 months?

By the way, how is it paid for? It is not by asking users to pay, which has traditionally been the way we have funded our roads and bridges, but by, in this case, among other dubious devices.

We are asking airline passengers 10 years from now to pay a few billion dollars to fix our highways tomorrow. Think about it. Airline passengers in 10 years—2025—will pay for road repairs we make tomorrow.

By the way, this resort to gimmicks is not new. It has become a habit. This is the 35th short-term extension in the past 6 years. The last one in July of 2014 was paid for by the gimmick of all gimmicks, pension smoothing. We created a pothole in somebody's pension in the future to fix a pothole in his highway today.

Mr. Speaker, we need a long-term plan. We need it first to restore some

semblance of duty and responsibility to this House of Representatives that has failed to do its job.

□ 1315

We need to have those 600,000 good-paying jobs start digging dirt and fixing those roads and bridges, and we need it to make America more competitive.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. I urge you to join me in voting “no” to this joke of a short-term plan. No more Band-Aids, no more patches, no more smoke and mirrors, no more gimmicks.

American contractors and workers are ready to do their job. It is time for Congress to do its job and pass a long-term highway transportation bill.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I was just handed a Statement of Administration Policy from the Executive Office of the President, a statement of his policy position on H.R. 3038. It says:

The administration supports passage of H.R. 3038 to give the House and Senate the necessary time to work on a long-term bill this year that increases investment to meet the needs of the Nation's infrastructure.

I just wanted to add that to the RECORD.

At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HARDY), a fellow freshman, a gentleman from the scenic Virgin Valley of Nevada.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding me time to speak on the rule of this vital piece of legislation, H.R. 2898, the Western Water and American Food Security Act.

Coming from Nevada, the Nation's most arid State, we continue to battle a drought in all 17 counties. At no time in recent memory has the significance and proactivity of managing our water resources across the West been more important.

I can sympathize with my colleagues from across the neighboring State of California, who are also facing the fourth consecutive year of drought. We obviously cannot afford to keep this status quo.

As the only Member of Nevada's House delegation on the Committee on Natural Resources, I take a great deal of pride in speaking up for my constituents and the people of my State on important issues facing our communities. Those communities are affected by the droughts currently affecting California's Central Valley, the source of so much of our Nation's food.

For those in my district and around the country who are still battling to get this economic recovery, they can ill afford to pay more of their hard-earned income at the supermarket to feed their families.

As the son of farmer-ranchers from southeastern Nevada, I feel for the hard-working farmers whose suffering is being made worse by burdensome environmental laws and the failure of our elected leaders to provide adequate water infrastructure to meet the ever-

growing demands of the 21st century. Though long overdue, we have a real opportunity to provide some common-sense solutions to this very dire situation.

Again, I would like to thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding me some time. I strongly urge a “yes” vote on the rule and a “yes” on the underlying bill.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, would you be kind enough to advise how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 13 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN), my good friend.

Ms. HAHN. I thank my colleague from Florida for allowing me these few minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to explain why I am voting against this rule today. As has been said, California is now in the fourth year of a record drought. In response, our State and local governments have implemented mandatory conservation measures, but we also need to think about how we will increase our water supply.

The bill that the House will consider today does not do that. It just moves water from one need to another. That is why I attempted to offer an amendment to address present and current water needs. However, my amendment was not made in order by the Committee on Rules.

My father, who was Los Angeles County Supervisor Kenny Hahn, had an idea in the 1970s to build a water pipeline from Alaska to California. The idea was never completely investigated but continues to have merit; therefore, I believe that the Department of the Interior should study the feasibility of a water pipeline network, linking our Nation's Federal reservoirs to transport water from wet regions to the dry regions in this country. That is what I thought my amendment would accomplish.

My proposal, I thought, was a first step in building pipelines from regions that have more than enough water to regions that do not. If we can transport oil via pipeline, we should be able to do the same thing with water. I am disappointed that the Committee on Rules did not find this amendment in order. It was a study to determine if this idea is feasible.

I believe a water pipeline and other creative ideas to increase our water supply should be studied. I would think Mr. VALADAO, my fellow Californian, would support an idea like this that we could consider.

To ensure that California and other States have enough water for our residents and other needs, even during periods of drought now and in the future, I think Congress should encourage and support efforts leading to these kinds of creative solutions.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES), a young man from the San Joaquin Valley to add to the California voice.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the fine gentleman from Washington from the Committee on Rules and, of course, Chairman SESSIONS for, again, bringing a water bill to the floor of the House.

Five years ago, we passed a water bill very similar to this. It was in a year where we had abundant rainfall. Unfortunately, that rain was not captured. The water flowed right out to the ocean and was wasted. We have continued to dump water out to the ocean over the last 4 years. Even today, we are continuing to dump water out to the ocean.

When I hear my colleagues talk about drought, yes, we are in the third year of a drought, a very bad drought; but, in fact, the founding fathers of our State built the water systems to withstand 5 years of drought.

Back from 1987 to 1992—it is a drought that I still remember and many of my constituents remember—we really didn't have harsh problems until that fifth year of the drought. Since that time, places down in Los Angeles have built big water storage projects—in our area, no new water storage projects, only taking water away.

You go to 1992; they pass the Central Valley Project Improvement Act that took a million acre feet away and dumped it out to the ocean. In 2009, the San Joaquin River Act took another 250,000 acre feet and wasted it. In addition to that, you have had lawsuits brought forth by the Endangered Species Act by radical environmental groups that have taken the rest of the water away.

The reason we don't have any water is not because of drought; it is because we didn't hold the water when we had a chance to hold the water and keep the water and use it and spread it throughout the State of California.

In fact, it is unfortunate to say because I don't wish ill on the people in San Francisco or the Silicon Valley, but they get their water from our area that they actually pipe over, instead of contributing to the environment.

Now, I don't want the people of San Francisco to lose their water, but at the same time, the people of San Francisco shouldn't be willing to forfeit and give up our water that we rightfully own while they are taking some of ours and not contributing to the fish populations that, no matter how much water we put down, down the river and out to the ocean, the fish continue to die.

At some point, you would think that people would step back and say: Well, if flushing water out to the ocean doesn't work and hasn't helped the fish populations, then we should stop doing that.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentle-

woman from California (Ms. MATSUI) to add further perspective from California.

Ms. MATSUI. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2898. California is in the fourth year of a devastating drought, and what is on the House floor today does nothing to address the crisis, but, rather, it sets California back by fanning the flames of century-old water wars.

The story of California and the West's drought is known across the country because it is unprecedented. Not only has our annual rainfall plummeted, but for the first time in our history, California has no snowpack—none. The snow in the Sierras once sustained us through the dry summers and replenished our streams with cold water, but not this year.

Folsom Reservoir, just upstream from the city of Sacramento, is projected to be at the lowest it has been by the end of September, less than 15 percent of capacity. This is not due to government mismanagement or environmental restrictions; it is due to the lack of rain.

We need real solutions to this crisis, short- and long-term solutions. There are no silver bullet solutions. It is an all-of-the-above approach, and it should certainly not be the fear-mongering legislation like H.R. 2898.

For the short term, our State has used the flexibility it already has to move the water and make timely deliveries to make the best of this very, very bad situation. We also need to continue our conservation efforts and fix our infrastructure where there are leaks and wastes, but that is just for the short term.

In the long term, we need to be investing in wastewater recycling, above- and below-ground water storage, and new technologies to help us monitor our water use on demand.

I have introduced a sensible bill that will allow wastewater recycling projects to move forward much more quickly with Federal support. We should be debating solutions like that and not wasting time, yet again, on a bill that does not solve the real problem.

As the daughter of a Central Valley farmer and the granddaughter of another, I grew up on a farm, and I deeply understand the value of and the controversy over water. In northern California, we have done our best to balance our watershed to provide water for our farms, our cities, and the environment.

To say that this bill will help the drought is grossly misleading and, frankly, irresponsible. Mr. Speaker, even if we pump as much water south as possible, it still wouldn't be enough.

The problem is a lack of rain. There is simply no more water to pump from the delta. This bill only further divides our State. My district, the city of Sacramento, the Sacramento region, and

northern California as a whole strongly opposes this bill.

Some of the concerns that have been raised include the loss of the State's right to manage its own water; the decimation of environmental protections for our Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta; the ability to manage Folsom Reservoir for the benefit of the Sacramento metropolitan area; and, most importantly, the overall instability that this bill will create in California.

We cannot afford to give up California's right to control its own water future. The stakes are too high. I urge my colleagues to strongly reject this legislation.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Lawrenceville, Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), a fellow member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend on the Committee on Rules for yielding and appreciate what he is doing down here today.

Mr. Speaker, you serve on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, as I do; you know how important it is that we get to these infrastructure questions. I see colleague after colleague after colleague coming and saying we need long-term solutions to infrastructure. What I don't see is any colleague coming and saying that those long-term solutions are available to us, as we stand here today.

I don't have to get everything I want in this institution, Mr. Speaker, but I do have to move the ball forward. Three yards and a cloud of dust is what I tell constituents back home is the way we are going to get what we all want for this country; and if the answer is to sit on your hands and do nothing for this thing that has been so vexing to this institution, we are looking at 34, 35 extensions.

We have an opportunity to put a stop to it. The Senate, in its wildest imaginations, says maybe we can get a 4-year deal; most likely, it will be an 18-month deal. When I turn to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means here in the House, when I turn to the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in the House, they say: Colleagues, give me 5 months, and we can do it right.

Colleagues, give me 5 months, and we will do what no other Congress has been able to do for nearly a decade. Give us 5 months, and we will deliver on not just the promises, but the expectations that every single American has.

□ 1330

My colleagues, we have gotten in the business of telling the American people that they can have their roads for free, and that is not true. If you want better roads to drive on, you have got to provide the money to make that happen.

For years, our solution has been to transfer general fund revenues into the user fee-funded transportation account. User fees mean that people who benefit from it pay for it.

I have never bumped into an American who didn't believe they ought to pay for what they use. I have never bumped into an American who didn't believe that paying their fair share was at the fabric of who we are as a nation.

This rule gives us the best chance we have, and the best chance we have had in a decade, to make transportation certainty a reality for this country. It means better roads. It means more savings of taxpayer dollars. It means better efficiency. It means more accountability.

I am grateful to my friend on the Rules Committee for bringing this rule forward and giving me an opportunity to cast my "yes" vote on this rule and a "yes" vote on the underlying bill. Five months to a better solution for America.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I will keep my good friend from Georgia's statement for him on December 18, and remind him of what he said.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), my good friend.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I listened to my friend from Georgia talking about 5 months and we will be able to finally fix this. I actually have in my hand my speech from 1 year ago today speaking on the rule where we dodged the bullet again, and I said at that time I could pull out some of my other speeches. All this does is let people off the hook.

Why didn't we fix it last fall or this spring? My good friend from Washington used to serve in the State legislature. His State legislature just passed a 15-cent gas tax increase, joining a list of six States, all Republican States, that have raised the gas tax this year.

My friend from Georgia says he has never met anybody that doesn't really want to pay for their infrastructure. Well, he ought to take a hard look at his leadership. They have denied an opportunity to move forward with something championed by Ronald Reagan in 1982, when the gas tax, at his direction, under his leadership, was raised 125 percent.

There is no excuse to keep torturing people at the State and local government level to stop enabling people to avoid their responsibility here.

My good friend, Mr. DEFAZIO, is on the floor. In 2 months, he and BILL SHUSTER, the chair of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, could give us a 6-year bill, but Congress has to give them a number.

Does anybody in their right mind think that we are going to go into 2016, with half the people in the other body running for President, holidays, treaties? Think again. It is a fool's errand. We ought to step up, follow Ronald Reagan's lead, replenish the gas tax, and get on with work.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Wash-

ington has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 8 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3064, a comprehensive, 6-year surface transportation bill that is partially paid for by restricting U.S. companies from using so-called inversion to shirk their tax obligations.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), my good friend and the ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, who will discuss our proposal.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As we have heard, a year ago today, the House passed a temporary extension of 1 year. Chairman RYAN of the Ways and Means Committee, who was supposed to figure out how to pay for this, said we will use this year to put the transportation highway trust fund on a sustainable path so we can avoid stopgap legislation in the future.

Well, that didn't happen, but they were occupied with much more important things. For instance, they said that estates worth more than \$10 million shouldn't pay a penny in taxes—none, zero. That cost \$289 billion. If we had dedicated that to surface transportation, we could have basically doubled spending over 10 years.

So today, the Democrats are here to offer a real, 6-year, long-term increase in investment in America's failing infrastructure.

There are 140,000 bridges that need repair or replacement on the National Highway System. Forty percent of the pavement is at the point where you have to dig up the underlayment and rebuild the whole road.

We have an \$84 billion backlog just bringing our existing transit systems up to a state of good repair. It is so bad that people are dying on Metro here in Washington, D.C., because of the decrepit condition of the system.

With the Buy America rules, we would create a phenomenal number of jobs. In fact, under our funding proposal in our bill, we would create an additional 300,000 jobs a year. And we need those jobs here in America, and they are good-paying jobs. They are not just construction jobs. They are engineering, they are technical, they are small business, and they are minority business enterprises. They are a whole host of things that would lift the whole economy—make us more energy efficient, make Americans save money getting out of congestion, not driving their cars through giant potholes and incurring costs—but the Republicans can't figure out how to get there.

Well, we are offering an alternative—a good, solid, 6-year bill. Yes, we haven't figure out the 6-year funding yet because you guys are totally opposed to user fees, despite Ronald

Reagan and Dwight Eisenhower and the history of the Republican Party on user fees, and also former chairman of the committee, Bud Shuster, who joined with the Democrats in 1993, the last time when we raised the Federal gas tax to 18.3 cents a gallon.

We would fund 2 years of this bill by prohibiting corporate inversions; i.e., Benedict Arnold corporations that continue to have all of their operations in America but go overseas and buy some minor entity and claim that is their international headquarters, like a corner drug store somewhere in London for a pharmaceutical company. It is an outrageous practice. While they enjoy all the benefits of America and all the protections of our law and our military and all those costs, they don't want to pay, and they don't want to pay for transportation either.

So we are offering an alternative today. If we defeat the previous question, we would go into an open rule, something that never happens much around here, where both sides of the aisle, any Member of Congress, could offer an amendment to increase spending, decrease spending, target one or another part of the infrastructure that they feel needs more investment.

So I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule, move to an open rule, something we were promised when the Republicans took over, and fund a 6-year bill. We will give you 2 years of funding, and we can figure out the rest over the next 2 years.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), my good friend and the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Let me thank my friend from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and congratulate Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. BLUMENAUER on all their work on trying to modernize our national infrastructure. They know what every American out there knows, which is that we have an embarrassing state of affairs when it comes to our roads, our bridges, and our transitways.

It is not just them. We also know from the American Society of Civil Engineers, who are the nonpartisan pros, that they have concluded we have failing infrastructure. They gave our infrastructure system a grade of D-plus, a grade we should all be embarrassed by. But what is even worse is this Congress should get a grade of F for its refusal to actually do something about it.

So we are about to see an expiration of the authorization in a few weeks. Funding will dry out in a few weeks. And so what is the proposal from our Republican colleagues? Let's do 5 more months, through December, at a level they know is inadequate to help modernize our infrastructure. That is their proposal.

As my colleagues have said, we have been here before, and we are tired of

Band-Aids. Who can plan to modernize their infrastructure with just a 5-month time period?

These are major investments our States are making, major investments we are making on behalf of our country, and to not have any kind of certainty that the funds are going to be there after the end of December is something that is embarrassing for a country like the United States of America.

So we are proposing today to do the 6-year plan. Mr. DEFAZIO has put that forward. The President has put forward the 6-year plan, the Grow America plan, to modernize our infrastructure and grow more jobs in the process, and we fund the first 2-year installment. How do we fund it? We fund through a mechanism that I will bet you virtually every American will support, which is to close these pernicious tax loopholes that are allowing American companies simply to move their mailing address overseas in order to dodge their obligations to the American people.

These companies are not moving their employees. They are not moving their management. They are not moving their factories or anything else. They are just changing their mailing address by acquiring a small overseas company. It is called inversion. By doing that, they are escaping their responsibilities to their own country.

That is why my colleague called them Benedict Arnold corporations, because they are still benefiting from everything this country has to offer—educating their employees, the infrastructure that we do have, and all the other support structures they get—but they don't want to pay for it. And when they don't pay for it, guess who pays for it. The American people. Their taxes go up, or we have to borrow more on our credit card to pay for it.

So what we are saying is let's stop these inversions. Let's use that \$41 billion to fund the first 2-year installment of a robust infrastructure plan. And we can do it now.

We have introduced the bill, H.R. 3064, introduced by Mr. DEFAZIO, myself, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. HOLMES NORTON. The next vote we have, the next vote we cast, will allow this body to take up that legislation.

So we don't have to kick the can down the road for just 5 months with all that uncertainty. We can vote to do a robust 6-year plan, have a modernized infrastructure, and pay for it by shutting down these loopholes that corporations are abusing.

Let's take that money that is right now going into the pockets of people who are dodging our tax laws and invest in infrastructure. Let's get the job done today, not 5 months from now or a year from now. Let's get it done today.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and defeat the previous question so we can take it up.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM).

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is an important and critical time for the State of California. We are facing an unprecedented drought that is affecting farms, families, and communities that are just being shut off from water, communities that are not only rationing, but now having to have water trucked in.

This has been an ongoing battle. This battle has been going on for years. Some would say this is all due to climate change. But shouldn't we as a country, shouldn't we as a State be focused on infrastructure that will actually capture water so that we can save the water for years like this rather than seeing huge unemployment levels?

Rather than seeing people waiting in lines to receive free food because they can't get a job, shouldn't we be making the simple fixes to actually store and capture our water?

The amendments that we heard earlier talk about desalinization. Sure, I am fine with desalinization. I think we ought to use every opportunity that we have. But rather than pushing all of our clean water out into the ocean only to desalinate the salt water to bring it back into clean water, shouldn't we first start by saving the precious resources that we have?

So, sure, desalinization is a good idea, but it ought to be mixed in with everything else that we do. We ought to have greater water storage. We ought to be actually protecting the fish that we talk about protecting. Let's actually address the predator fish that eat 95 to 98 percent of the fish that we are trying to save, spending millions of dollars not only trying to save them, but pushing out thousands of acre-feet of freshwater that would go to our communities, which would create thousands of jobs rather than seeing this huge population that begins to see unemployment levels at record levels.

□ 1345

We ought to do the restoration to the environment. We have a number of different tributaries that we entered into agreement on, bipartisan agreements, to actually address the restoration of that area.

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

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

Mr. DENHAM. Rather than restore the riverbeds themselves, we truck the fish around the river. That doesn't help the environment; it doesn't help the fish, and it certainly does not help the communities of California.

What the rest of the country needs to worry about is this shortage of food, the scarcity of food that we will see across the country not only being sent from California, but the high prices that go with it.

You are affecting the American family; you are affecting the jobs in California, and it is time to fix this water situation on the West Coast and in the United States and in California and to do it now.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I have one more good gentleman from California I would like to hear from.

I yield 2 minutes to the young man from Richvale, California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 2898, is the product of bipartisan, bicameral negotiations and will protect State water rights, store more water during winter storms, address invasive fish that my colleague Mr. DENHAM was talking about that have decimated endangered species, and advance new water infrastructure to prepare for future droughts.

One project alone—Sites Reservoir, in my region—would reduce the State's need for rationing by 60 percent with that project.

My northern California district is a source of a vast amount of the State's usable water supply and its largest reservoirs; yet even my constituents are facing water rationing. Fields across my district are fallow because Federal agencies haven't adapted to drought conditions.

While some in the minority party would prefer to simply hand out borrowed money, doing so only ensures that this crisis will be repeated again and again. Our conditions in our lakes are already desperate. Folsom Lake, for example, will soon be a dead pool, and that is an important water source for Sacramento, due to the attempts to try to keep water under salmon down there.

This bill increases access to water for all Californians, without benefiting one region at the expense of another.

Mr. Speaker, California and the Nation cannot wait any longer. We need H.R. 2898 to move forward in the bipartisan effort we have had so far. The answer to this crisis isn't billions again and more borrowed dollars or more environmental restrictions. It is action to move on California's drought and add to California's water supply.

I urge your support for H.R. 2898. Let's get California back moving again.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, there is too little time left on the legislative calendar for this body to be considering partisan legislation that we have been assured will not become law.

Furthermore, the future of our Nation's highways and transportation systems are far too important to continue to fund using short-term Band-Aid patches. Our constituents, this great country, deserves better.

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

In closing, the issues we have considered here today are critical to the stability of our transportation infrastructure and the health of our rural western communities, as well as the economic well-being of our country.

This rule provides for consideration of H.R. 3038, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act, as well as H.R. 2898, the Western Water and American Food Security Act, a comprehensive and bipartisan bill that aims at alleviating drought impacts in the short and long term.

Water is not just a resource in the West; it is the lifeblood of farming and ranching all across the region, and we must act swiftly and decisively to mitigate the impacts of this crisis.

California and many areas in the West are facing devastating drought conditions. This bill fixes the bureaucratic and regulatory mess that has prevented people from getting water they so desperately need. Failing to pass this bill would deal a devastating blow to farm families and the American economy.

Many families, businesses, and ag producers are producing with some of the most dire drought conditions they have seen in decades; and a growing number of communities have been impacted by water shortages and rationing.

However, most of the damaging effects of the drought are preventable, and this bill comes to the aid of the West by fixing the broken regulatory system and updating our water infrastructure for this coming century.

While the root of the cause of this crisis is the drought, complex and inconsistent laws, misguided court decisions, and burdensome regulations have exacerbated an already devastating situation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill addresses these policy failures and seeks to alleviate the drought's short- and long-term impacts. It will give immediate relief to millions of Americans who are facing mandatory water rationing and will invest in new water storage facilities to prepare for future droughts.

While the Obama administration has issued a veto threat for this bill, people suffering in the West have little time for political theater, which is why I am urging my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this critical legislation.

This rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 3038, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act, a bill that will extend the Federal surface transportation programs. This extension will provide the House and Senate with time to work out a long-term sur-

face transportation reauthorization bill in a bicameral, bipartisan manner.

This bill will also allow us to work towards a resolution of the highway trust fund, which is currently facing a \$90 billion shortfall, as we have heard. If we fail to address the trust fund, its insolvency would have disastrous impacts on States across our country. Many projects would grind to a halt. Workers would be furloughed, and existing infrastructure investments would be lost.

While another short-term extension is not what any of us wanted, our States need certainty, and that certainty can only come from the long-term reauthorization of these transportation programs, as well as a lasting solution for the trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good, straightforward rule, allowing for consideration of two important pieces of legislation that will help protect our rural, Western communities, while providing much relief from devastating water shortages and drought conditions.

It will also ensure that many important transportation programs do not lapse and will extend the highway trust fund expenditure authority so that this vital fund remains solvent and available for projects across the country while we work towards a lasting solution.

I appreciate the discussion we have had over the last hour. It has been great, very enlightening. Although we may have some differences of opinion, I believe this rule and the underlying bills are strong measures that are important to our country's future.

I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 362 and the underlying bills.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 362 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Strike section 2 and insert the following:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3064) to authorize highway infrastructure and safety, transit, motor carrier, rail, and other surface transportation programs, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the

Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3064.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools

for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 245, nays 182, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 438]

YEAS—245

Abraham	Fleischmann	Long
Aderholt	Fleming	Loudermilk
Allen	Flores	Love
Amash	Forbes	Lucas
Amodei	Fortenberry	Luetkemeyer
Babin	Fox	Lummis
Barletta	Franks (AZ)	MacArthur
Barr	Frelinghuysen	Marchant
Barton	Garrett	Marino
Benishek	Gibbs	Massie
Bilirakis	Gibson	McCarthy
Bishop (MI)	Gohmert	McCaul
Bishop (UT)	Goodlatte	McClintock
Black	Gosar	McHenry
Blackburn	Gowdy	McKinley
Blum	Granger	McMorris
Bost	Graves (GA)	Rodgers
Boustany	Graves (LA)	McSally
Brady (TX)	Graves (MO)	Meadows
Brat	Griffith	Meehan
Bridenstine	Grothman	Messer
Brooks (AL)	Guinta	Mica
Brooks (IN)	Guthrie	Miller (FL)
Brown (FL)	Hanna	Miller (MI)
Buchanan	Hardy	Moolenaar
Buck	Harper	Mooney (WV)
Bucshon	Harris	Mullin
Burgess	Hartzler	Mulvaney
Byrne	Heck (NV)	Murphy (PA)
Calvert	Hensarling	Neugebauer
Carter (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Newhouse
Carter (TX)	Hice, Jody B.	Noem
Chabot	Hill	Nugent
Chaffetz	Holding	Nunes
Clawson (FL)	Hudson	Olson
Coffman	Huelskamp	Palazzo
Cole	Huizenga (MI)	Palmer
Collins (GA)	Hultgren	Paulsen
Collins (NY)	Hunter	Pearce
Comstock	Hurd (TX)	Perry
Conaway	Hurt (VA)	Pittenger
Cook	Issa	Pitts
Costa	Jenkins (KS)	Poe (TX)
Costello (PA)	Jenkins (WV)	Poliquin
Crawford	Johnson (OH)	Pompeo
Crenshaw	Johnson, Sam	Posey
Culberson	Jolly	Price, Tom
Curbelo (FL)	Jones	Ratcliffe
Davis, Rodney	Jordan	Reed
Denham	Joyce	Reichert
Dent	Katko	Renacci
DeSantis	Kelly (MS)	Ribble
DesJarlais	Kelly (PA)	Rice (SC)
Diaz-Balart	King (IA)	Rigell
Dold	King (NY)	Roby
Donovan	Kinzingler (IL)	Roe (TN)
Duffy	Kline	Rogers (AL)
Duncan (SC)	Knight	Rogers (KY)
Duncan (TN)	Labrador	Rohrabacher
Ellmers (NC)	LaMalfa	Rokita
Emmer (MN)	Lamborn	Rooney (FL)
Farenthold	Lance	Ros-Lehtinen
Fincher	Latta	Roskam
Fitzpatrick	LoBiondo	Ross

Rothfus	Smith (TX)
Rouzer	Stefanik
Royce	Stewart
Russell	Stivers
Ryan (WI)	Stutzman
Salmon	Thompson (PA)
Sanford	Thornberry
Scalise	Tiberi
Schweikert	Tipton
Scott, Austin	Trott
Sensenbrenner	Turner
Sessions	Upton
Shimkus	Valadao
Shuster	Walberg
Simpson	Walden
Smith (MO)	Walker
Smith (NE)	Walorski
Smith (NJ)	Walters, Mimi

NAYS—182

Adams	Gallego
Aguilar	Graham
Ashford	Grayson
Bass	Green, Al
Beatty	Green, Gene
Becerra	Grijalva
Bera	Gutiérrez
Bishop (GA)	Hahn
Blumenauer	Hastings
Bonamici	Heck (WA)
Boyle, Brendan F.	Higgins
Brady (PA)	Himes
Brownley (CA)	Hinojosa
Bustos	Honda
Butterfield	Hoyer
Capps	Huffman
Capuano	Israel
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee
Carney	Jeffries
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.
Castor (FL)	Kaptur
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)
Chu, Judy	Kennedy
Cicilline	Kildee
Clark (MA)	Kilmer
Clarke (NY)	Kind
Clay	Kirkpatrick
Cleaver	Kuster
Clyburn	Langevin
Cohen	Larsen (WA)
Connolly	Larson (CT)
Conyers	Lawrence
Cooper	Lee
Courtney	Levin
Crowley	Lewis
Cuellar	Lieu, Ted
Cummings	Lipinski
Davis (CA)	Loeb
Davis, Danny	Loeb
DeFazio	Lowenthal
DeGette	Lujan Grisham
Delaney	(NM)
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray
DeBene	(NM)
DeSaulnier	Lynch
Deutch	Maloney,
Dingell	Carolyn
Doggett	Maloney, Sean
Doyle, Michael F.	Matsui
Duckworth	McCollum
Edwards	McDermott
Ellison	McGovern
Eshoo	McNerney
Esty	Meeks
Farr	Meng
Fattah	Moore
Foster	Moulton
Frankel (FL)	Murphy (FL)
Fudge	Nadler
Gabbard	Napolitano
	Neal

NOT VOTING—6

Beyer	Engel	Keating
Cramer	Garamendi	Wagner

□ 1422

Mrs. DINGELL and Mr. POLIS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Weber (TX)	Webster (FL)
Webster (FL)	Wenstrup
Westerman	Westerman
Westmoreland	Westmoreland
Whitfield	Williams
Williams	Wilson (SC)
Wittman	Wittman
Womack	Womack
Woodall	Woodall
Yoder	Yoder
Yoho	Young (AK)
Young (AK)	Young (IA)
Young (IA)	Young (IN)
Young (IN)	Zeldin
Zeldin	Zinke

Nolan	Nolan
Norcross	Norcross
O'Rourke	O'Rourke
Pallone	Pallone
Pascrell	Pascrell
Payne	Payne
Pelosi	Pelosi
Perlmutter	Perlmutter
Peters	Peters
Peterson	Peterson
Pingree	Pingree
Pocan	Pocan
Polis	Polis
Price (NC)	Price (NC)
Quigley	Quigley
Rangel	Rangel
Rice (NY)	Rice (NY)
Richmond	Richmond
Roybal-Allard	Roybal-Allard
Ruiz	Ruiz
Ruppersberger	Ruppersberger
Rush	Rush
Ryan (OH)	Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda T.	Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta	Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes	Sarbanes
Schakowsky	Schakowsky
Schiff	Schiff
Schrader	Schrader
Scott (VA)	Scott (VA)
Scott, David	Scott, David
Serrano	Serrano
Sewell (AL)	Sewell (AL)
Sherman	Sherman
Sinema	Sinema
Sires	Sires
Slaughter	Slaughter
Smith (WA)	Smith (WA)
Speier	Speier
Swalwell (CA)	Swalwell (CA)
Takai	Takai
Takano	Takano
Thompson (CA)	Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)	Thompson (MS)
Titus	Titus
Tonko	Tonko
Torres	Torres
Tsongas	Tsongas
Van Hollen	Van Hollen
Vargas	Vargas
Veasey	Veasey
Vela	Vela
Velazquez	Velazquez
Visclosky	Visclosky
Walz	Walz
Wasserman	Wasserman
Schultz	Schultz
Waters, Maxine	Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman	Watson Coleman
Welch	Welch
Wilson (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth	Yarmuth

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 438, I was unavoidably detained by media. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 245, noes 183, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 439]

AYES—245

Abraham	Gibson	Meehan
Aderholt	Gohmert	Messer
Allen	Goodlatte	Mica
Amash	Gosar	Miller (FL)
Amodei	Gowdy	Miller (MI)
Babin	Granger	Moolenaar
Barletta	Graves (GA)	Mooney (WV)
Barr	Graves (LA)	Mullin
Barton	Graves (MO)	Mulvaney
Benishek	Griffith	Murphy (PA)
Bilirakis	Grothman	Neugebauer
Bishop (MI)	Guinta	Newhouse
Bishop (UT)	Guthrie	Noem
Black	Hanna	Nugent
Blackburn	Hardy	Nunes
Blum	Harper	Olson
Bost	Harris	Palazzo
Boustany	Hartzler	Palmer
Brady (TX)	Heck (NV)	Paulsen
Brat	Hensarling	Pearce
Bridenstine	Herrera Beutler	Perry
Brooks (AL)	Hice, Jody B.	Pittenger
Brooks (IN)	Hill	Pitts
Buchanan	Holding	Poe (TX)
Buck	Hudson	Poliquin
Bucshon	Huelskamp	Pompeo
Burgess	Huizenga (MI)	Posey
Byrne	Hultgren	Price, Tom
Calvert	Hunter	Ratcliffe
Carter (GA)	Hurd (TX)	Reed
Carter (TX)	Hurt (VA)	Reichert
Chabot	Issa	Renacci
Chaffetz	Jenkins (KS)	Ribble
Clawson (FL)	Jenkins (WV)	Rice (SC)
Coffman	Johnson (OH)	Rigell
Cole	Johnson, Sam	Roby
Collins (GA)	Jolly	Roe (TN)
Collins (NY)	Jones	Rogers (AL)
Comstock	Jordan	Rogers (KY)
Conaway	Joyce	Rohrabacher
Cook	Katko	Rokita
Costa	Kelly (MS)	Rooney (FL)
Costello (PA)	Kelly (PA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Cramer	King (IA)	Roskam
Crawford	King (NY)	Ross
Crenshaw	Kinzingler (IL)	Rothfus
Culberson	Kline	Rouzer
Curbelo (FL)	Knight	Royce
Davis, Rodney	Labrador	Russell
Denham	LaMalfa	Ryan (WI)
Dent	Lamborn	Salmon
DeSantis	Lance	Sanford
DesJarlais	Latta	Scalise
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Schweikert
Dold	Long	Scott, Austin
Donovan	Loudermilk	Sensenbrenner
Duffy	Love	Sessions
Duncan (SC)	Lucas	Shimkus
Duncan (TN)	Luetkemeyer	Shuster
Ellmers (NC)	Lummis	Simpson
Emmer (MN)	MacArthur	Smith (MO)
Farenthold	Marchant	Smith (NE)
Fincher	Marino	Smith (NJ)
Fitzpatrick	Massie	Smith (TX)
Fleischmann	McCarthy	Stefanik
Fleming	Fleming	Stewart
Flores	Flores	Stivers
Forbes	McHenry	Stutzman
Franks (AZ)	McKinley	Thompson (PA)
Frelinghuysen	McMorris	Thornberry
Garrett	Rodgers	Tiberi
Gibbs	McSally	Tipton
	Meadows	Trott

Turner	Weber (TX)	Womack
Upton	Webster (FL)	Woodall
Valadao	Wenstrup	Yoder
Wagner	Westerman	Yoho
Walberg	Westmoreland	Young (AK)
Walden	Whitfield	Young (IA)
Walker	Williams	Young (IN)
Walorski	Wilson (SC)	Zeldin
Walters, Mimi	Wittman	Zinke

NOES—183

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

NOT VOTING—5

Beyer	Engel	Keating
DeLauro	Fortenberry	

□ 1430

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING ACT OF 2015, PART II

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 362, I call up the bill (H.R. 3038) 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, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 362, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3038

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; RECONCILIATION OF FUNDS; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015, Part II”.

(b) RECONCILIATION OF FUNDS.—The Secretary of Transportation shall reduce the amount apportioned or allocated for a program, project, or activity under this Act in fiscal year 2015 by amounts apportioned or allocated pursuant to the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014 and the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015, including the amendments made by such Acts, for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; reconciliation of funds; table of contents.

TITLE I—SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM EXTENSION

Subtitle A—Federal-Aid Highways

Sec. 1001. Extension of Federal-aid highway programs.

Sec. 1002. Administrative expenses.

Subtitle B—Extension of Highway Safety Programs

Sec. 1101. Extension of National Highway Traffic Safety Administration highway safety programs.

Sec. 1102. Extension of Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration programs.

Sec. 1103. Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act.

Subtitle C—Public Transportation Programs

Sec. 1201. Formula grants for rural areas.

Sec. 1202. Apportionment of appropriations for formula grants.

Sec. 1203. Authorizations for public transportation.

Sec. 1204. Bus and bus facilities formula grants.

Subtitle D—Hazardous Materials

Sec. 1301. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE II—REVENUE PROVISIONS

Sec. 2001. Extension of Highway Trust Fund expenditure authority.

Sec. 2002. Funding of Highway Trust Fund.

Sec. 2003. Modification of mortgage reporting requirements.

Sec. 2004. Consistent basis reporting between estate and person acquiring property from decedent.

Sec. 2005. Clarification of 6-year statute of limitations in case of overstatement of basis.

Sec. 2006. Tax return due dates.

Sec. 2007. Transfers of excess pension assets to retiree health accounts.

Sec. 2008. Equalization of Highway Trust Fund excise taxes on liquefied natural gas, liquefied petroleum gas, and compressed natural gas.

TITLE III—ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 3001. Service fees.

TITLE I—SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM EXTENSION

Subtitle A—Federal-Aid Highways

SEC. 1001. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1001(a) of the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1840) is amended by striking “July 31, 2015” and inserting “December 18, 2015”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—Section 1001(b)(1) of the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1840) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—Except as provided in section 1002, there is authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account)—

“(A) for fiscal year 2015, a sum equal to the total amount authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for programs, projects, and activities for fiscal year 2014 under divisions A and E of MAP-21 (Public Law 112-141) and title 23, United States Code (excluding chapter 4 of that title); and

“(B) for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015, ^{79/366} of the total amount authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for programs, projects, and activities for fiscal year 2015 under divisions A and E of MAP-21 (Public Law 112-141) and title 23, United States Code (excluding chapter 4 of that title).”.

(2) GENERAL FUND.—Section 1123(h)(1) of MAP-21 (23 U.S.C. 202 note) is amended by striking “each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and \$24,986,301 out of the general fund of the Treasury to carry out the program for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2013 through 2015 and \$6,475,410 out of the general fund of the Treasury to carry out the program for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015”.

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1001(c)(1) of the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1840) is amended by striking “(1) IN GENERAL.—” and all that follows through “to carry out programs” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise expressly provided in this subtitle, funds authorized to be appropriated under subsection (b)(1)—

“(A) for fiscal year 2015 shall be distributed, administered, limited, and made available for obligation in the same manner and at the same levels as the amounts of funds authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for fiscal year 2014; and

“(B) for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015, shall be distributed, administered, limited, and made available for obligation in the same manner and at the same levels as ^{79/366} of the amounts of funds authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for fiscal year 2015,

to carry out programs”.

(2) OBLIGATION CEILING.—Section 1102 of MAP-21 (23 U.S.C. 104 note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (2); and

(ii) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) \$40,256,000,000 for fiscal year 2015; and

“(4) \$8,689,136,612 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”;

(B) in subsection (b)(12)—

(i) by striking “each of fiscal years 2013 through 2014” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2013 through 2015”; and

(ii) by striking “, and for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015, only in an amount equal to \$639,000,000, less any reductions that would have otherwise been required for that year by section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a), then multiplied by $30\frac{2}{3}$ for that period” and inserting “, and for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015, only in an amount equal to \$639,000,000, less any reductions that would have otherwise been required for that year by section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a), then multiplied by $79\frac{2}{3}$ for that period”;

(C) in subsection (c)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “each of fiscal years 2013 through 2014 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2013 through 2015 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking “for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015, that is equal to $30\frac{2}{3}$ of such unobligated balance” and inserting “for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015, that is equal to $79\frac{2}{3}$ of such unobligated balance”;

(D) in subsection (d) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “2015” and inserting “2016”; and

(E) in subsection (f)(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking “each of fiscal years 2013 through 2014 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2013 through 2015 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015”.

SEC. 1002. ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

Section 1002 of the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1842) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking “for administrative expenses of the Federal-aid highway program \$366,465,753 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.” and inserting “for administrative expenses of the Federal-aid highway program—

“(1) \$440,000,000 for fiscal year 2015; and

“(2) \$94,972,678 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”; and

(2) by striking subsection (b)(2) and inserting the following:

“(2) for fiscal year 2015 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015, subject to the limitations on administrative expenses under the heading ‘Federal Highway Administration’ in appropriations Acts that apply, respectively, to that fiscal year and period.”.

Subtitle B—Extension of Highway Safety Programs

SEC. 1101. EXTENSION OF NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.

(a) EXTENSION OF PROGRAMS.—

(1) HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.—Section 31101(a)(1) of MAP-21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (B); and

(B) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) \$235,000,000 for fiscal year 2015; and

“(D) \$50,724,044 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”.

(2) HIGHWAY SAFETY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—Section 31101(a)(2) of MAP-21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (B); and

(B) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) \$113,500,000 for fiscal year 2015; and

“(D) \$24,498,634 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”.

(3) NATIONAL PRIORITY SAFETY PROGRAMS.—Section 31101(a)(3) of MAP-21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (B); and

(B) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) \$272,000,000 for fiscal year 2015; and

“(D) \$58,710,383 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”.

(4) NATIONAL DRIVER REGISTER.—Section 31101(a)(4) of MAP-21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (B); and

(B) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2015; and

“(D) \$1,079,235 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”.

(5) HIGH VISIBILITY ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM.—

(A) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 31101(a)(5) of MAP-21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended—

(i) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (B); and

(ii) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) \$29,000,000 for fiscal year 2015; and

“(D) \$6,259,563 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”.

(B) LAW ENFORCEMENT CAMPAIGNS.—Section 2009(a) of SAFETEA-LU (23 U.S.C. 402 note) is amended—

(i) in the first sentence by striking “each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and in the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2013 through 2015 and in the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015”; and

(ii) in the second sentence by striking “each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and in the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2013 through 2015 and in the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”.

(6) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 31101(a)(6) of MAP-21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (B); and

(B) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) \$25,500,000 for fiscal year 2015; and

“(D) \$5,504,098 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”.

(b) COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.—Section 403(f)(1) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking “each fiscal year ending before October 1, 2014, and \$2,082,192 of the total amount available for apportionment to the States for highway safety programs under section 402(c) in the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,” and inserting “each fiscal year ending before October 1, 2015, and

\$539,617 of the total amount available for apportionment to the States for highway safety programs under section 402(c) in the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”.

(c) APPLICABILITY OF TITLE 23.—Section 31101(c) of MAP-21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended by striking “fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2013 through 2015 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”.

SEC. 1102. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS.

(a) MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY GRANTS.—Section 31104(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (9); and

(2) by striking paragraph (10) and inserting the following:

“(10) \$218,000,000 for fiscal year 2015; and

“(11) \$47,054,645 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 31104(i)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (I); and

(2) by striking subparagraph (J) and inserting the following:

“(J) \$259,000,000 for fiscal year 2015; and

“(K) \$55,904,372 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”.

(c) GRANT PROGRAMS.—

(1) COMMERCIAL DRIVER’S LICENSE PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT GRANTS.—Section 4101(c)(1) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by striking “each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and \$24,986,301 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2013 through 2015 and \$6,475,410 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015”.

(2) BORDER ENFORCEMENT GRANTS.—Section 4101(c)(2) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by striking “each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and \$26,652,055 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2013 through 2015 and \$6,907,104 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015”.

(3) PERFORMANCE AND REGISTRATION INFORMATION SYSTEM MANAGEMENT GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 4101(c)(3) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by striking “each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and \$4,164,384 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2013 through 2015 and \$1,079,235 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015”.

(4) COMMERCIAL VEHICLE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND NETWORKS DEPLOYMENT PROGRAM.—Section 4101(c)(4) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by striking “each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and \$20,821,918 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2013 through 2015 and \$5,396,175 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015”.

(5) SAFETY DATA IMPROVEMENT GRANTS.—Section 4101(c)(5) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by striking “each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and \$2,498,630 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2013 through 2015 and \$647,541 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015”.

(d) HIGH-PRIORITY ACTIVITIES.—Section 31104(k)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is

amended by striking “each of fiscal years 2006 through 2014 and up to \$12,493,151 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2006 through 2015 and up to \$3,237,705 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”

(e) NEW ENTRANT AUDITS.—Section 31144(g)(5)(B) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “per fiscal year and up to \$26,652,055 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,” and inserting “per fiscal year and up to \$6,907,104 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”

(f) OUTREACH AND EDUCATION.—Section 4127(e) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1741) is amended by striking “each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and \$3,331,507 to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2013 through 2015 and \$863,388 to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”

(g) GRANT PROGRAM FOR COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATORS.—Section 4134(c) of SAFETEA-LU (49 U.S.C. 31301 note) is amended by striking “each of fiscal years 2005 through 2014 and \$832,877 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2005 through 2015 and \$215,847 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”

SEC. 1103. DINGELL-JOHNSON SPORT FISH RESTORATION ACT.

Section 4 of the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 777c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “each fiscal year through 2014 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015” and inserting “each fiscal year through 2015 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1)(A) by striking “for each fiscal year ending before October 1, 2014, and for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,” and inserting “for each fiscal year ending before October 1, 2015, and for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”

Subtitle C—Public Transportation Programs
SEC. 1201. FORMULA GRANTS FOR RURAL AREAS.

Section 5311(c)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A) by striking “for each fiscal year ending before October 1, 2014, and \$4,164,384 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,” and inserting “for each fiscal year ending before October 1, 2015, and \$1,079,235 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B) by striking “for each fiscal year ending before October 1, 2014, and \$20,821,918 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,” and inserting “for each fiscal year ending before October 1, 2015, and \$5,396,175 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”

SEC. 1202. APPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FORMULA GRANTS.

Section 5336(h)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “for each fiscal year ending before October 1, 2014, and \$24,986,301 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,” and inserting “for each fiscal year ending before October 1, 2015, and \$6,475,410 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”

SEC. 1203. AUTHORIZATIONS FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION.

(a) FORMULA GRANTS.—Section 5338(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking “and \$7,158,575,342 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015” and inserting “\$8,595,000,000 for fiscal year 2015, and \$1,855,204,918 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking “and \$107,274,521 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,” and inserting “\$128,800,000 for fiscal 2015, and \$27,801,093 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”;

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking “for each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and \$8,328,767 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,” and inserting “for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2015 and \$2,158,470 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”;

(C) in subparagraph (C) by striking “and \$3,713,505,753 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,” and inserting “\$4,458,650,000 for fiscal year 2015, and \$962,386,202 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”;

(D) in subparagraph (D) by striking “and \$215,132,055 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,” and inserting “\$258,300,000 for fiscal year 2015, and \$55,753,279 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”;

(E) in subparagraph (E)—

(i) by striking “and \$506,222,466 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,” and inserting “\$607,800,000 for fiscal year 2015, and \$131,191,803 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”;

(ii) by striking “and \$24,986,301 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,” and inserting “\$30,000,000 for fiscal year 2015, and \$6,475,410 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”; and

(iii) by striking “and \$16,657,534 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,” and inserting “\$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2015, and \$4,316,940 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”;

(F) in subparagraph (F) by striking “each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and \$2,498,630 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2013 through 2015 and \$647,541 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”;

(G) in subparagraph (G) by striking “each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and \$4,164,384 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2013 through 2015 and \$1,079,235 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”;

(H) in subparagraph (H) by striking “each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and \$3,206,575 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2013 through 2015 and \$831,011 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”;

(I) in subparagraph (I) by striking “and \$1,803,927,671 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,” and inserting “\$2,165,900,000 for fiscal year 2015, and \$467,503,005 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”;

(J) in subparagraph (J) by striking “and \$356,304,658 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,” and inserting “\$427,800,000 for fiscal year 2015, and \$92,339,344 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”; and

(K) in subparagraph (K) by striking “and \$438,009,863 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,” and inserting “\$525,900,000 for fiscal year 2015, and \$113,513,934 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”

(b) RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT DEMONSTRATION AND DEPLOYMENT PROJECTS.—Section 5338(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and \$58,301,370 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015” and inserting “\$70,000,000 for fiscal year 2015, and \$15,109,290 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”

(c) TRANSIT COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PROGRAM.—Section 5338(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and \$5,830,137 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015” and inserting “\$7,000,000 for fiscal year 2015, and \$1,510,929 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”

(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT.—Section 5338(d) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and \$5,830,137 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015” and inserting “\$7,000,000 for fiscal year 2015, and \$1,510,929 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”

(e) HUMAN RESOURCES AND TRAINING.—Section 5338(e) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and \$4,164,384 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015” and inserting “\$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2015, and \$1,079,235 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”

(f) CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS.—Section 5338(g) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and \$1,558,295,890 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015” and inserting “\$1,907,000,000 for fiscal year 2015, and \$411,620,219 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”

(g) ADMINISTRATION.—Section 5338(h) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking “and \$86,619,178 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015” and inserting “\$104,000,000 for fiscal year 2015, and \$22,448,087 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”;

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking “each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and not less than \$4,164,384 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2013 through 2015 and not less than \$1,079,235 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”; and

(3) in paragraph (3) by striking “each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and not less than \$832,877 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2013 through 2015 and not less than \$215,847 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”

SEC. 1204. BUS AND BUS FACILITIES FORMULA GRANTS.

Section 5339(d)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and \$54,553,425 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July

31, 2015,” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2013 through 2015 and \$14,137,978 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”;

(2) by striking “\$1,041,096 for such period” and inserting “\$269,809 for such period”; and

(3) by striking “\$416,438 for such period” and inserting “\$107,923 for such period”.

Subtitle D—Hazardous Materials

SEC. 1301. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5128(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (2); and

(2) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) \$42,762,000 for fiscal year 2015; and

“(4) \$9,230,049 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”.

(b) HAZARDOUS MATERIALS EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND.—Section 5128(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the paragraph heading by striking “FISCAL YEARS 2013 AND 2014” and inserting “FISCAL YEARS 2013 THROUGH 2015”; and

(B) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking “fiscal years 2013 and 2014” and inserting “fiscal years 2013 through 2015”; and

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) FISCAL YEAR 2016.—From the Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness Fund established under section 5116(i), the Secretary may expend for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015—

“(A) \$40,579 to carry out section 5115;

“(B) \$4,705,464 to carry out subsections (a) and (b) of section 5116, of which not less than \$2,946,311 shall be available to carry out section 5116(b);

“(C) \$32,377 to carry out section 5116(f);

“(D) \$134,904 to publish and distribute the Emergency Response Guidebook under section 5116(i)(3); and

“(E) \$215,847 to carry out section 5116(j).”.

(c) HAZARDOUS MATERIALS TRAINING GRANTS.—Section 5128(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “each of the fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and \$3,331,507 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2013 through 2015 and \$863,388 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015.”.

TITLE II—REVENUE PROVISIONS

SEC. 2001. EXTENSION OF HIGHWAY TRUST FUND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY.

(a) HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—Section 9503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “August 1, 2015” in subsections (b)(6)(B), (c)(1), and (e)(3) and inserting “December 19, 2015”, and

(2) by striking “Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015” in subsections (c)(1) and (e)(3) and inserting “Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015, Part II”.

(b) SPORT FISH RESTORATION AND BOATING TRUST FUND.—Section 9504 of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking “Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015” each place it appears in subsection (b)(2) and inserting “Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015, Part II”, and

(2) by striking “August 1, 2015” in subsection (d)(2) and inserting “December 19, 2015”.

(c) LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND.—Section 9508(e)(2) of such Code is amended by striking “August 1, 2015” and inserting “December 19, 2015”.

SEC. 2002. FUNDING OF HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.

Section 9503(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (8) and by inserting after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph:

“(7) ADDITIONAL SUMS.—Out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, there is hereby appropriated—

“(A) \$6,068,000,000 to the Highway Account (as defined in subsection (e)(5)(B)) in the Highway Trust Fund; and

“(B) \$2,000,000,000 to the Mass Transit Account in the Highway Trust Fund.”.

SEC. 2003. MODIFICATION OF MORTGAGE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) INFORMATION RETURN REQUIREMENTS.—Section 6050H(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (C), by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (G) and by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraphs:

“(D) the amount of outstanding principal on the mortgage as of the beginning of such calendar year,

“(E) the date of the origination of the mortgage,

“(F) the address (or other description in the case of property without an address) of the property which secures the mortgage, and”.

(b) STATEMENTS TO INDIVIDUALS.—Section 6050H(d)(2) of such Code is amended by striking “subsection (b)(2)(C)” and inserting “subparagraphs (C), (D), (E), and (F) of subsection (b)(2)”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to returns required to be made, and statements required to be furnished, after December 31, 2016.

SEC. 2004. CONSISTENT BASIS REPORTING BETWEEN ESTATE AND PERSON ACQUIRING PROPERTY FROM DECEDENT.

(a) PROPERTY ACQUIRED FROM A DECEDENT.—Section 1014 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) BASIS MUST BE CONSISTENT WITH ESTATE TAX RETURN.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The basis of any property to which subsection (a) applies shall not exceed—

“(A) in the case of property the final value of which has been determined for purposes of the tax imposed by chapter 11 on the estate of such decedent, such value, and

“(B) in the case of property not described in subparagraph (A) and with respect to which a statement has been furnished under section 6035(a) identifying the value of such property, such value.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall only apply to any property whose inclusion in the decedent’s estate increased the liability for the tax imposed by chapter 11 (reduced by credits allowable against such tax) on such estate.

“(3) DETERMINATION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the basis of property has been determined for purposes of the tax imposed by chapter 11 if—

“(A) the value of such property is shown on a return under section 6018 and such value is not contested by the Secretary before the expiration of the time for assessing a tax under chapter 11,

“(B) in a case not described in subparagraph (A), the value is specified by the Secretary and such value is not timely contested by the executor of the estate, or

“(C) the value is determined by a court or pursuant to a settlement agreement with the Secretary.

“(4) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary may by regulations provide exceptions to the application of this subsection.”.

(b) INFORMATION REPORTING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subpart A of part III of subchapter A of chapter 61 of such Code is amended by inserting after section 6034A the following new section:

“SEC. 6035. BASIS INFORMATION TO PERSONS ACQUIRING PROPERTY FROM DECEDENT.

“(a) INFORMATION WITH RESPECT TO PROPERTY ACQUIRED FROM DECEDENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The executor of any estate required to file a return under section 6018(a) shall furnish to the Secretary and to each person acquiring any interest in property included in the decedent’s gross estate for Federal estate tax purposes a statement identifying the value of each interest in such property as reported on such return and such other information with respect to such interest as the Secretary may prescribe.

“(2) STATEMENTS BY BENEFICIARIES.—Each person required to file a return under section 6018(b) shall furnish to the Secretary and to each other person who holds a legal or beneficial interest in the property to which such return relates a statement identifying the information described in paragraph (1).

“(3) TIME FOR FURNISHING STATEMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each statement required to be furnished under paragraph (1) or (2) shall be furnished at such time as the Secretary may prescribe, but in no case at a time later than the earlier of—

“(i) the date which is 30 days after the date on which the return under section 6018 was required to be filed (including extensions, if any), or

“(ii) the date which is 30 days after the date such return is filed.

“(B) ADJUSTMENTS.—In any case in which there is an adjustment to the information required to be included on a statement filed under paragraph (1) or (2) after such statement has been filed, a supplemental statement under such paragraph shall be filed not later than the date which is 30 days after such adjustment is made.

“(b) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as necessary to carry out this section, including regulations relating to—

“(1) the application of this section to property with regard to which no estate tax return is required to be filed, and

“(2) situations in which the surviving joint tenant or other recipient may have better information than the executor regarding the basis or fair market value of the property.”.

(2) PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO FILE.—

(A) RETURN.—Section 6724(d)(1) of such Code is amended by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting “, and”, and by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) any statement required to be filed with the Secretary under section 6035.”.

(B) STATEMENT.—Section 6724(d)(2) of such Code is amended by striking “or” at the end of subparagraph (GG), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (HH) and inserting “, or”, and by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(II) section 6035 (other than a statement described in paragraph (1)(D)).”.

(3) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart A of part III of subchapter A of chapter 61 of such Code is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 6034A the following new item:

“Sec. 6035. Basis information to persons acquiring property from decedent.”.

(c) PENALTY FOR INCONSISTENT REPORTING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 6662(b) of such Code is amended by inserting after paragraph (7) the following new paragraph:

“(8) Any inconsistent estate basis.”.

(2) INCONSISTENT BASIS REPORTING.—Section 6662 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(k) INCONSISTENT ESTATE BASIS REPORTING.—For purposes of this section, there is an ‘inconsistent estate basis’ if the basis of property claimed on a return exceeds the basis as determined under section 1014(f).”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property with respect to which an estate tax return is filed after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2005. CLARIFICATION OF 6-YEAR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS IN CASE OF OVERSTATEMENT OF BASIS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6501(e)(1)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of clause (i), by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii), and by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

“(ii) An understatement of gross income by reason of an overstatement of unrecovered cost or other basis is an omission from gross income; and”.

(2) by inserting “(other than in the case of an overstatement of unrecovered cost or other basis)” in clause (iii) (as so redesignated) after “In determining the amount omitted from gross income”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to—

(1) returns filed after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(2) returns filed on or before such date if the period specified in section 6501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (determined without regard to such amendments) for assessment of the taxes with respect to which such return relates has not expired as of such date.

SEC. 2006. TAX RETURN DUE DATES.

(a) DUE DATES FOR RETURNS OF PARTNERSHIPS, S CORPORATIONS, AND C CORPORATIONS.—

(1) PARTNERSHIPS AND S CORPORATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—So much of subsection (b) of 6072 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as precedes the second sentence thereof is amended to read as follows:

“(b) RETURNS OF PARTNERSHIPS AND S CORPORATIONS.—Returns of partnerships under section 6031 and returns of S corporations under sections 6012 and 6037 made on the basis of the calendar year shall be filed on or before the 15th day of March following the close of the calendar year, and such returns made on the basis of a fiscal year shall be filed on or before the 15th day of the third month following the close of the fiscal year.”.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 6072(a) of such Code is amended by striking “6017, or 6031” and inserting “or 6017”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO C CORPORATION DUE DATE OF 15TH DAY OF FOURTH MONTH FOLLOWING TAXABLE YEAR.—

(A) Section 170(a)(2)(B) of such Code is amended by striking “third month” and inserting “fourth month”.

(B) Section 563 of such Code is amended by striking “third month” each place it appears and inserting “fourth month”.

(C) Section 1354(d)(1)(B)(i) of such Code is amended by striking “3d month” and inserting “4th month”.

(D) Subsections (a) and (c) of section 6167 of such Code are each amended by striking “third month” and inserting “fourth month”.

(E) Section 6425(a)(1) of such Code is amended by striking “third month” and inserting “fourth month”.

(F) Subsections (b)(2)(A), (g)(3), and (h)(1) of section 6655 of such Code are each amended by striking “3rd month” and inserting “4th month”.

(G) Section 6655(g)(4) of such Code is amended by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (F) and by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph:

“(E) Subsection (b)(2)(A) shall be applied by substituting ‘3rd month’ for ‘4th month’.”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the amendments made by this subsection shall apply to returns for taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

(B) SPECIAL RULE FOR C CORPORATIONS WITH FISCAL YEARS ENDING ON JUNE 30.—In the case of any C corporation with a taxable year ending on June 30, the amendments made by this subsection shall apply to returns for taxable years beginning after December 31, 2025.

(b) MODIFICATION OF DUE DATES BY REGULATION.—In the case of returns for taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015, the Secretary of the Treasury, or the Secretary’s designee, shall modify appropriate regulations to provide as follows:

(1) The maximum extension for the returns of partnerships filing Form 1065 shall be a 6-month period ending on September 15 for calendar year taxpayers.

(2) The maximum extension for the returns of trusts filing Form 1041 shall be a 5½-month period ending on September 30 for calendar year taxpayers.

(3) The maximum extension for the returns of employee benefit plans filing Form 5500 shall be an automatic 3½-month period ending on November 15 for calendar year plans.

(4) The maximum extension for the returns of organizations exempt from income tax filing Form 990 (series) shall be an automatic 6-month period ending on November 15 for calendar year filers.

(5) The maximum extension for the returns of organizations exempt from income tax that are required to file Form 4720 returns of excise taxes shall be an automatic 6-month period beginning on the due date for filing the return (without regard to any extensions).

(6) The maximum extension for the returns of trusts required to file Form 5227 shall be an automatic 6-month period beginning on the due date for filing the return (without regard to any extensions).

(7) The maximum extension for filing Form 6069, Return of Excise Tax on Excess Contributions to Black Lung Benefit Trust Under Section 4953 and Computation of Section 192 Deduction, shall be an automatic 6-month period beginning on the due date for filing the return (without regard to any extensions).

(8) The maximum extension for a taxpayer required to file Form 8870 shall be an automatic 6-month period beginning on the due date for filing the return (without regard to any extensions).

(9) The due date of Form 3520-A, Annual Information Return of a Foreign Trust with a United States Owner, shall be the 15th day of the 3d month after the close of the trust’s taxable year, and the maximum extension shall be a 6-month period beginning on such day.

(10) The due date of Form 3520, Annual Return to Report Transactions with Foreign Trusts and Receipt of Certain Foreign Gifts, for calendar year filers shall be April 15 with a maximum extension for a 6-month period ending on October 15.

(11) The due date of FinCEN Report 114 (relating to Report of Foreign Bank and Finan-

cial Accounts) shall be April 15 with a maximum extension for a 6-month period ending on October 15 and with provision for an extension under rules similar to the rules in Treas. Reg. section 1.6081-5. For any taxpayer required to file such Form for the first time, any penalty for failure to timely request for, or file, an extension, may be waived by the Secretary.

(c) CORPORATIONS PERMITTED STATUTORY AUTOMATIC 6-MONTH EXTENSION OF INCOME TAX RETURNS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 6081(b) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “3 months” and inserting “6 months”, and

(B) by adding at the end the following: “In the case of any return for a taxable year of a C corporation which ends on December 31 and begins before January 1, 2026, the first sentence of this subsection shall be applied by substituting ‘5 months’ for ‘6 months’. In the case of any return for a taxable year of a C corporation which ends on June 30 and begins before January 1, 2026, the first sentence of this subsection shall be applied by substituting ‘7 months’ for ‘6 months’.”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to returns for taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 2007. TRANSFERS OF EXCESS PENSION ASSETS TO RETIREE HEALTH ACCOUNTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 420(b)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “December 31, 2021” and inserting “December 31, 2025”.

(b) CONFORMING ERISA AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Sections 101(e)(3), 403(c)(1), and 408(b)(13) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1021(e)(3), 1103(c)(1), 1108(b)(13)) are each amended by striking “MAP-21” and inserting “Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015, Part II”.

(2) Section 408(b)(13) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 1108(b)(13)) is amended by striking “January 1, 2022” and inserting “January 1, 2026”.

SEC. 2008. EQUALIZATION OF HIGHWAY TRUST FUND EXCISE TAXES ON LIQUEFIED NATURAL GAS, LIQUEFIED PETROLEUM GAS, AND COMPRESSED NATURAL GAS.

(a) LIQUEFIED PETROLEUM GAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4041(a)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “and” at the end of clause (i), by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii), and by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

“(ii) in the case of liquefied petroleum gas, 18.3 cents per energy equivalent of a gallon of gasoline, and”.

(2) ENERGY EQUIVALENT OF A GALLON OF GASOLINE.—Section 4041(a)(2) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) ENERGY EQUIVALENT OF A GALLON OF GASOLINE.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘energy equivalent of a gallon of gasoline’ means, with respect to a liquefied petroleum gas fuel, the amount of such fuel having a Btu content of 115,400 (lower heating value). For purposes of the preceding sentence, a Btu content of 115,400 (lower heating value) is equal to 5.75 pounds of liquefied petroleum gas.”.

(b) LIQUEFIED NATURAL GAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4041(a)(2)(B) of such Code, as amended by subsection (a)(1), is amended by striking “and” at the end of clause (ii), by striking the period at the end of clause (iii) and inserting “, and” and by inserting after clause (iii) the following new clause:

“(iv) in the case of liquefied natural gas, 24.3 cents per energy equivalent of a gallon of diesel.”.

(2) ENERGY EQUIVALENT OF A GALLON OF DIESEL.—Section 4041(a)(2) of such Code, as amended by subsection (a)(2), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(D) ENERGY EQUIVALENT OF A GALLON OF DIESEL.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘energy equivalent of a gallon of diesel’ means, with respect to a liquefied natural gas fuel, the amount of such fuel having a Btu content of 128,700 (lower heating value). For purposes of the preceding sentence, a Btu content of 128,700 (lower heating value) is equal to 6.06 pounds of liquefied natural gas.”.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 4041(a)(2)(B)(iii) of such Code, as redesignated by subsection (a)(1), is amended—

(A) by striking “liquefied natural gas,” and

(B) by striking “peat), and” and inserting “peat) and”.

(C) ENERGY EQUIVALENT OF A GALLON OF GASOLINE TO COMPRESSED NATURAL GAS.—Section 4041(a)(3) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(D) ENERGY EQUIVALENT OF A GALLON OF GASOLINE.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘energy equivalent of a gallon of gasoline’ means 5.66 pounds of compressed natural gas.”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to any sale or use of fuel after December 31, 2015.

TITLE III—ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 3001. SERVICE FEES.

Paragraph (4) of section 44940(i) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(K) \$1,560,000,000 for fiscal year 2024.

“(L) \$1,600,000,000 for fiscal year 2025.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the chair of ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. 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, H.R. 3038.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3038, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015, Part II.

This bill extends the Federal surface transportation programs through December 18, 2015. H.R. 3038 is a clean extension and funds the programs at authorized levels for fiscal year 2014.

The bill also ensures the solvency of the highway trust fund. We have an immediate, critical need to address the solvency of the trust fund and extend the current surface transportation law.

If Congress fails to act, the States will not be able to be reimbursed for past expenses, transportation projects, and jobs across the country will be at risk; and over 4,000 U.S. Department of Transportation employees will be furloughed.

I appreciate Chairman RYAN’s attention to this pressing issue, as well as his commitment to addressing the solvency of the trust fund.

A long-term surface transportation reauthorization bill remains a top priority for this committee, and it should be for this Congress.

I am committed to continuing to work with Chairman RYAN, Ranking Member DEFAZIO, and others on achieving a long-term reauthorization bill. I believe this extension gives us our best shot.

I strongly urge all Members to support H.R. 3038, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ironically, it was exactly 1 year ago today that the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee said they needed time to come together for funding a 6-year surface transportation bill investing in our transportation system, 1 year ago today.

There was an extension until the end of the year, then there was an extension until May, and then there was an extension from May until now—temporary extensions, I think 34 temporary extensions we have seen now.

Now, we are talking about another temporary extension with the hope that maybe they can find some money under the couch cushions or pass tax reform and cut taxes on rich people and use dynamic scoring and say it raises money and then put it in the trust fund. I don’t know what their solution is.

We have had a user fee funded transportation system in this country since Dwight David Eisenhower was President, followed by Ronald Reagan who doubled the tax; and Ronald Reagan also put transit into the highway trust fund, saying we should not ignore our population centers and actually our centers of economic growth.

Then in 1993—granted, Democratic President and Democratic Congress, but we didn’t quite have the votes to increase the gas tax—and Bud Shuster, Republican chair of the Transportation Committee back then, actual relation to current chairman, he brought us quite a number of Republicans to vote with the Democrats to go to 18.3 cents a gallon; and there it stood since 1993.

We are hearing now you can’t increase the gas tax, so I have offered alternatives. Let’s eliminate the gas tax and put a tax on a barrel of oil, the fraction that goes into taxable transportation uses, which economists say means Wall Street might eat part of that because they are speculating so much, ExxonMobil might eat part of that, OPEC—hey, we might get Saudi Arabia to pay for a little bit of our in-

frastructure; but I am told, no, they can’t do that.

I proposed just indexing the existing gas tax and bonding, pay it back over time with that increment. Now, if we double index the gas tax, it might go up 1.7 cents next year. There is apparently a fear in this place that if gas went up 1.7 cents a gallon—unlike ExxonMobil jacking it up 25 cents while you are driving by in May because Memorial Day is coming—but of the Federal Government to invest in filling in the potholes, fixing the bridges and the transit systems and raised it 1.7 cents, oh, my God, people lose their elections.

Well, we have seen six Republican States raise their gas tax this year, all red, deep red States; and those same States have said to us in testimony: It is not enough that we are raising the gas tax; we need more Federal investment.

The system is falling apart—140,000 bridges, 140,000 need repair or replacement. Forty percent of the surface national highway system needs to be not just resurfaced; it needs to be dug up and rebuilt—and that our transit systems, \$84 billion backlog to bring them up to a state of good repair.

It is so bad in Washington, D.C., that they are killing people; they are killing people on the transit system because it is so outmoded.

Now, if we made those investments and we made them in a more robust level than we are doing now, we could put hundreds of thousands of Americans to work. It is not just construction workers; you are talking manufacturing; you are talking small business; you are talking minority business enterprises; you are talking engineering; you are talking technical.

The Buy America requirements are the strongest in the whole government. It would have an incredible stimulative effect on the economy. In addition, it would put 300,000 people back to work, and we could begin to climb back toward where we were.

Dwight David Eisenhower gave us a system that was the envy of the world. We were number one in infrastructure. We are now 16. We are dropping like a rock. Pretty soon, we will be down there with Third World countries in terms of state of our infrastructure in this country. It is embarrassing. It is pathetic. It is not necessary.

Today, we should be considering a long-term bill. We have introduced a viable long-term bill. We propose today a way to pay for the first 2 years of it by just saying Benedict Arnold corporations can’t buy a drugstore overseas for a major pharmaceutical company and then say: Oh, that is our home headquarters, although we are still here enjoying all the protections of American citizenship law and our military, but we don’t want to pay for it and our infrastructure.

There are ways forward. There seems to be an incredible reluctance on their side, so here we are again saying let’s

do a patch until December 18. Meanwhile, the Senate over there has been in who knows what kind of circles. They are proposing to get most of the money by reducing retirement for Federal employees. Now, that is a tremendous relationship to infrastructure and user fees. Let's not get too far away from the idea of user pays.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to make note, the highway program funding mechanism expires at the end of this month. It expires; that means it runs out of funding. Voting against this bill causes the program to shut down, causes a decline, a dropoff on investment in our Nation's infrastructure.

Right now, we are seeing growth; we are seeing increasing demand. As the gentleman from Oregon just noted, we are seeing underinvestment in our infrastructure system. We have got to increase the investment. We have got to work hard to address the outdated funding mechanism that funds our current highway system. As was noted, we have lost value in the current funding mechanism.

Having a user fee is absolutely critical, but a user fee that ensures the level of investment that we truly need. This extension gives us time to recreate that. We have been using the same user fee for decades, a user fee with static figures since 1993, as was just mentioned, and a user fee that has conflicting Federal policies that reduces the value of the income of this trust fund as a result of the corporate average fuel economy or CAFE standards that require greater fuel efficiency out of vehicles.

We have got to take a fresh look at this. We have got to take this time and use it wisely to ensure that we can ensure the level of funding that we need to invest in our Nation's infrastructure. We need a fundamentally different approach, and we need to do it without raising taxes.

Mr. Speaker, back in my home State of Louisiana, we have some of the worst traffic in the Nation for a region of its size. We have an area that the interstate system, the only place in the Nation where it literally drops down to one lane, the interstate, an incredible bottleneck, in this same area where we are having a manufacturing renaissance, where we are seeing tens of billions of dollars in new economic development opportunities; yet the infrastructure is struggling. The infrastructure is strangling that growth and strangling that investment.

I urge all Members to support this. I urge all Members to work together to ensure we develop a new funding stream that meets the demand of our crumbling infrastructure in this Nation.

I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER, and I want to thank Chairman RYAN

and Ranking Member DEFAZIO, to ensure that this legislation moves forward.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), the ranking member of the Highways and Transit Subcommittee.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the ranking member, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the majority has turned virtually its only congressional policy, tax savings, on its head with useless short-term transportation bills and extensions. Their short-term policy on the Nation's highways, bridges, and transit has simply transferred the transportation tax burden to the State taxes of their constituents.

Twenty-one States and the District of Columbia have raised their gas user fees—six since July 1—Iowa, Wyoming, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Virginia, Vermont, District of Columbia, South Dakota, Idaho, Georgia, Nebraska, and Vermont.

□ 1445

States going in that direction are Michigan, North Carolina, Utah, and Washington State.

States also considering user fee increases are Kentucky, Missouri, New Jersey, and South Carolina. That makes almost half the States that Congress has driven to State taxpayers alone, States that have nothing in common except the desire to keep their transportation infrastructure, the key to a growth economy, from completely disintegrating.

Meanwhile, the Representatives in Washington have continually failed to pay their part, on the average, about 50 percent of the costs of State infrastructure with Federal dollars, yet the Federal dollars are only a pass-through that goes right back to the States.

For 22 years, we have allowed the Federal user fee to remain fixed at 1993 levels, although fuel efficiency long ago made that obsolete.

Although American taxpayers have stepped up, they can't do their projects without a Federal long-term bill. In the Nation's capital, for example, the iconic Memorial Bridge, gateway to Arlington Cemetery in the south and, on the north, to the National Mall, is partially closed, leaving thousands of workers unable to take Metro buses to get to work.

Even bridges like the H Street bridge here, which needs only repair, is standing in the way of billions of dollars of nontransportation development here and nationwide.

So whatever the Congress does in the next authorization bill, two things must be done: We must put in pilots that instruct us, guide us, for a new way to fund transportation infrastructure in light of fuel efficiencies, such as cars like my hybrid Ford C-Max.

And, most of all, to be useful at all, we must have a 6-year transportation bill.

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), the former chairman of the committee.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, here we are. It is the last minute to avoid an infrastructure disaster across the country.

How did we get here? Well, when we knew that we needed a substantial amount of money, the other side of the aisle found out that there was a little bit of money left.

We had asked several months ago to consider going to the end of the year when we are doing tax reform, and we could find sufficient money to fund a 4- to 6-year bill. They said "no."

They had to spend the last dime in the cookie jar, take it out of the cookie jar, and that is what put us in this situation. What that has done is at least seven States have almost closed down their infrastructure projects.

My State isn't affected, but some of the northern States are affected because they have a very short work period. So they are missing that work period.

States don't operate like the Federal Government. They have to pay their bills. They can't be spending, producing, and printing paper money without backing. So we have let them down.

So here we are, asking to go where we wanted to go to before December. So I urge the Members to pass this legislation.

It is kind of interesting. Sometimes I think that there is a lot of amnesia around here. Mr. Speaker, I don't know if we could go down to the health clinic downstairs and get a supply of ginkgo, but it would be good to give some of the Members on the other side of the aisle some ginkgo to help their memory.

Three years ago they controlled the House, the Senate, and the White House. They could have passed this legislation they are talking about, funded it, and we would have a bill that would be in place now.

The President came in. I was there. Ray LaHood came in, cut the knees out of Mr. Oberstar when he was chairman and said they weren't going to move forward, they weren't going to raise taxes. Now they call for raising taxes.

Well, 21 States have raised it. They have done the responsible thing, and they have to do it. It is better for them to do it because the overhead and the carrying charge is so great in Washington. So they have to do it.

Going to the well instead of raising gas taxes, now, didn't we recommend that to the other side and they ignored it? I think we need a double dose of ginkgo.

So I think now we step up to the plate and we help Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. RYAN. They will get us to December. The leadership of the House is committed to a long-term bill, and we will get that done, everybody working together. And maybe a few people having another little dose of ginkgo might help around here.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I must say it is one of the most bizarre and fanciful things I have ever heard. There never was a viable plan to go to year-end. The Republicans never proposed the revenues.

They just recently found revenues under couch cushions to get us through to December 18th. And they have not meaningfully addressed any long-term funding, despite having been in charge 4½ years, and he wants to blame us.

They just held the first hearing ever in Ways and Means on revenues just a couple of weeks ago, and the chairman started by saying, "No user fees."

Well, you have now ruled out the traditional way of paying for infrastructure. So they are going to have to come up with something else. But that was totally bizarre.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, for months Republicans have actually squandered an opportunity to develop and pass a long-term authorization for highway spending, and it is pretty regrettable, since May 19 Republicans simply brought up and passed another 2-month extension.

We have already heard—sometimes we lose count. Is it 33? Is it 34?—extensions. Unfortunately, here we are 2 months later and we are careening yet again to another Republican-made crisis, more gridlock for the highway trust fund, right in the middle of the critical construction season.

Hundreds of thousands of jobs, as has been said, and vital construction projects across the country are really hanging in the balance, and here we just have a few days left. What do we know? We know that Republicans don't have a plan and they don't have any ideas.

Well, we have some ideas, and those ideas are contained in the Grow America Act. I am one of the original co-sponsors. It is a 6-year, \$478 billion bill that would be a framework for our discussions. We could put that on the floor here today, vote on it, and make sure that we get underway.

But, oh, no, we are stuck yet again with another extension. Frankly, I am not really sure whether, when we get to December, we won't be stuck with yet another extension. This just goes on and on and on. The American people have had enough.

We know that, if we invest in our infrastructure, we create jobs, and we know that our infrastructure is falling apart. So this seems like a no-brainer to most Americans and to working people. And I don't understand what the complication here is, Mr. Speaker, but enough is enough.

It is time for Republicans to be the adults at the table to bring a plan and a program to the floor for a long-term authorization and put America back to work not 6 months at a time, not 2 months at a time, but for a long time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I again would like to remind my colleagues

that the Senate was controlled up until January by their party. The White House has been controlled for 6½ years by their party.

I know the ranking member at the time when the stimulus came out—as I recall, I believe he voted against the stimulus because they were going to squander \$800 billion.

If they would have listened to the ranking member at the time, they would have put much more or a lot more money into the investment of infrastructure. Instead of that \$800 billion bill, about \$68 billion went to transportation.

So everybody can point fingers at everybody, but the reality is here we are. We need to extend this so that the Ways and Means Committee and the Finance Committee in the Senate can figure out the dollars in a responsible way, not to continue to raise the debt and the deficit, but find a responsible funding level to get us to a 6-year bill, which I am committed to and I know Chairman RYAN has said many, many times in public he is committed to, and our leadership in the House is committed to a long-term bill.

Instead of pointing fingers at each other, let's figure out a way to move forward together, and I believe we will. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire as to the time left before we proceed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND). The gentleman has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the simple truth is, as has been articulated so well here today by my colleague, that this Nation desperately needs a long-term transportation funding bill to repair our Nation's crumbling infrastructure, not another kick-the-can-down-the-road, short-term, temporary, convoluted fix.

Last week Congress appropriately honored the late chairman of the Transportation Committee, Jim Oberstar, with the naming of his hometown post office in Chisholm, Minnesota. What a wonderful tribute it was to Chairman Oberstar.

But here we are once again kicking the can down the road on the issue that Jim Oberstar cared most about. As chairman, Jim worked hard to ensure the committee drafted good, strong, bipartisan legislation, and that is what we need here today.

If the Transportation Committee were allowed to do that, I have every confidence that we would indeed write a long-term transportation funding bill.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the trains are running off the tracks, the bridges are falling down, the wastewater treatment facilities are overflowing.

So let's do right by our good friend, former Congressman Jim Oberstar, and

let's create a long-term fix to our national transportation infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, I include an article for the RECORD.

[From The Washington Post, July 14, 2015]

HOUSE HONORS THE LATE REP. JIM OBERSTAR AS CONGRESS FUMBLES HIS GREATEST PASSION

(By Colby Itkowitz)

It was curious timing for House members to honor the late Democratic congressman Jim Oberstar.

On Monday evening, they voted to rename a post office after Oberstar in his hometown of Chisholm, Minn. Several members spoke on the floor about his deep institutional memory, passion for everything transportation and all-around collegiality.

"I'd 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 was the spirit that epitomized Jim Oberstar and that's how so he was successful in getting things done," Rep. Rick Nolan (D-Minn.), who represents Oberstar's former district, said in floor remarks.

But as Oberstar was being memorialized by his former colleagues, a Republican plan was being hatched to place another Band-Aid over the gaping, oozing wound that is federal highway program funding. Whatever short-term fix is agreed to, it will be just another patch to temporarily staunch the bleeding, when what's really needed is invasive surgery.

Oberstar knew this. He had a plan. And when he finally earned the gavel of the Transportation committee in 2007 (he'd begun his career as a young staffer on the then-Public Works panel and then, as a new congressman in 1975, climbed his way up from the lowest rung on the committee dais to the chairman's perch), he thought the Democratic majorities in both chambers and two years later the White House would lead to real investment in transportation.

But there was no political will then, or now, for the easiest immediate solution to ramp up revenue for the starved highway programs—raising the federal gas tax for the first time since 1993. Instead, Congress is poised to find a short-term fix to bailout the Highway Trust Fund for the seventh time since President George W. Bush first shifted money from the general treasury in 2008 to keep the trust fund solvent.

This time, with the highway program set to expire at the end of this month, House Budget Chairman Rep. Paul Ryan (R-Wis.) wants to find savings through complicated tax compliance rules to patch the highway program as lawmakers continue to fight over how to pay for a multi-year reauthorization, which has evaded Congress for years.

In 2009, when Oberstar released his six-year, \$450 billion plan for surface transportation, he warned that the short-term extensions don't allow state departments of transportation the certainty to plan for bigger, more ambitious projects. It's a sentiment that's been echoed by governors, mayors, big business and labor.

Oberstar, who lost his reelection in 2010, believed that if Democrats had passed his bill they would not have lost the House in those mid-term elections because the infrastructure jobs would have been such a boon to the economy.

It's of course impossible to know if that would have been true. But Oberstar, who died in May 2014, would probably feel quite conflicted this week—deeply honored by the post office naming and deeply disheartened that Congress still hasn't made transportation spending a priority.

Mr. SHUSTER. May I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 7 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oregon has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the words of my colleagues, who just spoke obviously on the need to do this and the need for a long-term transportation bill.

I remember Chairman Oberstar working diligently to try to do that in the six, seven extensions, I think, that we had at this time and never did come up with a transportation bill. That is why we are working so hard to make sure we have a good bipartisan bill.

I do rise in support of H.R. 3038. It is going to extend the current transportation law until December 18, 2015, until we can get that long-term bill in place.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Highways and Transit, I believe it is critical for Congress to come together on this bipartisan, long-term, surface transportation reauthorization bill.

In my home State of Missouri, we have nearly 35,000 highway miles and over 10,000 bridges that are begging for our attention.

Last month, I had a hearing focusing on the transportation needs of rural America. Our roads and bridges demonstrate why we need a strong Federal highway program. A network of efficient, interconnected roads is critical to moving people and goods and to the overall health of this economy.

That is why I am committed to working with Chairman SHUSTER, Chairman RYAN, and others to get a reauthorization bill done.

Federal surface transportation programs are set to expire at the end of this month, and Congress has to act to ensure that these programs continue and that the solvency of the highway trust fund is addressed.

State and local governments need to be able to plan for projects with confidence. They need certainty not just for the next 5 or 6 months, but for the next 5 or 6 years.

This bill enables us to continue our bipartisan efforts on a reauthorization bill, which we hope to accomplish by the end of the year.

We have a tremendous opportunity to secure that bill that is going to improve, rebuild, and modernize our Nation's transportation system, and it is time that we come together to do that.

I want to thank both of the chairmen on their work on H.R. 3038.

□ 1500

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I could not agree with the chairman of the committee more. I personally think that it is time to stop pointing fingers. There is enough bipartisan blame to go around. We didn't quite do the job when the economy was in free fall. We would have, a number of us—I know the ranking member would have—written the Recovery Act differently, but the point is we are here now with the challenge to fund it.

Six States, six Republican States have increased the gas tax already this year. I have got a proposal that is ready to go that could be passed in 2 weeks, and the committee could have the resources to actually fund the bill, but there could be other options. I know the ranking member has a barrel tax, a proposal to index the gas tax and bond against it. I don't care what it is that we do. I do care that we don't continue to stall.

It was exactly a year ago today we were standing here on this moment saying: Don't spill this to the end of the year; we need to get on with it because we will be right back here a year from now. And we are. It is time to act.

Mr. SHUSTER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE).

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. I want to thank my colleague for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this is just embarrassing. It is embarrassing that we are here talking about the umpteenth patch for the umpteenth time. Other countries around the world right now are looking at us and wondering whether or not the United States is still interested in leading. Let's forget the short-term patches. Let's finally deal with the problem.

The previous speaker, Mr. BLUMENAUER, is exactly right. Before coming here, as a State legislator in Pennsylvania, we had Democrats and Republicans band together and cast a very politically tough vote. It was the right thing to do. Both Democrats and Republicans did it, and now we are finally building bridges and repairing roads that we neglected for 20 years in our State.

It is time for the U.S. Federal Government to do exactly the same, right thing. Bite the bullet, and let's show that in America we can solve big problems and we can lead again.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Investing in infrastructure in America has always been extraordinarily bipartisan over the entire time I have been here. Recently, we have kind of gone off the tracks. It means we both have to cooperate on policy and on funding. For the life of me, why has the Republican Party drawn a line in the sand, saying we cannot have user fee-based investment in transportation

which benefits people who drive cars, pickup trucks, buses, everybody who moves goods in America, we can't do that anymore, we have got to come up with some fanciful tax reform which may or may not happen? It is very sad.

I proposed doing away with the retail gas tax, imposing a barrel tax, where some of the costs would be paid by ExxonMobil, Wall Street speculators, OPEC, Saudi Arabia, and, yes, they would probably pass a lot of it through at the pump, but that would be a fair way to move forward to make the massive investment we need to put hundreds of thousands of people back to work and get America moving again.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Oregon makes a good point. We are not spending the kind of dollars—at least, we are not spending wisely the kind of dollars, I would also add to that—to fix our infrastructure problem.

But we do face more difficult times today than we did when we set up the fund in the 1950s or even in the 1980s, as the economy grew. In the 1990s, the economy grew. Today we have an \$18 trillion debt. Republicans want to make sure this is fiscally responsible. We want to make sure we are just not layering something else on top of the American people.

More importantly, I hope my colleagues join with me to continue to reduce the regulatory burden that we have put out there to people who build the roads, who operate on the roads, the States that have to come up with a plan to building them.

So again, there is a lot of work to be done. I feel confident that Chairman RYAN and his committee will be able to come up with a funding level that we can continue to work to get a 6-year bill, which I think is essential to this Nation to give the certainty we need to help boost the economy.

A vote against this bill is a vote in favor of shutting down these vital programs, putting transportation projects and jobs across the country at risk, and furloughing Federal employees.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to speak in favor of this. Here is basically what we are trying to do:

We want to get to a long-term highway solution. We believe that, for the sake of jobs, the economy, certainty, planning big projects in our States, we want to do a multiyear highway bill, and typically a multiyear highway bill means a 6-year bill. That is our aspiration and our goal.

We know we are not going to write that bill in the next 2 weeks. We know we need at least 2 or 3 months to write that bill. Unfortunately, the highway trust fund has a fiscal shortfall in 2 weeks, so we are here to extend the highway trust fund through December

18 to give us the time we need to put together a multiyear solution. That costs \$8 billion just to do that. What we use are revenue compliance measures to make it easier for people to file their taxes, effectively, and some spending savings to get the \$8 billion. Not a single fee increase, not a single tax increase is in this bill to finance the extension of the highway trust fund solvency to December 18.

For example, TSA fees, TSA fees are not being increased. They are staying exactly the same as they are, so nobody getting on an airplane will see anything different. The difference is we keep those fees going to mandatory spending. We keep those fees going to where they are instead of going into discretionary spending where they can be spent in addition to other spending. So by walling off that money so Congress can't go spend it somewhere else, we save money by doing that.

Things like this are what we do. Savings for the taxpayer, tax compliance, easier to comply with your taxes, making sure that fees don't get spent in other areas are some important fiscal savings that we have to make sure that we can extend the solvency of the highway trust fund.

Now, the other point I would simply make is we believe that we have a chance of writing a big multiyear bill. That is why we are seeking this extension. If we didn't think that we had the chance and the opportunity on a bicameral, bipartisan basis to do a 6-year highway funding bill, then we would just do a 2-year bill like the other body is attempting to do. We think we can do a multiyear bill. We think there are ways of doing it, such as incorporating it with international tax reform, things that are important for the economy, things that are important for our businesses. We think that is an opportunity, and that is something that we are exploring on a bipartisan basis.

So for that reason and many others, I urge adoption of this. I think it makes sense. Where I come from in Wisconsin, the way we say it is: We have two seasons—road construction season and winter. The last thing we want to do is see road construction stop at the beginning of August. We need to give our construction, our highways, our people who are filling these construction projects a little certainty, at least get into the winter so they can finish the building season while we work out a long-term highway solution.

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

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

As was said, here we go again. A bill from the majority. They have been in power over 4 years, and the result is another patch. We need to do better. We know the state of highways and the infrastructure in this country, our national infrastructure, receives a D-plus grade, getting worse every day. So it has been said we need multiyear, and that is so true.

It is also being said that there needs to be a bipartisan, bicameral bill. I want to just talk to the chairman, to talk to this entire House, to talk to the Congress, having also met with the administration. There is no way to have a multiyear bill, 5, 6 years, unless it is truly bipartisan, involving Democrats as well as Republicans in both Houses.

We have come up with some ideas. We are suggesting today, for example, passage of the Stop Corporate Inversions Act that many others and I introduced some time ago. So we need to consider everything.

I want to close this way: We will not have a multiyear bill if lines are drawn not in sand, but in concrete. If the majority takes the position that some ideas cannot be considered, it is likely to lead infrastructure to another dead end. We need to do much better: multiyear, bipartisan, both Houses, with the administration. If we don't do that, the rest is talk.

This delay has cost millions of jobs. Everybody, including the majority, now talks about middle income and stagnation. Part of it is because we have been stagnant in terms of an infrastructure bill on a long-term basis. That has to stop. We need to put a big red sign that says "Stop" in front of the majority in this House and the entire House and the Congress and get busy on a bipartisan basis on a highway long-term bill, all infrastructure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Michigan has more speakers than I do, so if it is all right with him, why don't a few of the speakers on his side of the aisle go first.

Mr. LEVIN. We will be glad to do that. We are so full of vigor on this, we have lots of speakers.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), a member of our committee, who is also chair of our Caucus.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in the greatest, most capacitated nation on Earth, there is no excuse for so many crumbling roads and bridges and for the ever-growing traffic gridlock and congestion that we see every day that we try to get to work. There is no reason why hundreds of thousands of men and women in the construction industry today should remain unemployed because this Congress won't do its job of replenishing the highway trust fund. It is crazy.

We know that when we repair a road or a bridge, we put an American to work, and we make it easier for all of us to get to work so we can be more efficient. But here we are for the 34th time doing a patch to the highway trust fund, which doesn't help any city or county in America because you don't build a road or build a bridge or retrofit a bridge with 2 months of funding or 5 months of funding. You need 6 years to know how much money you can rely on because that contractor

doesn't buy cement or lumber for 2 months or 6 months. They buy for 4 or 5 years because, for them, time is money.

We are costing the American people a ton of money by doing these constant patches. Why? Because we are not willing to do what we were elected to do: our job. Instead of just spectating, we should be coming up with the funds to have those roads built and repaired, those bridges built and repaired, to replace those aging buses and trains that stop us from being efficient.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to do it the right way, the long way, a long-term fix, not this short-term patch.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures.

□ 1515

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of today's legislation that will ensure that our country's infrastructure needs are met.

The bottom line is we are all here. We have agreement on a lot of the discussion we are having today. We all want a multiyear highway bill. We all recognize that that is what our communities need. That is exactly why we need to pass this bill today, so that we can have that opportunity to discuss these issues over the next few months to come up with a multiyear bill.

It continues funding for construction projects through the end of the year, while giving us the time to come together on a solution that funds a multiyear transportation bill.

This is not just about the economy—it is about the economy, but not just about the economy. It is about jobs and jobs connected with construction and jobs connected with moving our goods across the country and in our communities. It is also about the quality of life that our constituents are having to deal with back home, stuck in traffic for an hour or 2 hours, trying to get home and not having time with their families.

There is a lot involved here with our discussion today and the benefits of a multiyear plan. Of course, when I go back home—just like any other Member—we drive on the highways. We see the need. We experience the congestion.

I want to go back and tell my constituents that we have listened to them, that we realize and recognize that there is a problem; but most of all, I want to go back and say: We have a plan. As Democrats and Republicans, we are going to work together on a multiyear plan that we can agree on to move this country forward, a plan that includes a multiyear highway bill that offers communities greater certainty to plan for the future, improves our roads and bridges, reduces congestion, and eases the movement of goods.

To get there, we must find a way—of course, this is where the rub comes in—to pay for it. By the end of the year, I want to be able to say to my constituents that we have met this challenge and that we have found a solution.

We can start by evaluating whether we can accomplish our goals through a solution that modernizes our international tax system, supports the competitiveness of our American companies, and secures funding for a multiyear transportation bill—and finally defining a permanent funding solution for our infrastructure needs.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask pardon for a pun I am about to use in my next sentence. The bill today can help drive us there and give us time to have these discussions.

Today, let's pass this bill; send it to the Senate, and let's get to work together, Mr. Speaker. People want us to work together on a multiyear solution to our transportation and infrastructure needs.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), an active member of our committee.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, in reference to the point that my friend, Sheriff REICHERT, just made, I would note the irony of his advocacy on behalf of a plan. I guess, after 35 short-term extensions, we haven't been able to find the time to develop a plan. You need years out to develop a plan.

Just weeks ago, in this very Chamber, our friends on the other side made a full-throttled argument about America remaining competitive in the world, and that is why we needed the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

Let me think about this for a moment. We want America to be competitive in the world, and we simultaneously allow America's infrastructure to crumble as we speak. Do you know what is going to get Congress to move, sadly enough? That catastrophe that awaits us somewhere across this country.

The European Union has a highway system that, in many instances, is the envy of the world; the Chinese are developing high-speed rail that is the envy of the world, and we are doing the 35th short-term extension on a highway bill.

Let me relate to our friends on the other side, as you travel across the Federal highway system, there is this great sign everywhere. It says the Dwight D. Eisenhower Federal highway system because a Republican President had the foresight and vision in the aftermath of World War II to develop a first-class Federal highway system.

You know what else he had? He had two great allies in the Congress: Lyndon Johnson, the majority leader in the Senate; and Sam Rayburn, who was the Speaker of this House—who helped sponsor legislation that gave us a system that was the envy of the world.

Mr. Speaker, 35 times we are not going to talk about extending the high-

way bill because we don't have time to develop a plan.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), another valued member of our committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, America is still falling apart and falling behind. We are looking now to slide again past the deadline towards the end of the year. The problem is we are still pretending we can pay for 2015 infrastructure with 1993 dollars. It isn't that hard. It doesn't take 6 months to come up with a funding stream.

I have legislation that is in the committee that could be acted on. We could follow the example of 20 States that have raised their user fees for transportation. We could get courage from the 6 Republican States that have raised their gas tax already this year.

Just a few days ago, in the State of Washington, the Republican-controlled State Senate approved a 15-cent gas tax increase. We could follow the example of Ronald Reagan in 1982, when he urged this Congress to bite the bullet and raise the gas tax. He proposed and Congress followed through on a 125 percent increase in the gas tax.

Somehow, my Republican friends are afraid to use the mechanism that is fast, that is accepted, that the people in the States—Republicans in the States—have the courage to undertake.

Why is it that this year is going to be any different than last year? Why will my speech be any different? Is it going to be cheaper? Is it going to become less complex? Are we going to have a little more backbone?

It is time for us to step up. I would hope that our Ways and Means Committee could take the next 2 weeks, follow regular order, and provide funding so that we could give the Transportation Committee the 2 months they need to fund it, and the job would be done.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), another valued member of our committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, what are we writing here, a new Magna Carta? They have had 4 years, for crying out loud; and we still don't have legislation in front of us.

It has been 2 months since we were last here. We had a lot of talks 2 months ago about how bad extensions are for transportation planning and policy, how the last extension was going to be the last extension. Nothing has changed.

You keep on talking about the anxiety over tax reform and tax change. What about the anxiety that the American people and the contractors and workers have of getting our roads and highways and airports up to snuff? The bill before us today has the Congress paying for our highways and transit systems with more gimmicks.

Tax compliance—these are the same provisions the House rejected last year. Transportation security administrative fees—Nick Calio at the airlines trade association rightfully criticizes: "This plan proposes to use tomorrow's dollars to pay for today's problems."

The international tax can be part of a solution to bridge the gap, but corporate America is counting on those revenues to lower their rates and not pay for highway spending. Using an international tax scheme now will make it that much more difficult to get back to a user fee system. The people who use the system should pay for the system. That is what we should be agreeing on.

The Ways and Means Committee did hold two hearings on renewing the trust fund—and we come to this?

This is the new Magna Carta. I am waiting to see the final results 6 months from now. It has been 10 years since this Congress passed a transportation bill. Neither party has the courage to deal with it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership on this very important issue.

I rise today in support of H.R. 3038. With the prospect of the highway trust fund dollars and spending authority expiring in just over 2 weeks, this bill is a critical step to give our States the certainty that they need to continue work on important infrastructure projects back home. This bill gives the House and the Senate time to work together toward a long-term highway package by the end of the year.

It is also important to note that this bill includes provisions I have pushed for to help many small businesses by establishing a chronological set of due dates for them to pay their taxes. The current law fails to do this, which causes small business and their owners unnecessary grief, time, and money.

I have worked during the past two Congresses on legislation to fix this problem, and I am pleased that the House is acting today to take another burden off the shoulders of small-business people.

I urge support of H.R. 3038.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), another valued member of our committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we all know that on July 31, the highway trust fund will expire, but we didn't just learn it. It is not that we just found out last week or last month. We have always known it. Now, we come to where we are backed up against the wall.

We know we need a long-term fix, but I am going to vote for a short-term fix. I am going to vote for it because I want the contractors in my State to keep

working. I want the construction workers to keep laying concrete. I want the bridgebuilders to keep repairing bridges.

We can't afford to have a short season. In Illinois, if you don't do construction now, you may not get a chance to do much.

On the basis of the logic of keeping the construction industry moving, I vote "yes" for the highway bill that we are considering today.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to respond to the gentleman from Chicago.

As a person who represents the State line and drives to O'Hare every week, back and forth, I want to add to the comment. They are in the middle of road construction right now on I-90 going to Chicago. If we don't pass this bill, construction projects like that will stop.

By the way, we need more construction in the Chicagoland area, just like we do around the rest of America. That is why we have to pass this.

I think the gentleman from Illinois hit it right, which is, yes, we knew this was coming; but it takes a while to figure out how to do things like rewrite international tax laws, something we haven't done for decades. It takes a while to figure out how to come up with long-term financing of something like a highway trust fund.

We know that we cannot come up with that answer within the next 2 weeks. We don't want to see these construction projects like the really important one on I-90 and I-94 going to O'Hare—and everywhere else in America—stop in 2 weeks.

That is why this is necessary. We don't like patches anymore than anybody else does, but this patch is necessary to make sure that those projects don't stop.

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

□ 1530

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), a truly valued member of our committee and this Congress.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong concern with yet another stop-gap measure. Nearly 60 years ago, a Republican President, Dwight Eisenhower, led the charge to create the Interstate Highway System. He realized that good roads were not just about commerce and economic development, they are a national security priority to keep America safe.

I have said it before and I will remind you again: there is no such thing as a Republican road or a Democratic bridge. Today, American roads and bridges, American transit, and American highways are crumbling. This is a national embarrassment.

We have already rolled the ball down the road more than 30 times, and here we are doing it again. The time for talk

is past. In the words of Dr. King: We have been bogged down in the paralysis of analysis for too long.

Delay for another day is not an option. American jobs are on the line. In a few short weeks, transportation projects across our country will grind to a stop. We must act, and we must act now.

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

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

As I think back, we have been doing this so often, and our chairman said it takes a while. It has been a decade.

I just want to emphasize, if we are no longer going to take a while but do it right, it is going to have to be done on a truly bipartisan basis.

There is a tendency, I think, to go off on a wild goose chase, and that won't build highways. And it won't build if one party doesn't work with another, if the Senate doesn't work with the House. Now we have the Senate seeming to go a different way on a short-term thinking they can do a long-term. Chaos doesn't build highways. So I really hope, however we vote on this bill, that there will be a new dedication to doing what is so long overdue.

All the talk about middle class incomes essentially goes up in smoke when we fail to do what is so clearly in the interest of middle class jobs, and that is to build highways, to repair bridges, to take care of airports, to take care of our infrastructure.

Coming from Michigan, I am ashamed of the state of highways in Michigan compared to when I was a kid and later on. Disrepair has essentially been the hallmark of highway and infrastructure in this country because there has been a failure to step up to the plate.

I just want to finish by saying: Don't put anything aside. Don't say anything can't be considered because that is a ticket, really, to another bridge to nowhere.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I will spare the cliches and just simply say I think this is important that we get this done. Both parties have patched this trust fund for, as the gentleman said, 10 years.

Part of the problem we have right now, Mr. Speaker, is the revenue source for highways is a revenue source that is no longer relevant, that doesn't work anymore. Gas taxes don't work well.

Why?

There is a good reason why. We get much better gas mileage. Our engine technology is better. Some cars don't even use gas. They are electric, and therefore, as a result, we don't pay as much for the highways we use, and that is the problem.

So we are trying to figure out what is a way we can bridge finance the highway trust fund so that we can come up with a new revenue source for the long

term. That means we have to have a medium term, a 6-year highway bill to make sure that the construction that we need to get done gets done, and that is going to take us some time to figure this out.

That is why we need to have this patch to give us that time, because if we fail to pass this extension right now, then I can, sure as day, tell you what will come over from the other body will be a medium, about an 18-month extension, and that will come through here, and we will not get the bridge we need. We will not get the ability to give multiyear projects the ability to plan and get off the ground, and we will not have done our jobs.

So in order to give us a chance to do our jobs, to get the long-term solution in place, to work on these big issues, we need to get ourselves a few more months' time. That is why I think, on a bipartisan basis, Members understand and appreciate this situation and therefore will, hopefully, support this.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for H.R. 3038, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015, because our nation cannot afford a surface transportation shutdown. There are still upwards of 15 million Americans either unemployed or underemployed, and a lapse in highway funding—however brief—would jeopardize thousands of Americans' livelihoods. My hope is that Republicans will stop careening toward crisis and finally pass a long-term measure to fix our aging infrastructure and put Americans to work. I am proud to support such a solution: today's Democratic Motion to Recommit aimed to allow a vote to re-authorize a long-term Transportation Bill to provide 6 years of funding for states and localities to repair crumbling roads and bridges. The time has come to stop governing by crisis and start making long-term investments to build a full employment society.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, roads, bridges, and railroads are crumbling all across America. In North Carolina, which used to be known as the "good roads" state, over 5,500 bridges are structurally unsound, and poor roads cost drivers \$1.5 billion a year. That's why I am so frustrated that instead of seizing the opportunity to build a viable transportation system with a long-term highway-transit bill, Republican leaders have instead elected to once again kick the can down the proverbial road and forgo critical repairs and safety improvements, to say nothing of new construction.

Despite these grave reservations, I will vote for today's 5-month extension because I believe it will allow congressional leaders to negotiate the comprehensive transportation overhaul we so desperately need. However, like President Obama, I will not support future efforts to shirk the responsibility of rebuilding our nation's infrastructure.

Short-term, stop-gap, extension-to-extension governance has become the norm over the past few years, and I'm frankly fed up with it. House Democrats are ready to get serious about making the investments we need to make to thrive as a country—I strongly encourage Republicans to answer the call.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of a long-term surface transportation bill.

It's disappointing that Congress once again has failed to propose a long-term solution to invest in our nation's roads, bridges, and rails.

The bill being brought to the floor is nothing more than a Band Aid: however, without this temporary fix, the Department of Transportation would be unable to fund new obligations to repair America's crumbling roads and fix our Nation's vast infrastructure problems. The reality is our nation's investment in infrastructure is woefully inadequate. These shortfalls hurt our constituents and damage our entire economy.

In Alabama, twenty percent of our major city streets are in poor condition. Driving on deteriorating roads costs motorists approximately \$1.4 billion a year.

Across our country, an estimated one in three fatal traffic accidents is caused by roads that are in poor or mediocre condition. Moreover, The American Society of Civil Engineers estimates that one out of every nine bridges in the U.S. is structurally deficient.

By building the infrastructure of tomorrow, we would create thousands of good-paying construction jobs that help more hard-working Americans earn a living.

Investing in our infrastructure would also enhance our economic competitiveness by reducing transit costs and travel delays.

We can't continue to kick the can down the road—we must do better by our constituents. There's no reason why Congress cannot pass a long-term plan that would fix our aging infrastructure and boost our nation's economic development.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3064, the GROW AMERICA Act, a bill that underscores the urgent need for a long-term investment in our Country's transportation infrastructure.

With only eighteen days left before the Highway Trust Fund expires on July 31st, we should be urgently seeking out a long term solution.

Instead, we are considering H.R. 3038, another short term extension of the Highway Trust Fund that only provides five months of additional funding. This five month quick-fix fails to provide America with the stability of a more permanent solution. Passing this bill only continues the repeated pattern of kicking the can down the road, further putting off the sensible solution that we owe to our constituents.

In my home state of Texas, 38 percent of roads are in mediocre or poor condition, forcing drivers to spend approximately \$5.3 billion annually on otherwise unnecessary automotive repairs. With 19% of our state's bridges being structurally deficient, it is clear that a sweeping bipartisan effort is needed to invest in the future of America's infrastructure.

Without a long term extension, many states are unable to plan future construction projects, providing much needed repair to deteriorating roads. This is particularly crippling for Texas, which has a longer construction season because of its climate.

In the Dallas area specifically, we currently have nine major construction projects costing in excess of \$275 million that would be put on hold, in the event that the highway trust fund runs out of money. This is simply unfair. It is harmful to the growth that this region is experi-

encing, and places an unnecessary burden on Dallas residents and their ability to commute safely.

Just a few months ago, I spoke out against the House's refusal to take up long term action on the Highway Trust Fund; and yet, we are again attempting to put a band-aid on a deep cut to America's transportation needs

By contrast, H.R. 3064, the GROW AMERICA Act seeks to address the harmful impacts of continuous stop-gap funding. This bill infuses our economy with transportation infrastructure investment, providing \$478 billion over six years for highways, bridges, public transportation, highway safety, and rail programs.

Enacting a six-year GROW AMERICA Act adds nearly two million jobs, compared to another extension of surface transportation programs, and is desperately needed to improve transportation quality across the nation.

I urge my colleagues to call their transportation departments, if they have not already, and find out how short funding patches in Federal highway funds would affect their states. Bridge replacements, traffic decongestion projects, and road widening efforts, all impact safety, time, money and jobs; all of which stand to be harmed by short-term funding.

Mr. Speaker, with only eighteen days until the Highway Trust Fund runs out of money, I urge my colleagues to support the GROW AMERICA Act, a multi-year solution that provides states with the funding necessary to adequately invest in their infrastructure.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I support workers and the important transportation and infrastructure jobs they do. They deserve the certainty and support that a long-term, well-funded highway funding bill would provide. H.R. 3038 is not that bill.

Our infrastructure is rated a D+ by the American Society of Civil Engineers. A transportation system that was once the envy of the world has fallen into disrepair. We've passed dozens of short-term extensions over the past decade, and they haven't done the trick.

We know where this bill will leave us: infrastructure projects won't be planned beyond December, long-overdue projects will hang in limbo, and workers will be left wondering if they'll spend the holidays unemployed.

Every business owner, worker, and state and local official I have spoken with has asked for the same thing: a long-term, well-funded bill. In order to do that, we need to make a commitment to filling the funding gap from the gas tax—which has not been increased in more than two decades.

I support gradually raising the gas tax to pay for our infrastructure priorities. I also joined 184 of my Democratic colleagues in supporting a motion that would have paid for a long-term, well-funded highway bill by preventing corporate tax inversions—the process of moving corporate headquarters overseas. Just one Republican supported that proposal. Doing either of those things would sustain the vital infrastructure investments we need.

Those who suggest we can't afford a good highway bill are wrong. We are the richest country in the world at the richest time in our history. Funding our roads and bridges is a priority. We can afford it, and the American people demand that we do.

What we cannot do is continue the path of unpredictability and short-term planning that

results from these stopgap measures for our highways, bridges, and other infrastructure projects. That is why I voted against H.R. 3038.

This is the greatest country in the world, and there is nothing we cannot do. It's time to act accordingly by advancing a long-term, well-funded transportation bill.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 362, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I am opposed, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Van Hollen moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3038 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE IV—STOP CORPORATE EXPATRIATION AND INVEST IN AMERICA'S INFRASTRUCTURE ACT

SEC. 4001. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Stop Corporate Expatriation and Invest in America's Infrastructure Act of 2015".

SEC. 4002. MODIFICATIONS TO RULES RELATING TO INVERTED CORPORATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(b) INVERTED CORPORATIONS TREATED AS DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 7701(a)(4), a foreign corporation shall be treated for purposes of this title as a domestic corporation if—

“(A) such corporation would be a surrogate foreign corporation if subsection (a)(2) were applied by substituting ‘80 percent’ for ‘60 percent’, or

“(B) such corporation is an inverted domestic corporation.

“(2) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—For purposes of this subsection, a foreign corporation shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

“(A) the entity completes after May 8, 2014, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

“(i) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation, or

“(ii) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership, and

“(B) after the acquisition, either—

“(i) more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

“(I) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation, or

“(II) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former

partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership, or

“(ii) the management and control of the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity occurs, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States, and such expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities.

“(3) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—A foreign corporation described in paragraph (2) shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group. For purposes of subsection (a)(2)(B)(iii) and the preceding sentence, the term ‘substantial business activities’ shall have the meaning given such term under regulations in effect on May 8, 2014, except that the Secretary may issue regulations increasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute substantial business activities for purposes of this paragraph.

“(4) MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL.—For purposes of paragraph (2)(B)(ii)—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations for purposes of determining cases in which the management and control of an expanded affiliated group is to be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States. The regulations prescribed under the preceding sentence shall apply to periods after May 8, 2014.

“(B) EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND SENIOR MANAGEMENT.—Such regulations shall provide that the management and control of an expanded affiliated group shall be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States if substantially all of the executive officers and senior management of the expanded affiliated group who exercise day-to-day responsibility for making decisions involving strategic, financial, and operational policies of the expanded affiliated group are based or primarily located within the United States. Individuals who in fact exercise such day-to-day responsibilities shall be treated as executive officers and senior management regardless of their title.

“(5) SIGNIFICANT DOMESTIC BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—For purposes of paragraph (2)(B)(ii), an expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities if at least 25 percent of—

“(A) the employees of the group are based in the United States,

“(B) the employee compensation incurred by the group is incurred with respect to employees based in the United States,

“(C) the assets of the group are located in the United States, or

“(D) the income of the group is derived in the United States,

determined in the same manner as such determinations are made for purposes of determining substantial business activities under regulations referred to in paragraph (3) as in effect on May 8, 2014, but applied by treating all references in such regulations to ‘foreign country’ and ‘relevant foreign country’ as references to ‘the United States’. The Secretary may issue regulations decreasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute significant domestic business activities for purposes of this paragraph.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Clause (i) of section 7874(a)(2)(B) of such Code is amended by striking “after March 4, 2003,” and inserting “after March 4, 2003, and before May 9, 2014.”.

(2) Subsection (c) of section 7874 of such Code is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii)” and inserting “subsections (a)(2)(B)(ii) and (b)(2)(B)(i)”, and

(ii) by inserting “or (b)(2)(A)” after “(a)(2)(B)(i)” in subparagraph (B),

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting “or (b)(2)(B)(i), as the case may be,” after “(a)(2)(B)(ii)”.

(C) in paragraph (5), by striking “subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii)” and inserting “subsections (a)(2)(B)(ii) and (b)(2)(B)(i)”, and

(D) in paragraph (6), by inserting “or inverted domestic corporation, as the case may be,” after “surrogate foreign corporation”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after May 8, 2014.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

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

Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, we have a very sad state of affairs here. We know we have an urgent problem with respect to infrastructure around America. Our roads, our bridges, our transitways are in disrepair at a time when we should actually be investing more to modernize our American infrastructure so we can compete and put people back to work.

And yet what do we have from our Republican colleagues? More of the same. Five more months of inadequate funding, no certainty for people who need to plan for projects. People are going to face layoffs again. So we have an urgent problem, and the response we get from our Republican colleagues is 5 months of inadequate funding.

We have put forward a 6-year plan, the first 2 years fully funded of a more robust plan. How do we fund it? We fund it by saying “no more” to the companies, the American companies that are cheating the American taxpayers by inversion.

So what are they doing? They are simply changing their addresses to an overseas address so they don't have to pay any more into helping our infrastructure and helping our country.

Let me give you an example of what these companies are doing. They are not moving their employees. They are not moving their management. They are not moving their factories or anything else. They are just changing their mailing address by acquiring a small foreign company and, in doing so, saying: We are not going to pay any more of our taxes.

So to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, I think most Americans would disagree with you that we need more time. We don't need 5 more months to figure out that these corporations are cheating, as taxpayers, by using these special provisions. We can close this tax loophole right now. In fact, about 30 of these companies have inverted in the last 5 years.

So we want to wait another 5 months and allow 5, 10 more to use this tax device to escape their responsibilities to the American taxpayer? Why should we do that?

Let's do the right thing, and let's do it right now. We have that within our power. That is what the legislation that we have put forward is all about. Let's invest in our national infrastructure, and let's use it by getting the savings from these companies that are engaging in these inversion tax practices.

I am pleased to yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank my colleague.

Mr. SPEAKER, Republicans and Democrats until this Congress have always agreed that the way you build an economy is by building highways, bridges, tunnels, and transit.

With this Congress, Mr. Speaker, under this Republican Congress, we are not building; we are patching. As a result, the American people are sitting in more traffic, longer rush hours, with higher repair bills.

Well, this is a choice, Mr. Speaker. Under the Republican plan, we can kick the can down the crumbling highway. We can patch through December, telling construction workers we don't know if they are going to work after that. We can fund the status quo.

Or, under this plan, we can be big, bold, and fair. We have 6 years of work, a 6-year extension of the highway trust fund, \$40 billion in jobs and construction. It is funded not by asking Americans to dig deeper into their pockets or take something from their paychecks. It is funded by telling America's corporations they cannot establish an address for themselves in the Caribbean in order to avoid paying their fair share of taxes right here at home.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are fed up. They are sitting in traffic. They can feel their tires hitting the potholes. They are told we can't afford to fix those potholes because we don't have the money. They sit in longer rush hours. Meanwhile, corporations rush to the Caribbean to avoid paying their fair share of taxes to fix the potholes.

This is the choice: Will we protect tax gimmicks for America's biggest corporations, or will we protect the American taxpayer and America's workers?

Our proposal, Mr. Speaker, grows jobs, creates sustainable growth and paychecks. It fixes potholes. It fixes our highways and transit. It gets Americans to their jobs on time. It rebuilds our economy by rebuilding jobs. And it is a choice we are making today.

The choice is this, Mr. Speaker: Will we protect tax gimmicks for tax dodgers, or will we protect jobs for the American people?

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I have a few points.

Number one, I am looking through the bill, the motion to recommit here. There is no 6-year plan in here. There is no 6-year highway project plan in here. They may have proposed one, but it is not being offered here today. All this bill does is the stop corporate expatriation and invest in America's infrastructure, but there is no invest in America's infrastructure here, just the tax increase.

Let's speak to that.

We have heard speaker after speaker after speaker here from the other side of the aisle say: You are getting away from gas taxes to fund highways, to fund infrastructure.

What does this do? This isn't a gas tax increase. So you are moving away from the user fee principle yourself in your own rhetoric.

Let's speak to the substance of this particular proposal. This proposal will do a couple of things.

Number one, it will encourage foreign companies to buy U.S. companies. You might as well say this is the Buy American Company Act of 2015.

Number two, it will encourage U.S. corporate headquarters to move overseas. Don't take my word for it. That is the characterization of this bill by the Senior Democratic Policy chair, the senior Senator from New York, who has said this policy will encourage U.S. headquarters to be moved overseas.

□ 1545

Inversions are bad. We want to stop inversions. But to quote the Treasury Secretary of the other side's party, the way to stop inversions is tax reform.

Why are we here doing this patch? So that we can give ourselves the time to do tax reform, to do international tax reform, so that we can prevent inversions. That is the whole purpose of this episode that we are having here.

So not only is this really bad policy, it doesn't work. It won't affect what they are trying to do.

If you want to stop inversions, you have got to do tax reforms. Adding more obstacles to U.S. companies doesn't stop U.S. companies from moving. It simply says that they are more ripe for takeovers by foreign companies.

There is a very dangerous trend, Mr. Speaker, of foreign companies buying

U.S. companies. It is happening at an alarming pace. If this were to pass, it would accelerate that pace.

And the way that this is written, it would say: If you have your headquarters in America, as an American company, you had better move them overseas. Why would we want to do that?

The real solution is tax reform, make America more competitive and make America the place you want to have your corporate headquarters.

Let's have American companies buy foreign companies instead of the other way around. That is what we should be doing.

Let's just have a little truth in advertising here. This doesn't stop inversions. This accelerates American companies being bought by foreign companies. It accelerates American headquarters going overseas, and it doesn't fund anything for the next 6 years.

So with that and many other reasons, I urge a 'no' vote on this motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage, if ordered; the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 2722; and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 185, nays 244, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 440]

YEAS—185

Adams	Cohen	Gabbard
Aguilar	Connolly	Gallego
Ashford	Conyers	Garamendi
Bass	Cooper	Graham
Beatty	Costa	Grayson
Becerra	Courtney	Green, Al
Bera	Crowley	Green, Gene
Bishop (GA)	Cuellar	Grijalva
Blumenauer	Cummings	Gutiérrez
Bonamici	Davis (CA)	Hahn
Boyle, Brendan F.	Davis, Danny	Hastings
Brady (PA)	DeFazio	Heck (WA)
Brown (FL)	DeGette	Higgins
Brownley (CA)	Delaney	Himes
Bustos	DeLauro	Hinojosa
Butterfield	DelBene	Honda
Capps	DeSaunier	Hoyer
Capuano	Deutch	Huffman
Cárdenas	Dingell	Israel
Carney	Doggett	Jackson Lee
Carter (IN)	Doyle, Michael F.	Jeffries
Cartwright	F.	Johnson (GA)
Castor (FL)	Duckworth	Johnson, E. B.
Castro (TX)	Edwards	Jones
Chu, Judy	Ellison	Kaptur
Cicilline	Eshoo	Keating
Clark (MA)	Esty	Kelly (IL)
Clarke (NY)	Farr	Kennedy
Clay	Fattah	Kildee
Cleaver	Foster	Kilmer
Clyburn	Frankel (FL)	Kind
	Fudge	Kirkpatrick

Kuster	Nadler	Scott, David
Langevin	Napolitano	Serrano
Larsen (WA)	Neal	Sewell (AL)
Larson (CT)	Nolan	Sherman
Lawrence	Norcross	Sinema
Lee	O'Rourke	Sires
Levin	Pallone	Slaughter
Lewis	Payne	Smith (WA)
Lieu, Ted	Pelosi	Speier
Lipinski	Perlmutter	Swalwell (CA)
Loebsock	Peters	Takai
Lofgren	Peterson	Takano
Lowenthal	Pingree	Thompson (CA)
Lowe	Pocan	Thompson (MS)
Lujan Grisham (NM)	Polis	Titus
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Price (NC)	Tonko
Lynch	Quigley	Torres
Maloney, Carolyn	Rangel	Tsongas
Maloney, Sean	Rice (NY)	Van Hollen
Matsui	Richmond	Vargas
McCullum	Roybal-Allard	Veasey
McDermott	Ruiz	Vela
McGovern	Ruppersberger	Velázquez
McNerney	Rush	Vislosky
Meeks	Ryan (OH)	Walz
Meng	Sánchez, Linda T.	Wasserman
Moore	Sánchez, Loretta	Waters, Maxine
Moulton	Schakowsky	Watson Coleman
Murphy (FL)	Schiff	Welch
	Scott (VA)	Wilson (FL)
		Yarmuth

NAYS—244

Abraham	Forbes	Lummis
Aderholt	Fortenberry	MacArthur
Allen	Fox	Marchant
Amash	Franks (AZ)	Marino
Amodei	Frelinghuysen	Massie
Babin	Garrett	McCarthy
Barletta	Gibbs	McCaul
Barr	Gibson	McClintock
Barton	Gohmert	McHenry
Benishek	Goodlatte	McKinley
Bilirakis	Gosar	McMorris
Bishop (MI)	Gowdy	Rodgers
Black	Granger	McSally
Blackburn	Graves (GA)	Meadows
Blum	Graves (LA)	Meehan
Bost	Graves (MO)	Messer
Boustany	Griffith	Mica
Brady (TX)	Grothman	Miller (FL)
Brat	Guinta	Miller (MI)
Bridenstine	Guthrie	Moolenaar
Brooks (AL)	Hanna	Mooney (WV)
Brooks (IN)	Hardy	Mullin
Buchanan	Harper	Mulvaney
Buck	Harris	Murphy (PA)
Bucshon	Hartzler	Neugebauer
Burgess	Heck (NV)	Newhouse
Byrne	Hensarling	Noem
Calvert	Herrera Beutler	Nugent
Carter (GA)	Hice, Jody B.	Nunes
Carter (TX)	Hill	Olson
Chabot	Holding	Palazzo
Chaffetz	Hudson	Palmer
Clawson (FL)	Huelskamp	Pascrell
Coffman	Huizenga (MI)	Paulsen
Cole	Hultgren	Pearce
Collins (GA)	Hunter	Perry
Collins (NY)	Hurd (TX)	Pittenger
Comstock	Hurt (VA)	Pitts
Conaway	Issa	Poe (TX)
Cook	Jenkins (KS)	Poliquin
Costello (PA)	Jenkins (WV)	Pompeo
Cramer	Johnson (OH)	Posey
Crawford	Johnson, Sam	Price, Tom
Crenshaw	Jolly	Ratcliffe
Culberson	Jordan	Reed
Curbelo (FL)	Joyce	Reichert
Davis, Rodney	Katko	Renacci
Denham	Kelly (MS)	Ribble
Dent	Kelly (PA)	Rice (SC)
DeSantis	King (IA)	Rigell
DesJarlais	King (NY)	Roby
Diaz-Balart	Kinzinger (IL)	Roe (TN)
Dold	Kline	Rogers (AL)
Donovan	Knight	Rogers (KY)
Duffy	Labrador	Rohrabacher
Duncan (SC)	LaMalfa	Rokita
Duncan (TN)	Lamborn	Rooney (FL)
Ellmers (NC)	Lance	Ros-Lehtinen
Emmer (MN)	Latta	Roskam
Farenthold	LoBiondo	Ross
Fincher	Long	Rothfus
Fitzpatrick	Loudermilk	Rouzer
Fleischmann	Love	Royce
Fleming	Lucas	Russell
Flores	Luetkemeyer	Ryan (WI)

Salmon Stutzman Wenstrup
 Sanford Thompson (PA) Westerman
 Scalise Thornberry Westmoreland
 Schweikert Tiberi Whitfield
 Scott, Austin Tipton Williams
 Sensenbrenner Trott Wilson (SC)
 Sessions Turner Wittman
 Shimkus Upton Womack
 Shuster Valadao Woodall
 Simpson Wagner Yoder
 Smith (MO) Walberg Yoho
 Smith (NE) Walden Young (AK)
 Smith (NJ) Walker Young (IA)
 Smith (TX) Walorski Young (IN)
 Stefanik Walters, Mimi Zeldin
 Stewart Weber (TX) Zinke
 Stivers Webster (FL)

Hardy Maloney, Ryan (OH)
 Harper Carolyn Ryan (WI)
 Harris Marchant Sanchez, Loretta
 Hastings Marino Sarbanes
 Heck (WA) McCarthy Scalise
 Hensarling McCaul Schiff
 Herrera Beutler McHenry Scott, David
 Higgins McKinley Serrano
 Hill McMorris Sessions
 Himes Rodgers Sewell (AL)
 Hinojosa McNerney Sherman
 Holding McSally Shimkus
 Honda Meadows Shuster
 Hoyer Meehan Simpson
 Hudson Meeks Sinema
 Huffman Meng Sires
 Huizenga (MI) Messer Slaughter
 Hultgren Mica Smith (MO)
 Hunter Miller (FL) Smith (NE)
 Hurd (TX) Miller (MI) Smith (NJ)
 Hurt (VA) Moonen Smith (TX)
 Israel Mooney (WV) Smith (WA)
 Issa Mullin Stefanik
 Jackson Lee Murphy (FL) Stewart
 Jeffries Murphy (PA) Stivers
 Jenkins (KS) Nadler Stutzman
 Jenkins (WV) Napolitano Swalwell (CA)
 Johnson (GA) Newhouse Takai
 Johnson (OH) Noem Takano
 Johnson, E. B. Nolan Thompson (CA)
 Johnson, Sam Norcross Thompson (PA)
 Joyce Nugent Thornberry
 Katko Nunes Tiberi
 Keating O'Rourke Titus
 Kelly (MS) Olson Torres
 Kelly (PA) Pallone Trott
 Kilmer Paulsen Turner
 King (IA) Payne Upton
 King (NY) Pelosi Valadao
 Kinzinger (IL) Peterson Vargas
 Kirkpatrick Pingree Veasey
 Kline Pittenger Vela
 Knight Pitts Velázquez
 Kuster Pocan Wagner
 LaMalfa Poe (TX) Walberg
 Lance Poliquin Walden
 Langevin Price (NC) Walorski
 Larsen (WA) Price, Tom Walters, Mimi
 Lawrence Quigley Walz
 Lee Reed Wasserman
 Levin Reichert Schultz
 Lewis Richmond Waters, Maxine
 Lieu, Ted Roby Watson Coleman
 Lipinski Roe (TN) Webster (FL)
 LoBiondo Rogers (AL) Wenstrup
 Loeb sack Rogers (KY) Westerman
 Lofgren Rohrabacher Whitfield
 Long Rokita Williams
 Love Rooney (FL) Wilson (FL)
 Lowenthal Ros-Lehtinen Wilson (SC)
 Lowey Roskam Wittman
 Lucas Ross Womack
 Luetkemeyer Rouzer Woodall
 Lujan Grisham Roybal-Allard Yarmuth
 (NM) Royce Young (AK)
 Lujan, Ben Ray Ruiz Young (IA)
 (NM) Ruppersberger Young (IN)
 Lynch Rush Zeldin
 MacArthur Russell Zinke

Perlmutter Rothfus Tipton
 Perry Salmon Tonko
 Peters Sánchez, Linda Tsongas
 Polis T. Van Hollen
 Pompeo Sanford Vislosky
 Posey Schakowsky Walker
 Rangel Schrader Weber (TX)
 Ratcliffe Schweikert Welch
 Renacci Scott (VA) Westmoreland
 Ribble Scott, Austin Yoder
 Rice (NY) Sensenbrenner Yoho
 Rice (SC) Speier
 Rigell Thompson (MS)

NOT VOTING—2

Beyer Engel
 Bishop (UT) Schrader

NOT VOTING—4

□ 1613

Messrs. WENSTRUP, DUNCAN of Tennessee, BROOKS of Alabama, MACARTHUR, HULTGREN, PITTENGER, and HARDY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Messrs. PETERS and LARSON of Connecticut changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 312, noes 119, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 441]

AYES—312

Abraham Castro (TX) Donovan
 Adams Chabot Duckworth
 Aderholt Chaffetz Duncan (TN)
 Allen Chu, Judy Ellison
 Ashford Cicilline Ellmers (NC)
 Babin Clarke (NY) Emmer (MN)
 Barr Clyburn Eshoo
 Barton Coffman Esty
 Bass Cohen Farr
 Beatty Cole Fattah
 Benishek Collins (NY) Fincher
 Bera Comstock Fitzpatrick
 Bilirakis Conaway Fleischmann
 Bishop (GA) Connolly Forbes
 Bishop (MI) Conyers Fortenberry
 Bishop (UT) Cook Foster
 Black Costa Fox
 Bonamici Costello (PA) Frankel (FL)
 Bost Cramer Frelinghuysen
 Boustany Crawford Gabbard
 Boyle, Brendan Crenshaw Gallego
 F. Crowley Garamendi
 Brady (PA) Cuellar Gibbs
 Brady (TX) Culberson Gibson
 Brooks (IN) Curbelo (FL) Goodlatte
 Brownley (CA) Davis (CA) Gowdy
 Buchanan Davis, Danny Graham
 Bucshon Davis, Rodney Granger
 Burgess DeFazio Graves (LA)
 Bustos Delaney Graves (MO)
 Butterfield DelBene Grayson
 Calvert Denham Green, Al
 Capps Dent Green, Gene
 Capuano Deutch Guinta
 Carson (IN) Diaz-Balart Guthrie
 Carter (GA) Dingell Hahn
 Carter (TX) Dold Hanna

Hardy Maloney, Ryan (OH)
 Harper Carolyn Ryan (WI)
 Harris Marchant Sanchez, Loretta
 Hastings Marino Sarbanes
 Heck (WA) McCarthy Scalise
 Hensarling McCaul Schiff
 Herrera Beutler McHenry Scott, David
 Higgins McKinley Serrano
 Hill McMorris Sessions
 Himes Rodgers Sewell (AL)
 Hinojosa McNerney Sherman
 Holding McSally Shimkus
 Honda Meadows Shuster
 Hoyer Meehan Simpson
 Hudson Meeks Sinema
 Huffman Meng Sires
 Huizenga (MI) Messer Slaughter
 Hultgren Mica Smith (MO)
 Hunter Miller (FL) Smith (NE)
 Hurd (TX) Miller (MI) Smith (NJ)
 Hurt (VA) Moonen Smith (TX)
 Israel Mooney (WV) Smith (WA)
 Issa Mullin Stefanik
 Jackson Lee Murphy (FL) Stewart
 Jeffries Murphy (PA) Stivers
 Jenkins (KS) Nadler Stutzman
 Jenkins (WV) Napolitano Swalwell (CA)
 Johnson (GA) Newhouse Takai
 Johnson (OH) Noem Takano
 Johnson, E. B. Nolan Thompson (CA)
 Johnson, Sam Norcross Thompson (PA)
 Joyce Nugent Thornberry
 Katko Nunes Tiberi
 Keating O'Rourke Titus
 Kelly (MS) Olson Torres
 Kelly (PA) Pallone Trott
 Kilmer Paulsen Turner
 King (IA) Payne Upton
 King (NY) Pelosi Valadao
 Kinzinger (IL) Peterson Vargas
 Kirkpatrick Pingree Veasey
 Kline Pittenger Vela
 Knight Pitts Velázquez
 Kuster Pocan Wagner
 LaMalfa Poe (TX) Walberg
 Lance Poliquin Walden
 Langevin Price (NC) Walorski
 Larsen (WA) Price, Tom Walters, Mimi
 Lawrence Quigley Walz
 Lee Reed Wasserman
 Levin Reichert Schultz
 Lewis Richmond Waters, Maxine
 Lieu, Ted Roby Watson Coleman
 Lipinski Roe (TN) Webster (FL)
 LoBiondo Rogers (AL) Wenstrup
 Loeb sack Rogers (KY) Westerman
 Lofgren Rohrabacher Whitfield
 Long Rokita Williams
 Love Rooney (FL) Wilson (FL)
 Lowenthal Ros-Lehtinen Wilson (SC)
 Lowey Roskam Wittman
 Lucas Ross Womack
 Luetkemeyer Rouzer Woodall
 Lujan Grisham Roybal-Allard Yarmuth
 (NM) Royce Young (AK)
 Lujan, Ben Ray Ruiz Young (IA)
 (NM) Ruppersberger Young (IN)
 Lynch Rush Zeldin
 MacArthur Russell Zinke

NOES—119

Aguilar DeSantis Jordan
 Amash DeSaulnier Kaptur
 Amodei DesJarlais Kelly (IL)
 Barietta Kennedy
 Becerra Doyle, Michael
 Blackburn F.
 Blum Duffy
 Blumenauer Duncan (SC)
 Brat Edwards
 Bridenstine Farenthold
 Brooks (AL) Fleming
 Brown (FL) Flores
 Buck Franks (AZ)
 Byrne Fudge
 Cárdenas Garrett
 Carney Gohmert
 Cartwright Gosar
 Castor (FL) Graves (GA)
 Clark (MA) Griffith
 Clawson (FL) Grijalva
 Clay Guthman
 Cleaver Gutiérrez
 Collins (GA) Hartzler
 Cooper Heck (NV)
 Courtney Hice, Jody B.
 Cummings Huelskamp
 DeGette Jolly
 DeLauro Jones

Maloney, Ryan (OH)
 Carolyn Ryan (WI)
 Marchant Sanchez, Loretta
 Marino Sarbanes
 McCarthy Scalise
 McCaul Schiff
 McHenry Scott, David
 McKinley Serrano
 McMorris Sessions
 Rodgers Sewell (AL)
 McNerney Sherman
 McSally Shimkus
 Meadows Shuster
 Meehan Simpson
 Meeks Sinema
 Meng Sires
 Messer Slaughter
 Mica Smith (MO)
 Miller (FL) Smith (NE)
 Miller (MI) Smith (NJ)
 Moonen Smith (TX)
 Mooney (WV) Smith (WA)
 Mullin Stefanik
 Murphy (FL) Stewart
 Murphy (PA) Stivers
 Nadler Stutzman
 Napolitano Swalwell (CA)
 Newhouse Takai
 Noem Takano
 Nolan Thompson (CA)
 Norcross Thompson (PA)
 Nugent Thornberry
 Nunes Tiberi
 O'Rourke Titus
 Olson Torres
 Pallone Trott
 Paulsen Turner
 Payne Upton
 Pelosi Valadao
 Peterson Vargas
 Pingree Veasey
 Pittenger Vela
 Pitts Velázquez
 Pocan Wagner
 Poe (TX) Walberg
 Poliquin Walden
 Price (NC) Walorski
 Price, Tom Walters, Mimi
 Quigley Walz
 Reed Wasserman
 Reichert Schultz
 Richmond Waters, Maxine
 Roby Watson Coleman
 Roe (TN) Webster (FL)
 Rogers (AL) Wenstrup
 Rogers (KY) Westerman
 Rohrabacher Whitfield
 Rokita Williams
 Rooney (FL) Wilson (FL)
 Ros-Lehtinen Wilson (SC)
 Roskam Wittman
 Ross Womack
 Rouzer Woodall
 Roybal-Allard Yarmuth
 Royce Young (AK)
 Ruiz Young (IA)
 Ruppersberger Young (IN)
 Rush Zeldin
 Russell Zinke

Beyer Engel

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1620

Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. GOHMERT changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the bill was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS
 COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2722) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of the fight against breast cancer, 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 Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 9, answered “present” 1, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 442]

YEAS—421

Abraham Brooks (IN) Collins (GA)
 Adams Brown (FL) Collins (NY)
 Aderholt Brownley (CA) Comstock
 Aguilar Buchanan Conaway
 Allen Bucshon Connolly
 Amodei Burgess Conyers
 Ashford Bustos Cook
 Babin Butterfield Cooper
 Barletta Byrne Costa
 Barr Calvert Costello (PA)
 Barton Capps Courtney
 Bass Capuano Cramer
 Beatty Cardenas Crawford
 Becerra Carney Crenshaw
 Benishek Carson (IN) Crowley
 Bera Carter (GA) Cuellar
 Bilirakis Carter (TX) Cullbertson
 Bishop (GA) Cartwright Cummings
 Bishop (MI) Castor (FL) Curbelo (FL)
 Bishop (UT) Castro (TX) Davis (CA)
 Black Chabot Davis, Danny
 Blackburn Chu, Judy Davis, Rodney
 Blum Cicilline DeFazio
 Blumenauer Clark (MA) DeGette
 Bonamici Clarke (NY) Delaney
 Bost Clawson (FL) DeLauro
 Boustany Clay DelBene
 Boyle, Brendan Cleaver Denham
 F. Clyburn Dent
 Brady (PA) Coffman DeSantis
 Brady (TX) Cohen DeSaulnier
 Brooks (IN) Cole DesJarlais

Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Gomlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur

Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb
Loeb
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeke
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce

Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Kelly (IL)
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swaikwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen

Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—9

Amash
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine

Buck
Chaffetz
Huelskamp

Massie
Sanford
Weber (TX)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Mulvaney

NOT VOTING—2

Beyer
Engel

□ 1628

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.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE). The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

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

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

□ 1630

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

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.

STEVE GLEASON ACT OF 2015

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 984) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare beneficiary access to eye tracking accessories for speech generating devices and to remove the rental cap for durable medical equipment

under the Medicare Program with respect to speech generating devices.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 984

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 "Steve Gleason Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. PROVIDING MEDICARE BENEFICIARY ACCESS TO EYE TRACKING ACCESSORIES FOR SPEECH GENERATING DEVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1861(n) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(n)) is amended by inserting "and eye tracking and gaze interaction accessories for speech generating devices furnished to individuals with a demonstrated medical need for such accessories" after "appropriate organizations)".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to devices furnished on or after January 1, 2016.

SEC. 3. REMOVING THE RENTAL CAP FOR DURABLE MEDICAL EQUIPMENT UNDER MEDICARE WITH RESPECT TO SPEECH GENERATING DEVICES.

Section 1834(a)(2)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m(a)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (ii), by striking "or" at the end;

(2) in clause (iii), by adding "or" at the end; and

(3) by inserting after clause (iii) the following new clause:

"(iv) in the case of devices furnished on or after October 1, 2015, and before October 1, 2018, which serves as a speech generating device or which is an accessory that is needed for the individual to effectively utilize such a device,".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on S. 984, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in favor of the Steve Gleason Act. This bill would expand access to life-changing equipment called SGDs, otherwise known as speech-generating devices.

People with severe diseases like ALS or Parkinson's need these devices to communicate. They often add SGDs as accessories to their wheelchairs.

Now, for a long time, Medicare has covered their wheelchairs and these devices and people have been able to buy SGDs so they can customize their devices.

There is one device that I have seen that is just incredible. It is called an

eye-gaze. It allows someone to use one's eyes to actually navigate a computer and hit the mouse click to do things like turn on the TV, go on the phone, speech communication, everything. It is just incredible, but there is a problem.

Two years ago CMS changed the policy. Before, you could buy this and you could add an upgrade to it. CMS changed the policy, and seniors now have to rent an SGD for 13 months before they can buy it.

What is worse, Medicare will stop making these rental payments if a senior citizen makes an upgrade that is not directly related to speech.

As you also know, Mr. Speaker, not just seniors go on Medicare. People with certain disabilities as well are allowed to go on Medicare; so this affects people of all ages.

This change is so sweeping that Medicare is refusing to pay for things like an eye-gaze, the very thing that patients need in order to use their SGDs.

This bill would remove the 13-month rental requirement so as to allow seniors to buy their SGDs immediately. It would also make sure that Medicare continues to cover SGDs if they are entering nursing homes.

The people who need these devices are truly the most disabled and most vulnerable among us. The whole point of Medicare is to protect these very patients and to give them the care that they need.

And this bill goes to the heart of Medicare's mission. It goes to the heart of fixing a flaw that I think everybody recognizes needs to be fixed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS), our distinguished Conference chair.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, last summer more than 17 million people participated in the ice bucket challenge to raise awareness of the crippling disease of ALS and the physical and emotional toll it takes on millions of men and women and their families.

Around the same time, Gail Gleason, who is the mother of former NFL star Steve Gleason, who has ALS, came to me with concerns about Medicare denying access to cutting-edge speech-generating technology for patients who are living with degenerative diseases.

Gail and Steve feared thousands of people would lose their ability to communicate with the world around them, to share their stories, order coffee, tell jokes, ask for help, say "I love you."

Before eye-tracking technology became available, once people lost their ability to type, they could no longer communicate, but all that has changed with revolutionary technology.

Today patients can continue communicating by typing with their eyes, but top-down, government-knows-best rules and regulations threaten to take it all away for those who need it most.

I pledge to do everything within my power to fix this, and I am proud to help steer this bill through Congress, from the start to the finish, with the help of Majority Leader MCCARTHY, Majority Whip SCALISE, Representative PAULSEN, and Senator VITTER.

So many have joined us in this effort. We led a letter with more than 200 Republicans and Democrats to push CMS to investigate this arbitrary decision, and I am proud today to stand to help support the effort to send the Steve Gleason Act to the President's desk.

Mr. Speaker, life-changing innovation cannot help people when it is collecting dust on a desk or is getting caught up in red tape. Because of Gail Gleason and Steve Gleason, thousands of Americans living with degenerative diseases can have peace of mind today that their voices will continue to be heard and that they will still be able to say "I love you."

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

I rise today in support of S. 984, the Steve Gleason Act. This legislation is named after Steve Gleason, a former professional football player for the New Orleans Saints and a native of Washington State.

The bill will increase access to speech-generating devices that help patients living with ALS and other neurological disorders. ALS is what is commonly known as Lou Gehrig's Disease.

Under current law, speech-generating devices are treated as capped rental items by Medicare, requiring beneficiaries to rent their devices for 13 months before they are able to own them. This cap has made it difficult for many beneficiaries to have access to these devices.

In a recent national coverage determination, CMS has already begun providing payment for speech-generating devices. This is a good step, but it does not necessarily ensure continued payment for the devices if a beneficiary moves from a post-acute facility, such as a nursing home.

This legislation makes a simple fix that will eliminate the rental cap and clarify that beneficiaries may purchase speech-generating devices immediately.

It will ensure payment for these devices even if a beneficiary is admitted into a facility for which payment is bundled into a post-acute facility payment.

It will improve the Medicare program, and it will make a meaningful difference in the lives of beneficiaries who are living with ALS.

I am pleased to see the chairman out here pushing this, and I am glad to join with him. I hope someday I will join with him to provide hearing aids to senior citizens who are having trouble paying for them today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman

from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding and for his leadership in bringing the Steve Gleason Act to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, Steve Gleason is somebody who has served as an inspiration for the people of Louisiana for a long time, going back, of course, to the 2006 game when the Superdome was reopened after Hurricane Katrina.

That night was really one of the galvanizing moments that helped bring the city of New Orleans back, that helped reinspire the people of New Orleans to come back.

It was Steve Gleason who blocked the punt at the end of the game to win the game. I was in the Dome that night. I know my wife, Jennifer, and I were as euphoric as everybody in that building.

The reason that Steve Gleason inspires people today, Mr. Speaker, is not because of what he did on the football field. It is because of what he has done to serve as an inspiration for people all across the country, people with all disabilities, since he was diagnosed with ALS, with Lou Gehrig's Disease.

What he has done is to go out and show that he is able to exhibit his voice because of the speech-generating device that he has.

This isn't something that he just wants for himself. He wants this for all people who have something to say, who have that same voice, to be able to go out and inspire other people.

When CMS made the change in policy that started to take away that voice, he spoke up, as so many others did, and said, "We need to reverse this."

I commend Senator VITTER for bringing the legislation forward that we are debating that was passed through the Senate, for this is a bill that truly will give voice to thousands of people.

Over 5,000 people every year are diagnosed with Lou Gehrig's Disease, with ALS. They all have something to say. They all have that voice.

The Steve Gleason Act will give them that voice so they can go out and continue to achieve their lives' potential.

I urge the passage of this legislation.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND).

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague and my friend, Majority Whip STEVE SCALISE, in advocating for and in asking our colleagues to vote today for the Steve Gleason Act.

Steve's name is on it, but it is a lot bigger than Steve. If you know Steve and what he stands for, you will understand that this bill and this fight on behalf of him and his family—the fight that they have fought—benefits thousands of people in our society who really need the help.

That is why last year I was happy to join in a letter with Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS to CMS, asking them to change this policy.

It is important to put patients first and to fix this extremely misguided

and harmful Medicare regulation that has had a devastating impact on the lives of ALS patients, stroke victims, and other folks who are experiencing significant paralysis. It has really prohibited them from talking to and communicating with their families.

I think Steve did a great job of expressing what Steve means to the people of New Orleans. Gleason's actions on the football field and his actions since being diagnosed with ALS really exemplify the resilience that the people of New Orleans have had after being knocked down time and time again from hurricanes and other things.

□ 1645

But just as Steve stood up and just as the city of New Orleans stood up to help themselves, government has a responsibility to make the lives of people better and to help them help themselves, and that is what this does.

I will give you Steve's words. He said: If we have a purpose in life beyond being a cog in the human machine, mine is to help inspire people. And that is pretty cool.

What I would like to say today is that Steve inspired Congress to make the lives of thousands and thousands of people better; and what Steve was able to do was bring out the best of what is in this body, and that is both sides working together to make sure that we do tangible things to improve the lives of the people whom we represent.

I am proud to stand here with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and enjoy the benefit of their hard work and a team effort to do this. So I would just encourage my colleagues to vote for the Steve Gleason Act.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank the chairman for his leadership on this issue.

As has already been mentioned, last summer, millions of Americans participated in the ice bucket challenge, raising more than \$100 million to combat ALS, or Lou Gehrig's disease.

What most people don't realize, though, is at the exact same time this movement was sweeping the Nation, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services was implementing misguided policies to deny access to speech-generating devices for those patients with ALS and other degenerative conditions. Now, for many people who have ALS, speech-generating devices and the eye-tracking technology that is often used with these devices are the only way to communicate with your loved ones, with families, friends, and others.

In response to the agency's new policies, Representative CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS and I led a bipartisan letter with over 200 Republicans and Democrats asking for changes to the proposals. While the agency has taken some actions to roll back some of the

rules, we have got to guarantee that these patients will have access to speech-generating devices.

That is why Senator VITTER, Representative McMORRIS RODGERS, and Majority Whip SCALISE and I first introduced the Steve Gleason Act. Now, this bill gets its name, as was mentioned, from former New Orleans Saints safety Steve Gleason. Steve famously blocked a punt, resulting in the first touchdown for the New Orleans Saints in their dramatic return to the Superdome after Hurricane Katrina. Today, Steve faces a new opponent as he battles ALS. This bill is for Steve and the millions of people who have ALS.

The ice bucket challenge was a good start, but there is more we can do to help people with that deadly disease. Instead of limiting access to life-improving devices, we should be embracing 21st century cures and technologies that empower millions of Americans living with degenerative disabilities to have a better life and communicate with their family, friends, physicians, and loved ones.

I am glad we could come together in a bipartisan manner to embrace innovation and help so many patients, Mr. Speaker. I encourage passage of this important legislation.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, to thousands of Americans living with ALS and end-stage Parkinson's disease, the Steve Gleason Act literally means the difference between the ability to speak and silence.

I had the great privilege 2 weeks ago to spend about an hour with Steve and his mother in Steve's home in New Orleans. You have heard about Steve's exploits on the football field and how he inspired so many in that first return back to the Superdome after Katrina. But Steve lost his ability to speak and is wheelchair bound due to ALS. This happened earlier this year. His 2011 diagnosis could have been a tragedy, but he turned it into something amazing and good.

When I visited with Steve, it was amazing to see the fire and the spirit in his eyes because, despite all that has happened to him, he is determined to help a lot of people. He told me: I am not going to give up until you guys pass this legislation so we could help so many others who don't have access to this technology that I have been blessed to have.

So Steve started Team Gleason, an advocacy organization. Its main priority is to raise awareness for ALS. And Steve is communicating, using this amazing technology, but he knows not all individuals with ALS or end-stage Parkinson's have the resources to be able to afford these expensive devices.

This bill is named for Steve because of his tireless advocacy, and this final

legislation will provide the resources to give voice to thousands of individuals living across this country with ALS, end-stage Parkinson's, and other types of neurological disorders.

I am proud to have played a little role on the Ways and Means Committee with my chairman to help move this bill through. I think this is a very proud day for America. We are happy for Steve and his advocacy and happy for so many individuals who are caught with this very difficult disease.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), another senior member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman again for yielding to me today.

I rise today to support the Steve Gleason Act of 2015. I have never had the honor of meeting Steve; however, he is a native Washingtonian.

I have had the honor of knowing a good friend and partner who passed away from ALS while I was with the sheriff's office back in Washington State in King County in the city of Seattle. His name was Jim. And I have heard people talk about Steve, his inspiration, and the fight and fire in his eyes this afternoon, and Jim had that same inspiration to those around him and had that same fire in his eyes.

He came to work every day. And people noticed there was something a little bit different, not quite right about Jim, but Jim just said, you know: I had an operation on my knee.

He limped into work and he committed himself to doing the job and getting it done. He was working on one of the biggest serial murder cases this country has ever known, the Green River case. He lived long enough to interview the person that we finally arrested, which took us 19 years. He stayed alive long enough to interview—I am not even going to mention that person's name on the floor of the House.

Jim was a good friend. For CMS to make a ruling like this, to withhold commonsense medical devices for people who need it, to help Americans across this country, is almost unbelievable and illogical. CMS has made other rules, too, denying medical devices for people with lymphedema, for example, commonsense medical devices, like garments to help them live a normal life.

I am so pleased to hear today that we are able to change this rule to help people with ALS communicate, to be able to say, "I love you."

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purpose of closing.

Mr. Speaker, as I saw STEVE SCALISE talk about that play—I am a big NFL fan, and I remember that play. My

friend Aaron Stecker, who is a friend of mine from Wisconsin, played on that team at that time. I just have to say, Mr. Speaker, in America, we have all of these heroes, and the best among us are the heroes that have been so high and have been brought so low but have come back up and have shown a great example of courage to the rest of us.

We are very pleased to be bringing this bill to the floor. I basically want to thank the members of the Louisiana delegation for bringing this issue to our attention, for making us know about this.

This is one of those things where the bureaucracy just got it wrong. The bureaucracy basically came up with a rule that effectively denied these devices to people, which means they can't live a full life.

These SGDs are invaluable. They are absolutely essential for people suffering from ALS to be able to communicate and to be able to function. I had a constituent at a town hall meeting walk me through how his eye gaze technology worked as a part of SGD, and it is just truly remarkable.

So this is one of those issues that speaks to absolute common sense. The bureaucracy got it wrong, and this is Congress in action. This is democracy in action. Our constituents brought us an issue. We understood that there was a problem that needed to be solved. So, in a bipartisan basis, here we are, passing legislation, fixing this problem so that we can make sure that this program, Medicare, fulfills its mission by making sure that it is there for the people who need it. That is democracy.

I want to thank the people from Louisiana for bringing this to our attention. I urge the passage of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 984.

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.

MEDICARE INDEPENDENCE AT HOME MEDICAL PRACTICE DEMONSTRATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2015

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 971) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an increase in the limit on the length of an agreement under the Medicare independence at home medical practice demonstration program.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 971

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 "Medicare Independence at Home Medical Practice Demonstration Improvement Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN THE LIMIT ON THE LENGTH OF AN AGREEMENT UNDER THE MEDICARE INDEPENDENCE AT HOME MEDICAL PRACTICE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

Section 1866E(e)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395cc-5(e)(1)) is amended by striking "3-year" and inserting "5-year".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on S. 971, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), the author of this bill and a member of the Ways and Means Committee, for the purpose of describing this bill.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman RYAN for yielding time.

I am pleased to see that we are taking up this 2-year extension of the independence at home demonstration project, which expired on May 1.

I first got interested in this because of a constituent, Dr. Thomas Cornwell from Wheaton, Illinois. He is actually a visionary. He was way ahead of his time on this effort to reach out to patients at home. He is the president of the American Academy of Home Care Physicians and chairman and chief medical officer of the Home Centered Care Institute. He has been really passionate about this idea of trying to reach people where they are.

Since the founding of his home care practice in 1997, Mr. Speaker, he has personally made over 30,000 house calls. So he knows intimately the difference that a home care option makes in the lives of individuals with multiple chronic conditions and the savings that it can bring to the healthcare system to treat these people at home rather than at the hospital.

So what he has been able to do is to say, look, this is better for the patient and it is better for the system, so let's pursue this and let's move it further along. That is exactly what the independence at home demonstration brings to Medicare. It focuses on reducing costs where the needs are the highest and improving care where the needs are the greatest. It provides home-based care to medical enrollees with two or more chronic conditions who

are within the 5 to 25 percent of beneficiaries that account for nearly 80 percent of all Medicare spending.

Of the 34 Medicare home care demonstrations over the past 20 years, the IAH is decidedly different, requiring that doctors meet fiscally responsible conditions of participation. Here is what they have got to do: they have to return a minimum savings of at least 5 percent to Medicare; they have to produce good outcomes; and they have to pass patient and caregiver satisfaction ratings.

It even provides an additional incentive by allowing successful patient participants to share in any savings that generate from Medicare above that 5 percent mark on an 80/20 basis. So think about that; everybody comes out ahead on this. And it is working.

□ 1700

In June, CMS reported that IAH saved over \$25 million in its first performance year. That is an average of over \$3,000 for each of the 8,400 beneficiaries that participated in the demonstration.

In other words, have you heard, have you talked about, have you contemplated anything that is like this? In other words, you have got happier patients, and they are saving money at \$3,000 a person. What is not to love about this?

We have several lessons from this that have been artfully crafted into the demonstration itself. It requires participants to save taxpayer money by avoiding unnecessary hospitalizations, ER visits, and nursing home admissions.

It protects the viability of the Medicare Program, provides quality health care for those most in need, and benefits providers by giving them the flexibility they need to care for their patients and share in the savings they produce.

For those reasons, I strongly support passage of this, and I thank Chairman RYAN for his support.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 971, the Medicare Independence at Home Extension Medical Practice Demonstration Improvement Act of 2015. This bill provides for a 2-year extension of an interesting program intended to help beneficiaries living with multiple chronic conditions.

The Affordable Care Act, which has been reviled extensively, established the Medicare independence at home demonstration. The purpose of this project is to test a new service delivery and payment incentive model that utilizes primary care teams directed by doctors and nurse practitioners to provide care to patients in their home.

Practices that successfully reduce costs and meet quality measures will be rewarded with incentive payments. If this is successful, this model would provide Medicare beneficiaries with access to home-based primary care and

avoid costly and unnecessary trips to the hospital.

In 2012, 15 practices launched IAH practices, but the authority to continue these practices will expire in 2015. S. 971 extends this authority by 2 years. This will provide CMS with additional time to evaluate the results of the demonstration and to determine whether this is a sustainable model to pursue moving forward.

This will give policymakers the additional information we need to inform our decisionmaking as we look for innovative ways to coordinate care and reduce costs in the healthcare system.

It is noteworthy to note that this was instituted by the ACA. There are good things in that bill. As they have tried again and again out here to repeal it, we never thought about things like independent health practices.

I think that it is important for us, as a Congress, to look individually at the programs before we make sweeping generalizations.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), the author of this legislation, a Member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and a physician.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I certainly thank him for having this bill on the floor this afternoon.

I am pleased the House is considering this bipartisan, bicameral legislation. S. 971 is identical to H.R. 2196, the Medicare Independence At Home Medical Practice Demonstration Improvement Act, which I introduced with Mr. ROSKAM of Illinois and Mr. THOMPSON of California. The bill extends the Medicare independence at home medical practice demonstration program for an additional 2 years.

S. 971 passed the other Chamber with unanimous consent in April. Let me reiterate that this bill has cleared the Senate, and we have the opportunity to actually advance this bill today and have it become law shortly.

Now, more than ever, it is essential that we consider innovative ways to deliver care that is led by providers. Individuals are aging into Medicare at a rate of 10,000 seniors a day, with many of the most elderly being severely disabled or home limited. It just so happens that one of the best ways to both lower costs and improve care is to return to the simple house calls of the past.

The independence at home program puts patients and their families first by allowing them to stay at home as long as possible and incentivizing their providers to coordinate the care they provide to their patients.

This program targets Medicare beneficiaries with multiple chronic conditions who have the highest healthcare costs, require more services from providers, and have a greater need for coordinated care.

Independence at home allows providers to take a more active role in patient care and is proving to decrease unnecessary hospitalizations, unnecessary ER visits, and unnecessary nursing home visits.

Independence at home offers incentives to doctors, specialists, and nurse practitioners to better coordinate care for patients while also cutting costs. This is accomplished by requiring that these groups attain a savings of at least 5 percent of which each qualified patient would otherwise have cost the Medicare system.

I will say it again: The program has and must deliver savings by law. If these providers fail to achieve the mandatory 5 percent savings, they face removal from the program; however, if they are able to accomplish the 5 percent savings threshold, these groups may keep up to 80 percent of the savings.

This program is proving to reduce costs and increase quality by reducing duplicative and unnecessary services, delaying or eliminating the need for nursing home placement, and reducing readmissions to the hospital simply by having a coordinating team of providers.

In addition to saving Medicare money, the patient and their family are able to spend quality time at home, instead of the doctor's office or a hospital. In fact, these programs must improve patient and caregiver satisfaction for the program to continue.

This demonstration program is generating substantial savings and positive outcomes. While the Congressional Budget Office estimated a zero score on June 12, a week later, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services released practice results from year one of the program, showing a savings of \$25 million the first performance year.

Since CMS has been able to release the data, we are confident that if the Congressional Budget Office were to look at this bill again, they would estimate savings for the program, and we expect higher savings in coming years.

Without this extension, there would be a disruption in care for Medicare beneficiaries and lost savings that are being generated for the Medicare Program.

A vote in favor of S. 971 is a vote in favor of ensuring improved, better managed care for chronically ill Medicare beneficiaries and smarter spending in the Medicare Program.

This bill has gone through regular order. It passed the Ways and Means Committee. I would like to thank Chairman RYAN and Ranking Member LEVIN for that. I would also like to thank the Ways and Means Committee staff on both sides of the dais, as well as the Energy and Commerce staffs, for discharging and advancing the bill.

I want to thank Representative ROSKAM and Representative THOMPSON and their staffs. I certainly want to thank J.P. Paluskiewicz and Lauren Fleming from my office who have worked to get this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the program has been a success. Mr. Speaker, the program has no cost. Mr. Speaker, the program is generating savings. If it does not generate savings in the future, it goes away.

This program is generating higher satisfaction for Medicare beneficiaries. If it does not generate beneficiary satisfaction in the future, it goes away.

The Senate has already passed this bill by unanimous consent. Mr. Speaker, there is no reason for us not to do so as well.

I urge everyone to vote in the affirmative.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 971, the Medicare Independence at Home Extension Medical Practice Demonstration Improvement Act. As was pointed out, it is a 2-year extension to a very important and critical component of ObamaCare.

I thank Mr. ROSKAM from Illinois and Mr. BURGESS from Texas, the two folks who coauthored the House bill with me. I appreciate them and their staff for the great work they did.

According to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid, more than two-thirds of Medicare beneficiaries suffer from multiple chronic conditions, the care and the treatment for which account for more than a majority of the Medicare spending. These costs are expected to increase substantially with the growing population of seniors, particularly those living with multiple chronic conditions.

Consequently, there is a need for programs aimed at reducing unnecessary hospital admissions and ER visits, strengthening chronic care coordination for our sickest seniors, and slowing the growth in Medicare spending.

This program, the independence at home demonstration program, was created in ObamaCare to do just that. This program provides chronically ill Medicare beneficiaries with primary care services in the comfort of their homes, where they will be able to retain their independence, dignity, and quality of life. It is essential. In essence, it is doctors making house calls, a "back to the future" way of providing care.

The demonstration is targeted; it is immediate; it is proven; it is fiscally responsible, and it is in high demand by Medicare beneficiaries and their families in my home State of California and every State in the Nation.

During its first year, the demonstration saved over \$25 million, an average of over \$3,000 per benefactor. These are very real savings, and there is more to come if we act today to extend this important and successful demonstration for 2 more years. Without this extension, there would be a disruption in care for our most fragile seniors and lost savings to the Medicare Program.

The independence at home demonstration enjoys strong, bipartisan support in both the House and the Senate. It passed the Senate by unanimous consent and in the Ways and Means Committee on a voice vote. I hope that we do the same here. I urge everyone to vote for this important piece of legislation.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I urge Members to vote for the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I act on the sentiment of the gentleman from Washington.

I urge Members to vote for the 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 Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 971.

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.

JDRF CHILDREN'S CONGRESS

(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, I rise to recognize the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation, the leading global organization funding type 1 diabetes research.

This week, the JDRF Children's Congress took place here in our Nation's Capital. Delegates from across the country visited my colleagues and me to help us understand what life is like with type 1 diabetes and why research to fund life-changing therapies until a cure can be found is so critical.

As part of this important event, I had the honor of meeting Madyson Huston, an eighth-grader at Fort LeBoeuf Middle School located in my district. Madyson was diagnosed with type 1 diabetes 2 years ago and has since become a tremendous advocate for JDRF. I admire her courageous spirit and willingness to fight for a cure.

I was encouraged by the recent passage of the 21st Century Cures Act, and I look forward to working with my colleagues and advocates like Madyson to advance similar initiatives that will improve the lives and health of Americans.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF JONATHAN ROSADO

(Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Jonathan Rosado

was a model citizen who generously shared his strong character and kind spirit through the act of teaching tennis to disadvantaged children.

Jonathan fostered the Legacy Youth Tennis program's presence in the Hunting Park community, a groundbreaking addition to youth programming for this Philadelphia neighborhood. His steadfast commitment to community service has served as a tremendous benefit to the many lives he touched.

Jonathan's sense of responsibility and dedication was instilled in him by his own childhood participation in the Legacy Youth Tennis program, and he chose to contribute those attributes right back into the program as he ascended into adulthood.

Jonathan was tragically murdered last year. Although he is sorely missed by all, his bright spirit will continue to be felt in the Hunting Park neighborhood and in Philadelphia long into the future.

I recognize Jonathan here on the floor of the House of Representatives, the people's House, so that his shining example can be more widely witnessed across the Nation.

□ 1715

UNCLE SAM OWNS OVER 27 PERCENT OF AMERICAN LAND

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government is hoarding American land. The bureaucrats own about 640 million acres of it. That is 27 percent of America, larger than all of Western Europe.

The government cannot afford this massive estate. Notice this map. All the red area is what the Federal Government owns. Over half the West is owned by the Federal Government.

Day by day, unused and unmaintained land sits idle. Instead of Uncle Sam hoarding this land, the government should consider selling the land to Americans. To be clear, I am not talking about selling off national parks, monuments, forests, or protected areas—just unused land and unmaintained land the government doesn't take care of.

The revenue from the sales could go toward reducing the debt or improving transportation. Plus, the sale of land would help State and local governments because new property owners will be paying taxes on the land.

Time for the Federal Government to let Americans own more of America. Does Uncle Sam really need all of this land?

And that is just the way it is.

PURSUING PEACE THROUGH DIPLOMACY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Iowa). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015,

the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the United States and our allies reached a landmark agreement with Iran to prevent them from obtaining a nuclear weapon.

To get to this point, Mr. Speaker, we used diplomacy to find a potential solution that seeks to stabilize the entire Middle East region. Diplomacy affords us a clearer picture of what the Iranian Government is doing and what they are capable of.

We used peaceful means to promote peace in one of the most volatile regions in the world, and I am proud of the commitment of President Obama, this administration, and our allies, in keeping these negotiations alive.

Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that our job is done. Congress must and should take a very close look at this agreement in its final form. In fact, I firmly believe that Congress has a critical role to play in the next steps of this agreement.

Let's look at what this agreement does. Within the text, Iran affirms that it will not seek, develop, or acquire a nuclear weapon; but we must ensure that the language will fully deter them from going back on their word and duly punish them if they take that path.

Within the text of the agreement, we accept that the United States will lift the sanctions that we have placed on Iran, but we must have mechanisms that will allow for oversight on the ground in Iran that holds them accountable.

This is a difficult and sensitive balance, but if this agreement has managed to strike that balance, we would miss a once-in-a-generation opportunity to transform the Middle East if we reject this deal. That is not something we can afford to flippantly dismiss.

What this teaches us, Mr. Speaker, is that aggression is not the only answer we have to handle difficult relations across the globe. In fact, aggression would not have brought us to this point where, without any loss of life for us or our allies, without significant cost to our Nation or the global economy, we have managed to find compromise.

Sanctions cannot and should not be the only way we bring nations to the table. They serve a critical purpose, and certainly, they helped in bringing us to this point.

They also come at a significant cost; rather than starving their government

in the way we thought they would, they pushed the government to starve its people, resulting in vast unemployment and limited opportunity for a generation of Iranians and probably fertile ground for the radicalization of individuals.

They pushed Iran to ally itself with international actors that further hampered our efforts to stabilize this region. They pushed Iran towards total isolation, a situation in which we have no impact whatsoever. At some point, sanctions that have at points been effective become obsolete and counter-productive.

I would not ask any of my colleagues to support a deal that does not achieve our chief purpose, preventing a nuclear-armed Iran, with the ability to wreak havoc on the United States, our allies, and the world.

I will also ask my colleagues to consider the alternative if we fail to ratify a deal that would meet these goals appropriately, pushing Iran further into the shadows; giving us no chance at monitoring how, where, and when Iran is enriching uranium; and sending Iran further into the arms of bad actors or offering Iran even greater motivation to undermine basic international law.

I have one pretty solid idea of the outcome: a dangerous, complicated war that would drag what is likely the most volatile region in the world into complete chaos.

This agreement may be the best chance to put Iran at the table and keep them accountable, to engage the international community in monitoring their activities, to operate in the known and not the unknown of what they are capable of, and to give them a reason to seek the same kind of international peace that every country desperately relies upon.

Further aggression, further sanctions, further isolation can no longer be our answer, especially when we have been given a real opportunity to open the door to peace.

I urge my colleagues to give this agreement real consideration. I urge my colleagues to read this agreement. I urge my colleagues to approach this agreement without partisan or political bias.

It is time to give peace a chance.

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me start by thanking BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN for leading this important special order and for her leadership on these issues.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, President Obama announced that the United States—along with our P5+1 negotiating partners—had reached a deal with Iran—a deal that if fully implemented, will prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.

As someone who has long supported sustained diplomatic engagement with Iran, I applaud President Obama, Secretary Kerry, and our P5+1 partners for their tireless work to obtain a deal which promotes peace and global security.

In the 112th and 113th Congresses, I introduced a bill—the Prevent Iran from Acquiring

Nuclear Weapons and Stop War Through Diplomacy Act—that called on the President to use all diplomatic means to resolve the nuclear issue with Iran. It urged the President to “secure an agreement that ensures Iran does not engage in nuclear weapons work,” through increased safeguards and international inspections,

Yesterday’s announcement demonstrates just how effective that type of sustained engagement and diplomacy can be.

When fully implemented, this deal—or the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action—will prevent an Iranian nuclear weapon while ensuring greater stability in the Middle East. The deal is an important victory for diplomacy and America’s leadership abroad as well as for United States national security and of course for global peace and security.

And as the President said yesterday during his announcement—“This deal meets every single one of the bottom lines we established when we achieved a framework earlier this spring. Every pathway to a nuclear weapon is cut off.”

Prior to yesterday’s announcement, negotiations with Iran had already led to a first-step agreement that has significant reduced Iran’s nuclear stockpile and their ability to create a nuclear weapon. Without those negotiations and the framework agreements, Iran’s nuclear program would have been unmonitored, unrestrained and Iran would have continued the production of medium enriched uranium.

Now, we know that more work remains. The deal has to go to the United Nations Security Council—and Congress now has 60 days to review the terms of the agreement.

Mr. Speaker, all of us share the same goal; preventing Iran from developing a nuclear weapon.

That is why it is critical—as this process moves forward—that Congress act in good faith and ensure the success of this agreement.

This negotiated deal, between Iran and our international partners, remains the best route to ensuring national and regional security while preventing another war in the Middle East.

We simply cannot afford the alternative to this deal.

Diplomacy is the best way to cut off any potential pathways to an Iranian nuclear weapon.

It is the best way to ensure oversight and inspection.

And it is the best way to ensure regional security.

So I urge my colleagues to support the President, support our negotiators, and to give this deal the chance to succeed.

PORT CHICAGO DISASTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with my colleagues from the Congressional Black Caucus, to talk today to the American people about the tragedy of Port Chicago, California, and the injustice that marked the lives of 50 African American sailors in 1944 and continues to mark every American today.

On my right is an overview of where the facility is. It is still an existing Naval facility—or a Department of Defense facility—an important deepwater port that allows for munitions to go to strategic assets in the Pacific.

This is the map of the bay area. You can see it is in the Sacramento delta, as the delta comes into the San Francisco Bay. The photograph is an aerial photograph, obviously, of how the facility looked in 1944. You can see where the trains came in and put the boxcars into sidings that had concrete on either side to protect people from explosions, and then you can see where the ships docked.

In this photograph, there is one ship docked. On the night that we will talk about, there were two ships loaded. In continuously operated shifts, those ships were loaded, as witnesses would say, in a manner that sacrificed safety in order for expedience.

The fateful, moonless night on Monday, July 17, 1944, was clear and cool. A slight breeze was blowing from the southwest. Two cargo ships were tied up at the pier, Port Chicago pier. Under floodlights, work was proceeding at full speed, all hours.

Shortly after 10:18 p.m., disaster struck. This is how the day of the explosion is described by Dr. Robert Allen in his book, titled “The Port Chicago Mutiny.”

The deadliest homefront disaster of World War II occurred at Port Chicago Naval Magazine, a major ammunition facility in my district in northern California.

The shipyard site was 2 miles from a little community of Port Chicago, population 1,500. In those days, the greater area was largely wheat fields and had a very small population of under 50,000. The area currently has a population of over 600,000.

Indicative of the discriminatory practices at the time, all of the enlisted men loading ammunition at the site were African American, whereas all of their officers were Caucasian. The explosion killed or wounded 710 people, 435 of whom were African American.

They had no formal training in safe methods of ammunition or explosives handling given to any of the enlisted men. The Navy failed to adequately provide these enlisted men with the tools necessary to be able to operate under safe working conditions, even after the tragedy struck.

When the surviving 258 African American sailors who, understandably, refused to return to work in these deplorable conditions following the explosion, 50 were charged with mutiny and convicted.

During this time, we seek to bring attention to the systemic racial discrimination suffered by these sailors while on duty, in order to bring perspective to the ongoing discrimination against people of color as we enter into the weekend which will note the 71st anniversary of this tragedy.

Prior to the explosion, many officers at Port Chicago had no previous training either or experience in ship-loading, handling ammunition, or commanding enlisted men. Many of them were reservists. They were called to Active Duty from civilian life and given little or no training. They had to, as they said, learn by doing.

Black enlisted men were also untrained. While they were very aware of the inherent danger of their jobs, these African Americans coped by discounting the risks, much by humor.

Weeks before the explosion, the longshoremen's union of San Francisco warned the Navy that there would be disaster at Port Chicago if the Navy continued to use untrained seamen to load ammunition.

The longshoremen's union was doing similar work in either ports on the West Coast and knew how to load these dangerous materials safely and did not sacrifice safety for speed. The union offered to send experienced longshoremen to train Navy recruits in the safe handling of ammunition, but this offer was ignored by the Navy.

Existing policy required the Coast Guard to provide a detail to ensure that safe handling procedures were followed. Navy commanders believed that this was unnecessary and would create confusion and disrupt loading.

When the Coast Guard tried to oversee operations, it rejected the Navy's common practice, including the practice of moving bombs by rolling and dropping them into place in the ship's hold. Alternative methods offered by the Coast Guard were considered "ridiculous" by the Navy and ignored.

In addition, sailors were encouraged to compete against each other to load as much ammunition as possible into the ship, and officers placed nightly bets among themselves as to which division would load more and then pursued their individual enlisted men to make sure that they would win bets as small as \$5.

During the environment of this whole period, 8-day work periods were what were allowed by the Navy. You would have 6 days of loading ammunition, with a sleep break, and with meals and short rest periods; then after the sixth day, you would have what was called a duty day, which you would do duty around the facility. You had 1 day of liberty.

Now, this, at that time, was a very remote facility and was a long way from Oakland, the nearest major city; but many of the enlisted men made that trip anyway and went back to work very exhausted.

□ 1730

Aside from the petty officers, all the officers at Port Chicago were white.

Commanding officers believed Black enlisted men were a major problem rather than an asset.

Captain Nelson Goss, the commanding officer of Mare Island, of which Port Chicago was a subcommand, said the Black recruits "arrived with a chip on their shoulder, if not, indeed, one on each shoulder."

In actuality, these recruits joined the military to defend their country and to fight, if necessary, and put themselves in harm's way overseas. Captain Goss also complained that they were poor workers, capable of only 60 percent of the work compared to White workers.

In turn, Black men resented, obviously, that only they were assigned to essential labor battalions charged with doing dangerous work. They were distressed that they could not receive the rating and promotions that they thought they deserved. For men working under these precarious conditions, the situation amounted to a new form of slavery.

A worker described Port Chicago as a "slave outfit," adding that, "We were considered a cheap labor force from the beginning." They believed their lives were worth less. They were treated as if their lives were worth less, just as their work and abilities were valued less.

A group of men drafted a letter in 1943 setting their grievances and pointing out that the morale among the enlisted men at Port Chicago had dropped to an "alarming depth."

On the evening of 17th, two ships—as I said, the *E.A. Bryan* and the *Quinault Victory*—the *Quinault Victory* was a brand-new ship that was about to embark on its maiden voyage—were both in port being loaded. The *E.A. Bryan* was almost fully loaded as they entered into the graveyard shift.

In the enlisted men's barracks a short distance away, it was quiet. Many men were in their bunks when suddenly an unbelievable explosion occurred shortly after 10:18 p.m.

Survivors in Oakland and San Francisco still remember the explosion from 20 and 35 miles away. People in the nearby rural communities continue to remember this explosion the way survivors of the earthquake in San Francisco did for many years after.

The *E.A. Bryan* was loaded that night with 4,600 tons of ammunition and high explosives. Bombs weighing 650 pounds each and with their activating mechanisms, or fuses, fully installed were being loaded one at a time.

The dock and the ship had disappeared after the explosion. The *E.A. Bryan* was eviscerated. Very few pieces were found of this large ship. The *Quinault Victory* was lifted clear out of the water in an instant by the blast, turned over, and broken into pieces, with very little of it remaining. The 1,200-foot-long wooden pier simply disappeared.

This is the day after the explosion, and this is what was left of the pier.

During the evening, the accounts talk about people in the barracks being

completely in black because all the electricity went out. Not knowing what had happened, not knowing what had happened to their colleagues down at the pier, many of them thought they were under attack by the Japanese.

I have one account from Jack Critten, who was a guard on duty that night. "The barracks had a lot of windows, lower and upper deck, whole side was windows." This is a distance away from this site. "And they were blown to pieces. Some guys lost their sight; others were badly cut. Finally, they got the emergency lights together. Then some guys came by in a truck. And we went down to the dock, but when we got there, we didn't see no dock, no ship, no nothing," just darkness.

Everyone onboard the two ships and the fire barge were killed instantly: 320 men, 202 of whom were African American. Another 390 military personnel and civilians were injured, including 233 Black enlisted men.

This single stunning disaster accounted for more than 15 percent of all Black naval casualties during World War II. Property damage, military and civilian, was estimated at that time at more than \$12 million.

Again, Mr. Critten recounted, "You'd see a shoe with a foot in it, and then you would remember how you'd joked about who was gonna be the first one out of the hold if something went wrong. You'd see a head floating across the water—just the head—or an arm, bodies. Just awful."

Four Port Chicago seamen and one Black enlisted man were awarded medals for their heroic conduct in fighting the ammunition boxcar fire and subsequent fires that broke out that evening after the explosion.

A proposal was presented in Congress to grant families up to \$5,000 in compensation for the loss of their loved ones. However, when Mississippi Representative John Rankin objected to the plan because most of the beneficiaries would be Black, Congress reduced the maximum allowable grant to \$3,000.

Four days after the explosion, a Naval Court of Inquiry convened on Mare Island to inquire into the circumstances of the explosion.

Captain Nelson Goss admitted that a port director had previously warned him that, "Conditions are bad up there. You've got to do something about it. If you aren't careful, something's going to happen, and you'll be held responsible for it."

The judge advocate of the inquiry concluded by addressing the question of the role of Black enlisted personnel in his official inquiry: "The consensus of opinion of the witness—and practically admitted by the interested parties—is that the colored enlisted personnel are neither temperamentally or intellectually capable of handling high explosives."

In short, they blamed the victims because they were African American.

During the weeks after and the days after, the men obviously were in a state of shock, troubled by the vivid memory of the horrible explosion in which so many of their friends had died and so many of them had believed would come to bear and then, unfortunately, saw the tragedy worse than they could imagine.

"Everybody was scared," one survivor recalled. "If someone dropped a box or slammed a door, people began jumping around like crazy."

Many of the Black survivors expected to be granted survivor's leave, as was the custom at the time in the Navy, to visit their families before being reassigned to regular duty.

They waited and waited to get these 30 days off to go visit friends and to start to process what they had seen before they would come back to regular duty, which they were happy to do.

Such leaves were not granted. Even men who had been hospitalized were not granted leaves. All men were to be sent back to work loading ammunition under the same officers before. However, White officers were allowed to go home for 30-day leaves, all of them.

You can see why, under these circumstances and given the tragedy, many of the enlisted African American survivors at Port Chicago were upset in the 3 weeks after the explosion.

They continued to be treated as they were treated before the explosion in spite of their warnings, the warnings of the professionals in the longshoremen union, and the United States Coast Guard.

So some weeks later the men were sent back to Mare Island, a short distance away from where Port Chicago is, across the strait, where munition ships were again being loaded for the war effort, an important job.

As the men marched to go back to work 3 weeks after the incident, they still did not know where they were going as they marched.

But they did know that, at a certain juncture in the road, they could be ordered to turn right, which would take them to the parade ground, or they could be ordered to turn left, which would take them to a ferry that crossed the river to the ammunition loading dock, where they would inevitably resume doing the same work they had done before.

There was a young enlisted man from New Jersey who had natural leadership qualities, who we will hear about shortly, enlisted man Small.

He actually directed the cadence as they walked back. And he described what happened next as he delivered the cadence and he marched his division back towards the pier:

"I was marching on the left-hand side of the ranks. When the lieutenant gave the command 'column left,' everybody stopped dead, boom, just like that. He said, 'Forward march, column left.' Nobody moved."

An officer asked Small, "Small, are you going to go back to work?" He an-

swered, "No, sir." The officer asked why. And he said, "I am afraid."

Seen as a leader among the men, others refused to work when he refused to go back. Someone over in the ranks said, "If Small don't go, we're not going either."

Mr. Speaker, 328 followed enlisted member Small and refused to return to work at that moment. 258 were imprisoned as a result. And shortly thereafter 50 were charged with conspiring to make mutiny.

The trial commenced on Treasure Island shortly thereafter. If these 50 were convicted of the charge, the men faced prison terms of 15 years or death.

Mutiny was defined by the defense as "unlawful opposition or resistance to or defiance of superior military authority with a deliberate purpose to usurp, subvert, or override the same."

Mutiny was defined by the prosecution as "collective insubordination. Collective disobedience of lawful orders of a superior. A conspiracy to disobey lawful orders of a superior is mutiny" as opposed to what we described.

One sailor stated that, "We didn't know you could define disobeying orders as being mutiny. We thought mutiny could only happen on a ship."

A refusal to work is a passive act of resistance, without intent to seize power. A mutiny, on the other hand, is an active revolt with the intent of taking charge.

At this point, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND), the gentleman from the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire from the Chair how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 35 minutes remaining.

Mr. RICHMOND. First I would like to thank Congressman DESAULNIER for bringing this important issue up and highlighting, one, the contribution made by the sailors; two, the challenges they faced during this ordeal; and, three, the remarkable sense of patriotism that each one of them exhibited and their desire to serve our country.

Not often do we bring up things that happened 71 years ago, especially things that have not gained a lot of media attention. But the sacrifice of every man and woman in this country, whether Black, White, or otherwise, deserves recognition.

So I am honored to be a part of this hour tonight, and I feel really privileged that I get a chance to talk about a few of my constituents' families that really exemplified what is best in America and what is best about the American people.

So the first sailor I will start with is Ernest Joseph Gaines. He was a native of New Orleans. He enlisted in the Navy in 1942, when he was only 20 years old.

Before enlisting, he worked as a helper, doing sheet metal work in a ma-

chine shop. At Port Chicago, he was a winch operator and worked loading the *E.A. Bryan*, one of the ships that was destroyed in the explosion at the base.

At the mutiny trial, Gaines testified that he had "a lot of trouble" controlling the winch he was operating. After the explosion, he said he became afraid of loading ammunition because he knew he could not control the winch.

And just as a side note here, there was a report of trouble with the brake on the number one winch on the *E.A. Bryan* before the explosion, but whether it was fixed is not known to us.

The next person I would like to talk about is Martin Bordenave from New Orleans. And just think about his eagerness to show his patriotism.

□ 1745

Mr. Speaker, he initially volunteered for the Navy in 1942 when he was 16 years old. He wanted to follow in the footsteps of his four older brothers, all of whom had enlisted in the Navy. When they discovered he was underaged, they immediately discharged him, but he immediately reenlisted in 1944 when he was of proper age. In the meantime, Bordenave worked as a painter helping his father who had a job painting houses. The ultimate thing with Bordenave, although his patriotism is remarkable, he was one of the African American soldiers that was injured in the explosion and hospitalized.

Of the last two, one of which is Miller Matthews, he was born and raised in New Orleans, had 5 years of elementary education before becoming a shoeshine boy, then a busboy, and then a delivery boy, before finally becoming a longshoreman loading and unloading Mississippi riverboats for 6 years. He enlisted in the Navy in 1943 at the age of 27.

Then we have Lloyd McKinney, Mr. Speaker, who was born and raised in Donaldsonville, Louisiana, which is another part of my district, where he completed 1 year of high school and then went on to work as a porter in a hotel and later as a helper in an auto repair shop. He enlisted at the age of 18 in 1942. McKinney, in the explosion, suffered lacerations from flying glass. But imagine this: he declined to be taken to the hospital because he did not want to take up space that other officers would need because they were more seriously injured.

So again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for really bringing up this story, which I am not ashamed to say is a story that was new to me, and I think that every day we learn more and more about our country, about the people who sacrificed to make this country great; and talking about past instances of discrimination and unfair treatment that African Americans went through, especially while serving their country, only makes this country better. It helps us share perspective and gives us the real-life experiences that others went

through, which makes this country stronger, which makes this country better, and it breeds understanding and a love that makes us exceptional.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague again for letting me participate in this Special Order.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Thank you, Mr. RICHMOND.

I yield, Mr. Speaker, to the gentlewoman from New Jersey, Representative WATSON COLEMAN, my friend.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join his call for justice for the sailors and their families who suffered in the discriminatory and callous response to the Port Chicago Naval Magazine tragedy.

This is of particular importance to me because I have the honor of representing the district that the alleged leader of that protest, Joseph Randolph Small, had called home. It is also important because of where we are in the arc of history. The events of the past couple months have forced our Nation to do quite a bit of soul-searching on the topic of race and the enduring injustices felt by men and women of color.

From the seemingly inexplicable use of force against unarmed people of color in cases like those of Walter Scott in South Carolina and Tamir Rice in Cleveland, Ohio, to the explicit and disturbing hate crime committed at Mother Emanuel, we know that the bias and discrimination that occurred at Port Chicago is not isolated to the past.

But, Mr. Speaker, if there is any positive outcome to these tragedies, it is in the opportunity to heal long buried but never bandaged wounds. Recognizing one such wound, South Carolina recently voted to remove the Confederate battle flag from the grounds of its statehouse. Exonerating the sailors who were unfairly punished simply for seeking safer working conditions would help heal yet another.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleague already described, in 1944, a segregated U.S. Navy used Black enlisted men with no training to do the heavy, dangerous work of loading ammunition onto vessels that would transport them to the front. That lack of training and neglect for the safety of those sailors led to the greatest homefront disaster of World War II and claimed several hundred lives—most of them Black.

Small, who hailed from beautiful Somerset, New Jersey, led the protest because the survivors understood that to return to the same routine would mean risking another explosion. That simple protest of basic rights and consideration led to convictions of mutiny, prison sentences, and dishonorable discharges for the sailors who stood with Small.

Before the explosion, Small had complained to the new commander that he was promoting inherently dangerous behavior by rewarding the sailors who

could load the most ammunition in the shortest period of time. Small was ignored. And after joining his peers in protest, he was kept in solitary confinement during his trial and sentenced to 15 years simply for seeking justice.

Mr. Speaker, exonerating these men would make right a longstanding injustice, and I am proud to stand with my colleagues in this call for action. I thank the gentleman for his work.

Mr. DESAULNIER. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressman DESAULNIER and Congresswoman LEE for their leadership and drawing attention to this issue and for helping to bring attention to this story of injustice. The story of the Port Chicago 50 isn't in most textbooks or histories of World War II, but perhaps it should be.

While it may not be this Nation's proudest moment, it is a part of our history, and it is a tragic event from which we can learn and we can actually grow, I think, as a nation.

The enlisted men stationed at the Port Chicago Naval Magazine, including the Port Chicago 50, served our Nation proudly, and they served her honorably. For that, they deserve our gratitude.

For those unfamiliar with the story, and I know it has already been talked about, but I would like to talk about it very briefly again.

Following a catastrophic cargo vessel explosion on July 17, 1944, which killed or wounded 710 people, several enlisted men voiced concerns about continuing to handle munitions at the port. Among those voicing concerns were two gentlemen from Cincinnati, Ohio, from the area that I am proud to serve, Mentor Burns and Edward Lee Longmire. Both men enlisted in 1943. They were not lifelong soldiers with extensive training. They were ordinary, patriotic Americans doing their part to help in the war effort. Mr. Burns was a wood-turner in a furniture factory before enlisting. Mr. LONGMIRE worked as a sales clerk selling poultry.

Nothing in their background prepared them for handling munitions, and, unfortunately, the Navy at that time, did not provide adequate training for the men serving at Port Chicago. So it is understandable that the men who survived the explosion were reluctant to continue loading munitions without efforts to make the process safer. For that, they were charged with mutiny.

Reluctance and even refusal to return to unsafe conditions and procedures is not mutiny; it is common sense.

Mr. Speaker, America is the greatest country on the face of the globe, but that doesn't mean we don't at times make mistakes, and that is what happened here. Injustices like the mutiny

convictions for the Port Chicago 50 certainly fall within that category. However, one of the things that makes America great is the freedom of the American people and the people's elected representatives to speak out against injustices, correct past wrongs, and strive for a better future for all of us.

Mr. Speaker, we can't go back in time and prevent the convictions of the Port Chicago 50, but we can correct the record, and we can exonerate those wrongfully convicted and give their families and their loved ones the peace of knowing that they served our Nation honorably and faithfully and that they did nothing wrong.

Mr. Speaker, it is far past time that the Port Chicago 50 received justice. We owe it to Mr. Burns, Mr. Longmire, and the rest of those wrongfully convicted and discharged. We need to set the record straight.

I want to thank my colleagues for making it possible for us this evening to participate in this effort.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his eloquence and to the point of what we asked for today.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), my neighbor, my colleague, and my partner in this effort.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me just start by thanking my colleague and my neighbor in the East Bay, Congressman DESAULNIER, for organizing this very important and long overdue Special Order.

Since being elected to the House, Congressman DESAULNIER, you have really been doing a phenomenal job working on behalf of your constituents on a whole range of issues as a member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. So I know your constituents are thanking you, but I just want to thank you for coming and hitting the ground running on so many issues, including our efforts to eliminate poverty.

Also tonight, it is so important, this special hour, calling for the exoneration of these brave and courageous men. This is an issue, I must say, that I have worked on for many, many years, first as a staffer to my mentor and predecessor, Congressman Ron Dellums, and then alongside your predecessor, Congressman George Miller, who was a true leader on so many issues.

Some, and you may have mentioned this earlier, may know that in 1999 we pulled together a national petition and persuaded President Clinton to pardon one of the few surviving convicted sailors affected by this tragedy. We also worked tirelessly to preserve the Port Chicago National Memorial through legislation, the Port Chicago Naval Magazine Memorial Enhancement Act, which President Obama signed into law in 2009. So I am very pleased to see that we are here tonight once again calling for justice for the African American sailors at Port Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, this story needs to be told over and over and over again, as we are doing tonight. And, once again, thank you for taking that baton, continuing to fight the good fight for justice, Congressman DESAULNIER.

We stand here just days before the 71st anniversary of a national tragedy that is far too often forgotten. Today we remember 320 American sailors—African American soldiers were, I think, 200 of the 320—who lost their lives in the deadliest homefront disaster of World War II. But we also remember how deeply this tragedy was marked by, yes, institutional racism and the solemn duty we have to undo the legacy of that racism today, which Congresswoman BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN talked about very eloquently.

The Port Chicago Naval Magazine, as some may know, is located near Concord, California, right next to my congressional district. On the evening of July 17, 1944, a violent explosion ripped through the magazine, shattering piers, destroying vital ships, and blowing out windows as far away as San Francisco. As I said earlier, all in all, 320 sailors lost their lives; 200 of them were African Americans.

The cause of this tragedy was inadequate training and insufficient safety precautions around handling active munitions. All of the enlisted men who were unloading the active munitions onto a cargo vessel at the time of the explosion were African American. Our Nation's then-segregated military barred African American enlisted servicemen from active naval duty and, therefore, from receiving the proper training to handle artillery.

Nevertheless, White officers at Port Chicago ordered African American sailors to improperly load active munitions into ships resulting in the tragic explosion. These men died serving their country on the homefront and died because their lives and personal safety were not valued by their commanding officers.

But the story does not end there. Three weeks after the tragedy, the more than 300 African Americans sailors who survived the tragedy were once again ordered to continue loading ships in the same perilous fashion. Nearly all of them stood their ground and refused to return to work without proper safety conditions and ammunition training in place. All of those who refused to go back to work in unsafe conditions were arrested, and 208 of them were sentenced to bad conduct discharges and forfeiture of 3 months' pay for disobeying orders.

This is mind-boggling as I recount the history of this tonight. It is so sad.

The 50 of these men who stood up for their rights and spoke truth to power about the value of their lives were charged with mutiny—mutiny, mind you—convicted and sentenced to hard labor, and dishonorably discharged from the Navy. They are now known as the Port Chicago 50.

So we are here tonight, Mr. Speaker, demanding justice for their courage

and recognition for their service. Instead of being cited for mutiny and dishonor, these men should be recognized for standing up to the specter of discrimination and racism in the Armed Forces. As the daughter of a retired lieutenant colonel in the Army, I remember these days very, very vividly as a child.

These naval sailors, these men, showed that their courageous act of defiance really is part of the long history of people of color demanding just basic respect for their rights and their lives, which continues to this day. That is why it is so important for us to stand here tonight and remember their brave actions and how they pushed us towards progress in our Nation and the Armed Forces.

But to date, only one of the Port Chicago 50 has been pardoned—only one. For the remaining 49, their families have been patiently waiting for their names to be cleared of this unjust conviction.

So I urge my colleagues to join us in calling for the exoneration of these 49 sailors. These brave sailors should be remembered for their courage. They were heroes. They are heroes. They stood up in the face of discrimination and the devaluing of Black lives.

□ 1800

We must continue to tell the story, which is far too often left out of our narratives on civil rights; military history; and, yes, California history; and the history of our Nation.

As Dr. King said and, Congressman DESAULNIER, I am reminded of this tonight because you are certainly showing us that Dr. King's quote, the arc of history is long, but it bends towards justice, this is one night that you are helping to bend that arc towards justice.

Thank you again, Congressman DESAULNIER, for your leadership and ensuring that not only we remember those who were lost in this tragedy, but that we move forward and exonerate each and every one of them.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Thank you, Congresswoman LEE. Thank you for all of your support.

I do want to thank and recognize my predecessor, Congressman MILLER and his staff, particularly his former chief of staff, John Lawrence, who put so much effort into this and still has been helpful.

I just want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, with a few brief comments and a quote from Thurgood Marshall and then a brief quote from Mr. Small.

Thurgood Marshall was then chief counsel of the NAACP, and he came West to observe the case. During the trial, Marshall declared:

This is not an individual case. This is not 50 men on trial for mutiny. This is the Navy on trial for its whole vicious policy towards Blacks. Black Americans are not afraid of anything anymore than anyone else is. Blacks in the Navy don't mind loading ammunition. They just want to know why they are the only ones doing the loading. They

wanted to know why they are segregated, why they don't get promoted.

The future Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, Mr. Marshall, continued. He said:

I want to know why the Navy disregarded official warnings by the San Francisco waterfront unions—before the Port Chicago disaster—that an explosion was inevitable if they persisted in using untrained seamen in the loading of ammunition.

I want to know why the Navy disregarded an offer by these same unions to send experienced men to train Navy personnel in the safe handling of explosives. I want to know why commissioned officers at Port Chicago were allowed to race their men. I want to know why bets ranging from \$5 up were made between division officers as to whose crew would load more ammunition.

Still, these men were convicted, whereupon Mr. Marshall responded after the trial by saying these men were tried and convicted of mutiny "solely because of their race and color."

He continued:

The accused were made scapegoats in a situation brought about by a combination of circumstances.

He concluded by saying:

Justice can only be done in this case by a complete reversal of the findings.

That is why we are here today.

Mr. Speaker, the events at Port Chicago and their aftermath played a role in the eventual desegregation of the Armed Forces in 1948. That was a good thing.

The rebellion by the Port Chicago 50, like the civil rights movement of the 1960s and the ongoing conversation today on violence against Americans of color, are a part of a continued struggle against social injustice.

Joseph Small described the events, just before his death, in an interview by the author of a book on the incident. Mr. Small said:

So my only way of changing what was an impossible situation was not to work. It wasn't a planned thing; it was brought on by circumstances, working conditions—it was inevitable, just the same way the explosion was inevitable. Something would have happened to set off that explosion because of the way they were handling the ammunition; it had to happen.

What else can I say? It has been more than 40 years ago, but that is more vivid in my memory than the actual court-martial—the conditions under which we were working, because they were so appalling.

That is apropos for many instances that we see today in our society.

Mr. Speaker, as the Nation seeks to heal the deep racial wound that continues to permeate into violent acts of our fellow citizens of color, we must seek to rectify injustices like these in order to continue to forge a better future—as Dr. King said so well: "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere."

America would do well to remember Port Chicago; indeed, America must remember Port Chicago. For Marshall's words are more poignant today than ever before when he said, during the trial: "What's at stake here is more

than the rights of my clients. It's the moral commitment stated in our Nation's creed."

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

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on the topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with friends and colleagues from every corner of our great country to support an American institution that, in its 81 years, has created countless jobs here at home and supported the export of American-made goods around the world.

The Export-Import Bank, while first created under Franklin D. Roosevelt in response to the Great Depression, is an institution that has supported American manufacturers and producers through both good times and bad; it has experienced strong support over the years from both Republicans and Democrats.

President Ronald Reagan, praising the Export-Import Bank, declared:

Exports create and sustain jobs for millions of American workers and contribute to the growth and strength of the United States economy. The Export-Import Bank contributes in a significant way to our Nation's export sales.

Mr. Speaker, the charter for the Export-Import Bank recently expired on June 30 of this year, depriving our Nation of a critical financial tool for growing our economy in an age where we must stay as competitive as possible in the global economy.

Today, my colleagues and I will explain the role of the Bank, clear up any misconceptions surrounding it, and explain that, like any institution, it should be reformed to make it leaner and more competitive; this is still a very worthwhile institution that we should support and reauthorize as soon as possible.

I urge House leadership to allow a vote to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank and let the members of this Chamber weigh the merits of the Bank for themselves.

I would like to extend a special thanks to my colleagues, Congressman COLLINS from New York and Congressman FINCHER from Tennessee, who helped organize today's Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FINCHER) for his thoughts on the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding on this important subject and the rest of my colleagues for coming tonight to hopefully shed light on why the Export-Import Bank is so important.

I have a few stats I just want to read. My comments will be brief. The Bank supports about 200,000 jobs each year at no cost—let me repeat—no cost to the U.S. taxpayer, including 8,315 jobs in my home State of Tennessee. That is around 1.4 million American jobs in the past 5 years.

In fiscal year 2014, Ex-Im Bank supported \$27.5 billion in exports and 164,000 U.S. jobs. The Bank returned \$675 million to the U.S. Treasury in fiscal year 2014, reducing the deficit. In fiscal year 2013, the Bank sent back more than \$1 billion. Small businesses accounted for nearly 90 percent of the Bank's transactions in 2014.

Last year, the Bank had a historically low active default rate of less than one-quarter of 1 percent. Its default rate for the past quarter was .167 percent.

We have a very, very serious obligation to our constituents that we represent back in our districts. I serve the Eighth Congressional District of Tennessee—a wonderful State and a wonderful district—and my constituents send me to Washington to make the government more accountable, to make it better, to make it smaller, to make it more transparent, and to make it work for them back in their districts.

They don't send me to Washington—I don't go home every week to my district, and my constituents come to me and say: Stephen, we wish you would shut down the government this week. We wish you would end, Stephen, the only good government programs that work. We want you to abolish them.

They send us up here to make these things work. The Export-Import Bank is in need of serious reforms, and that is why, a few months ago, we started to work on a reform package, our bill to reauthorize with reforms, with 31 reforms, to fix the Bank and to make it work better and more transparent and more accountable.

For some reason, some of my colleagues in the House have taken a very different approach. They have taken a political approach that this is going to be the hill, so to speak, that they are going to die on and the facts don't matter; all that matters are the political outside groups calling for whatever is in their best interest, not the best interest of our districts and our constituents back home.

Think about this. I go home to my district and my constituents come up to me and say: Congressman, have you been able to get rid of Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae?

I will say to them: Well, we are working on it.

They say: Well, Congressman, have you been able to reform Medicare and

Social Security and make sure it is solvent for future generations?

I say: Well, we are working on it.

They say: Well, Congressman, have you been able to do tax reform?

I say: Well, we are getting there.

They say: But, Congressman, let me make sure I understand that the only thing that Congress did do was get rid of the only thing that worked that helped create my job, and now, I am on the unemployment line because I don't have a job.

Surely, surely, we are better than this and that we can work for our constituents all over this great country.

I look back at history, and I look back a few years ago. In 2006, this was voice voted. My chairman, who is on opposite sides with me on this issue, was here in 2006. Now, if this was such a big deal, why in 2006 was this issue not raised? We are doing more in the way of reforms probably than Ronald Reagan did many, many years ago.

Plain and simple, this is about jobs; this is about making sure that we are working for our districts; this is a serious reform bill that moves this Export-Import Bank in the right direction by making it work.

I urge my colleagues—hopefully, we get a chance to vote on this in the next week to 10 days, but that we pass this, and we do what is right for our constituents.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Thank you, Mr. FINCHER. I thank you for bringing forward the legislation to reauthorize the Bank and for your compelling arguments. Those are great strong statistics on the benefits that Ex-Im has given our country, the manufacturers, and employees all over the United States.

Mr. Speaker, next, I yield to the gentleman from the State of New York (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Washington for his work organizing this Special Order and certainly thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FINCHER) for his steadfast work to ensure the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank, and his impassioned speech that he just delivered pretty much sums it up.

I rise today in support of the Export-Import Bank, which supports hundreds of thousands of jobs and returns a profit to the U.S. Treasury and ensures that U.S. exporters can compete on a level playing field in the global market.

My chart here says it all. The Ex-Im Bank equals jobs.

Not too long ago, I said I was befuddled by why the majority of my own Conference seemed focused on ending the charter for the Export-Import Bank—and I got to give them the credit for this—they did that.

Well, we are here to say that we can reauthorize this Bank, get back to supporting small business, and growing jobs because that is what this is all about.

□ 1815

There has been misinformation and, I would say, misguided outside influences that have come into play, as Mr. FINCHER pointed out. This has always been voice voted, and all of a sudden, this became the cause, as he said, that someone wanted to die on the Hill for.

But why do we want to kill jobs in the United States, jobs that contribute to a surplus of exports? We have a trade imbalance. These jobs are creating exports that are being shipped overseas to reduce that trade imbalance.

In my district alone, the Ex-Im Bank supports over 700 jobs and \$100 million in exports. Reauthorizing the Ex-Im Bank is vital for manufacturers of all sizes to grow and to prosper in a competitive world economy.

U.S. exporters look to the Ex-Im Bank when they face direct competition from foreign export credit agencies when regulatory constraints hinder commercial lending, when they are selling in the markets with political risks or economic uncertainty, or when a foreign customer requires official export credit as part of the bidding process.

Unlike most, I know from experience. Before coming to Congress, I started and ran a number of small businesses. One of those small businesses that I founded in 2004 was Audubon Machinery Corporation, located in North Tonawanda, New York.

Today Audubon is a diversified manufacturing company that, amongst other things, exports oxygen-generating systems around the world. These are medical-grade oxygen systems used in hospitals in Nigeria, Vietnam, Mainland China, places where the hospitals don't have the liquid oxygen tank outside like they do in the U.S. and Europe.

We simply take the nitrogen out of the air we breathe. The air we breathe is 22 percent oxygen and 78 percent nitrogen.

We take that nitrogen out of the air, producing 93 percent medical-grade oxygen used in these hospitals throughout the developing countries in Africa, South America, Asia, and, like I said, there are major exports into Mainland China.

The Export-Import Bank plays a critical role in what we do. We pay a fee to the Export-Import Bank to provide a guarantee to our commercial bank that guarantees a portion of the line of credit we use to buy the inventory we need to make the product.

I will say it again: In a small business, cash is king. We have to buy materials, and we have to pay our vendors. But we probably are not going to ship that product for 5 or 6 months, so there is a gap there.

We collect our money after we ship, but we have 4 or 5 months in which we have had to borrow money to buy the inventory to make the product. That is how business works.

The commercial banks in the United States are more than willing to loan

that money for business done in the United States and perhaps in Europe, but in the rest of the world—Africa, Asia, and much of South America—the banks will not take that risk.

So, with the Export-Import Bank, we pay a fee and they loan us the money. That is a surplus for the Ex-Im Bank because we are going to ultimately, certainly, never default on that loan. That is how those jobs are created.

Without the Export-Import Bank, the commercial banks are saying: I am not going to lend you for the inventory you need to ship those hospital systems to Mainland China.

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I am fascinated by the example. I had a constituent, actually, who came in to talk to me. He is a manufacturer who manufactures tractors, and tractors cost about \$1 million apiece.

When he said he was shipping his tractor over to France, the local bank that he was dealing with said that there was no way in the world it would accept the collateral.

So it is a specific example. I assume that is exactly the type of thing that we are seeing in small businesses all across the country.

Mr. COLLINS of New York. It just comes down to the banks today being very risk averse. I know what they are thinking.

Here are their thoughts: We have taken an order from Vietnam to produce a hospital system that costs \$250,000. We have to buy the inventory. We get the inventory.

I think what the bank is worried about is that somehow that order is canceled. When that order is canceled, its fear would be: We are not going to have any recourse to collect cancellation charges, and we are going to have this useless inventory in our factory.

First of all, in our case, that is not true. We send the same systems around the world. In fact, in our case, we would be able to use that inventory on a future order.

But you can see where the banks would just have a credit policy that they are not going to lend for foreign inventories without some kind of backup. Now, the backup is the Export-Import Bank at about an 80 percent guarantee.

When I have said I am somewhat befuddled by what we are doing here, I have asked my fellow colleagues directly if they support the Small Business Administration, the SBA, which makes the very same loan guarantees to the very same banks.

The small businesses pay a fee for those Small Business Administration loan guarantees for start-up companies.

How can you support the SBA, on the one hand, which is helping small businesses, and not support the Ex-Im Bank, on the other hand, which is supporting small businesses?

I will make another point.

The default rate on SBA loans is many multiples of that on the Ex-Im

loans. Why? Start-up companies fail at a pretty regular pace. I can't give you the exact percentage, but we all know that start-up companies fail.

That is why the SBA makes an 80 percent guarantee for those loans. It is so the bank will lend them money. Their risk is very small, but you have a lot of failures.

Companies that are producing products and exporting around the world have been in business for 5 or 10 years. You don't open your doors and immediately start making products and shipping them into Mainland China, Vietnam, and Indonesia. No.

You are going to wait until you are mature enough to enter those markets, which is why the default rate is so low. These are small businesses that have been around for 5 or 10 years.

In being around that long, they just need the credit to support the inventory for the 4 or 5 months that they are in production. That is why the default rate is so low.

When I have asked fellow Members, "How can you support the SBA and not the Ex-Im Bank?" I don't get a good answer.

Now, typically, the answer I get is that they will call it the "bank of Boeing" or the "bank of General Electric" because, in competing against Airbus, which has access to European credit, I would say, "Sure. That is another piece of it besides small business, but GE and Boeing buy from a lot of small businesses as well. You are absolutely inconsistent to say you support the SBA, and you can't support the Ex-Im Bank."

I know that the moneys my companies have paid for this insurance, if you will, has created that surplus that the Ex-Im Bank returns year in and year out.

I would like to stay around to continue the discussion, but I think it comes back to Ex-Im equals jobs.

Ex-Im is creating jobs that manufacture and ship products overseas, reducing our trade deficit and creating a surplus for the U.S. Treasury to reduce our financial deficit.

This should be voice voted like it has been forever. It hasn't been. So now we have got to lead this charge, and that is what we are doing here.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. COLLINS, your stories of small businesses in your State and your district, I think, can be told of virtually every district in the country. They are very powerful stories.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD), a great member of our caucus and, technically, a member of our freshman team. I am very happy to have him here this evening.

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank my good friend from Washington for organizing this Special Order. I want to thank my good friend Mr. FINCHER for his work on the legislation, and I thank those who are really talking about trying to create jobs.

Mr. Speaker, really, what we are talking about here is in terms of the Ex-Im Bank. The Export-Import Bank—it is a bipartisan piece of legislation that we are looking to reauthorize. We are looking to make sure that, again, we are creating jobs.

As for the reauthorization of the bank, for those who might have forgotten and for those who may be tuned in, Mr. Speaker, in 2012, the reauthorization passed on a suspension vote of 330–93. It passed in the Senate 78–20. This was not three decades ago. This was 3 years ago.

There is a reason to support the reauthorization of the Ex-Im Bank, and I appreciate my good friend Mr. COLLINS for talking about how Ex-Im equals jobs. I do believe that is the case.

You have all heard the statistics. I mean, 83 percent of the loans nationwide from the Ex-Im Bank are going to small businesses. Small businesses create two-thirds of the net new jobs in our Nation.

I have to tell you, in talking to my colleagues around this very body, the number one issue that we encounter is the fact that it is jobs and the economy. We want to create and make sure that there is a robust number of good, high-paying careers.

The Ex-Im Bank enables those small businesses to be able to keep their doors open, to be able to ship to 96 percent of the world's consumers, which happen to be outside of the United States.

It is interesting to me when we talk about this because there are a lot of big businesses out there that have the ability and the resources to put a plant over in places like Malaysia or Germany or those other places. It is the small businesses that oftentimes don't have that ability.

You heard me having a conversation with Mr. COLLINS earlier about someone who came into my office who was talking about the fact that he manufactures tractors. The tractors aren't big tractors. They are fairly small tractors. But the tractors cost about \$1 million apiece.

If they aren't able to manufacture those tractors here in the United States in getting that Export-Import Bank financing, they will go somewhere else. They have a facility in France that they will be able to use. Those are jobs that are going to leave the United States.

I do believe that, when we talk about the economic growth in manufacturing, my district and, I know, many of the other districts of my colleagues here are heavy in manufacturing.

We are the fourth largest manufacturing district in the 10th District of Illinois. We have literally hundreds of jobs—54,000—in the district that rely upon exports.

I recognize that there are a lot of people who want to talk about Boeing, but Boeing actually has three dozen suppliers in the 10th District of Illinois. These are three dozen businesses

and hundreds of employees who support making things that go into a Boeing plane.

You have heard the adage that, when a Boeing plane lands, 21,000 small businesses land with it. This is important. This is talking about good, high-paying jobs, things that the Export-Import Bank absolutely helps support.

The thing that is interesting to me is that, if we choose to not reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, who loses? Our competitors overseas have export financing. Our small businesses will be the ones that lose.

We are going to, in essence, tie one hand behind our back and make us less competitive. I can't think of a crazier thing, that of making us less competitive.

We want to be more competitive. We want to give our small businesses every advantage possible to be able to go out and compete and win. This is what we have an obligation to do. This is what we have an opportunity to do.

I am delighted to be able to stand up here with my friends to talk in a bipartisan way, actually, about why it is important that we reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

It is because there are jobs and there are businesses in Vernon Hills, in Wheeling, in Lincolnshire, in Northbrook, in Waukegan, in Glenview, in Des Plaines, in Gurnee, in Elmhurst, in Lake Villa, in Bannockburn, and in Mount Prospect. These are all towns in the 10th District that have companies that utilize the Export-Import Bank.

This is not some random deal. This is something that small businesses utilize in order to make sure that they can sell their goods to places all over the globe, to places like France, Germany, India, and China.

It is super important that we give them the opportunity to not only make it here in America, but to be able to send it all over the globe.

Mr. Speaker, if we are looking for an opportunity to end a government program, listen, I am all for government accountability and for trying to make sure that the government is smaller and more responsive. Let's not focus on a government program that brings billions of dollars into the Federal Treasury and creates jobs.

We have heard about the crony capitalism. Frankly, I think that we need to be focusing on how we help small businesses because, again, if we shut down the Export-Import Bank, who loses? It is our small businesses, not the small businesses that they compete against that may be overseas, because they will have an export financing arm.

As my friend Mr. COLLINS was talking about before, if the private sector and the private sector banks would do it, I understand, but there are a lot of those private sector banks and a lot of those local community banks, even those mid-sized banks, that see the collateral go overseas that they can't touch and that they can't get back.

When they walk in for \$1 million of financing to send that tractor overseas,

the answer is “no.” Guess what. They can't hire that next individual to create and make that tractor.

□ 1830

We need export financing. We need to make sure that the Export-Import Bank has some restructuring. This bill does some of that in terms of the bill that we are looking for, to try to have some changes that go into the Export-Import Bank to make sure that we are having that appropriate oversight, to make sure that we are holding them accountable. But it is absolutely vital, Mr. Speaker, for good, high-paying careers that the Export-Import Bank is reauthorized, and reauthorized with an overwhelming support. If it comes to the floor, Mr. Speaker, I am confident that this passes.

I want to thank my good friend from Washington for bringing this up. I want to thank my colleagues for standing up and supporting what we all know is going to be absolutely good for small business.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. I thank Mr. DOLD for his comments about the small jobs. Coming from a State like Washington, as I do, I can certainly relate. Fully 40 percent of the jobs in my State are related to exports, so we understand the importance of having all the tools we can at our disposal to make these small businesses successful in the world economy.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS), a colleague of mine who sits on the Committee on Rules, for his comments.

Mr. STIVERS. I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding. I also thank him for doing this Special Order. This message needs to get out. I also want to thank the gentleman from Tennessee, STEVE FINCHER, for sponsoring the reform bill that makes 31 meaningful reforms in the Export-Import Bank.

I think it is important to note, we need to reauthorize and reform the Ex-Im Bank. Obviously, the Ex-Im Bank is about jobs. You have heard that message all evening. The charter did expire on June 30. Today, the Export-Import Bank can service existing loans, but they can't make new loan guarantees. That is why we need to act now to reform and reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

We are facing competition against 59 countries that have similar export credit finance agencies, and it is really important that we reauthorize our Export-Import Bank. The worst thing we could do would be to unilaterally disarm in a trade war against these 59 other countries and put our small businesses and job creators and exporters at a competitive disadvantage.

I want to tell a story about one of the companies in my district called Davenport Aviation. It is a small exporter that sends aircraft spare parts to sub-Saharan Africa. Only 1 percent of exporters use the Export-Import Bank, but Davenport Aviation is one that

really needs it because in places like Angola and places like Mozambique, there is a political risk, there is a credit risk, and only the Export-Import Bank can come in and take that risk and make that happen, because, as the gentleman from New York said earlier, it is probably pretty hard to get a bank loan to sell spare parts into Angola, Mozambique, and other places in sub-Saharan Africa. Davenport Aviation has thrived because the Export-Import Bank has been there. Now there are 12 jobs in Davenport Aviation, a company that started with just one person just 3 years ago.

There are companies like that all throughout my district. J D Equipment exports tractors, and Showa Aluminum exports a lot of things using the Export-Import Bank. This bill that Mr. FINCHER has created will help make sure those job creators can continue to make and create products that they export to other countries and create American jobs in the process.

As you heard, the Fincher bill has 31 reforms that are meaningful. I am working on amendments that would create four additional reforms. One would be a reinsurance pilot that would determine the private sector price, an actuarially sound price of this credit insurance just so we could have that conversation. The second is a restructuring of the appointment process to make sure that minority and majority views are heard on the board of the Export-Import Bank. The third would be a report on any adverse impacts going on to American companies by loans that the Export-Import Bank guarantees. Finally, I have an amendment that would end the discrimination of coal and make sure that we can fund an all-of-the-above energy policy through our exports because export markets are an important place for energy and American-made energy. We need to make sure that we create jobs here to export the energy where possible.

As you have heard, this debate is about jobs. The Export-Import Bank is about jobs. In fact, if we do nothing, America will lose 164,000 jobs; in Ohio, we will lose 15,300 jobs; and in my district, we will lose almost 1,500 jobs. So we have got to act. We need to act to reauthorize and reform the Ex-Im Bank.

I am working hard to make sure we do that. I appreciate the gentleman from Washington. I appreciate the gentleman from Tennessee and everybody that is participating tonight. It is important to remember this debate is about jobs, and, in fact, the Export-Import Bank guaranteed \$2.4 billion worth of exports in Ohio since 2007 and has helped make sure that 15,300 Ohioans had jobs.

Thank you for this Special Order. Thank you, everyone, for participating. I urge my colleagues to support reforming and reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Those are powerful, powerful arguments. I appreciate Mr.

STIVERS' contribution here this evening.

Next, I would like to turn to one of the stars of our freshman class, a colleague of mine from New York, Ms. ELISE STEFANIK.

Ms. STEFANIK. First, I want to take a moment to thank Congressman NEWHOUSE and my colleague from New York, Congressman COLLINS, for spearheading and organizing this Special Order. I also thank Congressman FINCHER for all of his work and leadership on H.R. 597.

Mr. Speaker, I stand today to express my support for the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank and of H.R. 597, of which I am a proud original co-sponsor. H.R. 597 would reform and reauthorize this critical institution.

For the last 80 years, the Export-Import Bank has helped facilitate exports on behalf of thousands of businesses and has created jobs in all 50 States. Failing to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank would create a stark disadvantage for our country's businesses and cause significant job loss. In fact, over 40 other nations have an export credit agency. If America's is not reauthorized, our Nation would be the only country in the top 20 economies in terms of GDP not to have one.

As I travel throughout my district, I hear from manufacturers who are directly impacted by the Ex-Im Bank. For example, the Plattco Corporation out of Plattsburgh, New York, has been in operation since 1897 and specializes in valve engineering for a wide variety of industrial applications. Through innovation and expertise, this small business has become the industry standard, and their products are sold in over 50 countries around the world. Exports represent 40 percent of Plattco's sales, and over half of these are financed by the Export-Import Bank.

In addition to financing the overseas sales, the Ex-Im Bank also provides due diligence by determining which customers are creditworthy enough to receive a loan. Plattco and their 70 employees do not have the infrastructure or the resources to do this on their own.

Another example in my district is New York Air Brake in Watertown, which has been serving the rail industry since 1890. Among their many products, New York Air Brake develops train brakes and controls which are among the most reliable in the world today. New York Air Brake's largest customers utilize Ex-Im Bank. These customers use Ex-Im to finance their railcar sales and other manufactured products around the world.

Failing to reauthorize Ex-Im Bank would lead to purchases from overseas instead of U.S. manufacturers here. If this were to occur, the loss isn't just felt by the company making the sale, but it is also felt by New York Air Brake and their 575 employees who supply railcar assemblers with exceptional products.

New York Air Brake is truly vital to our economy and our local community,

and as leaders in Congress, we must continue to support these types of companies that provide high-paying manufacturing jobs.

On behalf of Plattco Corporation, New York Air Brake, their employees, and thousands of other small businesses that create jobs in New York's north country and across the U.S., I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. I thank the gentleman from New York for underscoring the importance of the Ex-Im Bank to small businesses, small businesses that employ a huge number of people around this country. That is very important to point out.

Next I would like to turn to the good gentleman from the State of Georgia (Mr. CARTER), another freshman colleague of mine.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the greatest threat to our national security is our national debt. It is the number one issue facing our country right now and one of the primary reasons I sought to serve in this body. I have often said that the only way that we are ever going to balance our budget, the only way that we are ever going to retire our national debt is by three things: first of all, we have got to cut spending; secondly, we have got to have entitlement reform; and, thirdly, and perhaps most importantly, we have got to grow our way out of this. The Ex-Im Bank helps us to do that.

As a small-business man, having owned three independent retail pharmacies for the last 27 years, I understand the value in business of cutting costs and increasing revenues. It is important. You have to both cut costs and increase revenues, and you have to grow your business.

The Ex-Im Bank helps us to increase revenues. It helps us to retire our national debt. First of all, the Ex-Im Bank has returned money to the Treasury in the form of revenues it generates from loan interest and fees. Last year alone, the Bank generated a surplus of \$675 million.

Secondly, and most importantly, the Ex-Im Bank encourages economic growth by supporting the purchase of American-made goods around the world. These purchases sustain thousands of American companies who rely on exports and put food on the table of hard-working men and women employed by them.

In my district alone, there are 19 companies that in recent years have utilized the Ex-Im Bank to export goods overseas. These companies range from Gulfstream, a leading manufacturer of aircraft, to Strength of Nature, a company founded by immigrants who fled the Castro regime and started a company that now exports many of their goods to the Caribbean and to Africa.

The Ex-Im Bank helps businesses, big and small, across America to compete with the competitors abroad by leveling the playing field. With over 60

government export credit agencies currently active around the world, including every modern industrialized economy, allowing the Bank to expire is tantamount to unilaterally disarming ourselves in the competition for big contracts around the globe.

If a company cannot get financing to buy Gulfstream manufactured in Savannah, Georgia, they will go to Canada, which actively promotes Bombardier, or Brazil, which does the same for its Embraer jets. If they can't get a Caterpillar excavator made in Athens, Georgia, they will go to Japan to buy a Komatsu. If they can't get access to an AGCO tractor headquartered in Duluth, Georgia, they will go to India to buy Mahindra.

Mr. Speaker, again, as a small-business owner myself, I know that American companies can compete when the playing field is level. In a perfect world, we wouldn't need an Ex-Im Bank, but we don't live in a perfect world. Instead of leveling the playing field for American businesses, those who would shutter the Bank are stacking the deck against them.

Mr. Speaker, unilaterally closing the Bank would expose our economy to a devastating blow at a time when we can least afford it. It would also further erode our global competitiveness and America's influence around the globe.

While we stand here debating the future of the Ex-Im Bank, our competitors are leveraging their own versions of their export-import banks to increase their market shares abroad. Every minute we wait, foreign countries and companies are expanding. If we don't fill the market need, countries like Russia and China will, and with it, the influence of their regimes is on the rise. They relish in every day that we wait.

Like any Federal agency, the Ex-Im Bank can and should be reformed to make it more accountable, more efficient, more transparent. I support reforms that would bring interest rates more in line with those found in an open private market.

I support reforms to ensure the Bank is a true lender of last resort for all companies by implementing measures to ensure the Bank's customers prove that they have exhausted all their options for financing by private lenders before seeking assistance from the Bank. One way to do that would be to require three letters of denial as part of an application. The Bank should also produce a report explaining why certain businesses receive assistance by the Bank in order to provide taxpayers with more information on exactly what the Bank is doing and why.

□ 1845

Full transparency of the Bank's actions is the only way to hold it accountable, while demonstrating the valuable role the Bank plays in maintaining our competitiveness in global markets.

I stand here today ready to work with my colleagues to implement these and other necessary reforms to the Ex-Im Bank, but allowing it to expire is a disservice to the constituents that we serve.

The Ex-Im Bank not only supports America's manufacturers and the working American families they employ, it helps to promote America's national interests abroad. Most importantly, it helps address our national debt, both through economic expansion and by returning its surplus to the Treasury each year.

I want to thank my colleagues—DAN NEWHOUSE, STEPHEN FINCHER, and CHRIS COLLINS—for helping to host this forum and all those working with us to restore the Ex-Im Bank to its important function.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. I appreciate your powerful words and the importance of the Ex-Im Bank to your district, to your State, and to our country.

Next, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), another member of the Agriculture Committee on which I serve.

I appreciate Mr. RODNEY DAVIS taking the time to come here and with helping us make the points on the importance of this authorization.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Washington for leading this special order. Thank you to all of those who are interested in what I think is doing the right thing, reauthorizing and reforming the Ex-Im Bank.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of small businesses, American manufacturing, and good jobs right here at home.

The simple reality is that more than 95 percent of the globe's consumers live outside of our borders; therefore, our ability to export American products around the world has a direct impact on many small, medium, and large companies and their ability to create and sustain jobs.

Unfortunately, many potential global customers are not able to secure the necessary financing to complete a purchase from an American company because of the instability of their region or another circumstance.

In order to connect these American exporters with their buyers around the globe, the Ex-Im Bank can provide vital loans to complete transactions with American companies that otherwise may not have occurred.

The economic impacts here at home are significant. Last year, the Ex-Im Bank provided financing for \$27.5 billion in U.S. exports. That supports more than 160,000 American jobs; most importantly, 90 percent of all of these public-private transactions were with America's small businesses.

Some have called for ending the Ex-Im Bank on the grounds that it competes with the private market. That is simply not the case. While we do need to reform this agency, we still need to make sure that the Ex-Im Bank is al-

lowed to level the playing field and fill the gaps that exist in the private credit market.

Additionally, the Ex-Im Bank brings in a surplus of dollars to the U.S. Treasury. Last year alone, it was upwards of \$700 million. Over the past two decades, the surplus has been \$7 billion. I ask many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle: What are we going to do to fill that hole?

Ex-Im supports good-paying jobs in Illinois, not only at great companies like Caterpillar and John Deere, but also at small- and medium-sized businesses, such as the GSI Group in Assumption, Illinois, my home county's largest employer, and also Litanian Sports Group in Champaign.

Congress has already let the Ex-Im Bank expire, but we cannot afford to put more jobs at risk. We must reform and reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank now, and I urge a speedy process to do so.

I thank my colleague, once again, for his time, his energy, and his focus on this important issue.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. DAVIS, I am very grateful for you sharing with us today.

I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE)

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking my friend from Washington and my friend from Tennessee for organizing this exceptionally important discussion tonight.

I think the case, from a national standpoint, in terms of maintaining the Ex-Im or the Export-Import Bank, is really almost uncontestable. It is not a new institution. It has been around well over 80 years. It is not a unique institution.

As has been mentioned here on the floor several times, literally dozens of other countries have a similar tool in their toolbox to facilitate exports.

It has not cost the American taxpayer a dime during the course of its existence. It has actually made billions of dollars back, indeed, since 2007, \$2.8 billion last year alone, a billion dollars extra to the United States Treasury.

What it has done and what every American ought to be interested in is it creates thousands and thousands and thousands of jobs for our fellow Americans competing in the international marketplace.

Now, I can talk about some big companies that have a presence in my State that have been enormously well served by the Ex-Im Bank. Boeing aircraft, we have almost 3,000 Boeing jobs in Oklahoma. That is important to us, and we are very proud to have them. Halliburton, historically founded in California, headquartered now in Texas, but their largest machinery production facility is in my district in Duncan, Oklahoma—1,500 jobs. Those are real Oklahomans going to work.

What impresses me the most is the opportunities that the Export-Import Bank have created for small companies to get into the international marketplace. The Export-Import Bank in

Oklahoma in recent years has helped 129 exporting firms; 87 of those, over two-thirds, are small businesses, and that has made a difference in small communities.

The small business is the bedrock of the American economy, and Ex-Im helps them open markets that they would never have had an opportunity to participate in, absent that particular mechanism. Don't take my word for it.

Here is a story from a third-generation Oklahoma company about how the Export-Import Bank has been able to help them. The Mills Machine Company operating in Shawnee, Oklahoma, just outside my district but in the district next to it, has been in business since 1908—over 100 years. It makes drill bits, augers, and other tools for water construction in geothermal industries.

According to the current president, Chuck Mills, who is actually the third generation in the family to run the company—his grandfather started it; his father maintained it, and he is now operating it. He was the first one to think about operating overseas.

How does a small company in the middle of Oklahoma identify and finance overseas sales? He figured out the Export-Import Bank would be the way to open the door for him to create jobs for his employees in Shawnee, Oklahoma.

Today, the Export-Import Bank provides credit insurance when his company is selling their products abroad, which is awfully necessary because some of those individual items, while they sound mundane, cost up to \$30,000 apiece. That is a lot of risk for a small company.

Access to the Ex-Im Bank has allowed the Mills Machine Company to actually increase their exports overseas by 20 percent. Now, when you are a company of 20–30 employees, 20 percent is five or six jobs that literally would not have been there absent the services of this Bank.

The Export-Import Bank actually allows our companies to compete in the global marketplace where countries often directly subsidize or own the means of productions.

We don't have a free market today in every way. Our competitors have this tool. They use this tool aggressively. We need to have the ability to counter them, when necessary, with the Export-Import Bank.

I want to encourage my colleagues to support this bill to understand how essential it is to some of—not just the biggest, but some of the smallest exporters in the American economy and how many thousands of jobs it creates.

Remember, it has never cost the taxpayers of the United States of America a single dime. It has always put billions of dollars, over time, into our Treasury. Most importantly, there are thousands of Americans working today thanks to what the Export-Import Bank has done to facilitate the export

of American products into the international marketplace.

I want to urge my colleagues to support the reauthorization of this important institution.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. COLE, thank you very much for participating tonight and pointing out the importance of the Bank to your State and to your district.

I yield now to gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Washington organizing this special order in support of Ex-Im.

I will tell you one of the worst mistakes that Congress could make is not acting to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank.

Unfortunately, few people in Congress have been involved in international trade. For some 7 years, I was very active in international trade, got into it by accident in other businesses, but I have led delegations and represented some very big corporations, some of the biggest in Florida and the United States and some of the smallest companies trying to compete.

I have been in every country in South America except the Guianas. I have been throughout the entire Caribbean, trying to sell U.S. products. I was in Egypt, the Middle East. I took the first trade delegations into the Eastern bloc countries—Lithuania, I went into Poland and Slovakia.

I have seen international trade up close. I am telling you, folks, it is not a level playing field. It is very rough in the global market.

Some of our competitors, the Chinese and the Europeans, were doing trade across borders, well, when the Americas were still in loincloths. These are experienced people. They throw their mother-in-law in to close the deal. It is a very tough market out there. To cut the legs out from our folks has consequences when it comes to financing.

In business and international trade, if you can finance the deal, you can do the deal. Why would we do this? You just heard the other gentleman say that this is one of the least risks of guaranteeing or providing a loan, less than 1 percent. Banks are 10 times that.

There is no cost to the taxpayer; we actually make money from this, but what we have out there is competition that is unfair, unlevel.

It is possible that we can make some reforms. In fact, we should make reforms to get us into some areas where we don't have export-import. I was the only Member from the House, at least from the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, to go to the biggest airshow—I hadn't been for about 12 years—in Europe recently.

Our competitors were applauding at the time that America was going to let Ex-Im go down the tubes because they, again, are experts in being able to finance things. In aviation, aviation is one of our biggest areas of exports, huge opportunities; and these people

are now being asked to fight and struggle.

We should be expanding. For example, I heard from some of our military folks at the airshow that other countries have ex-im for military foreign sales and that we are losing part of that market while others are getting into it.

If you want to send jobs overseas, if you want to kill American manufacturing, if you want to tie the hands of American companies overseas, and if you want to close down some jobs in my district—I have a large power generation headquarters, which also manufactures in North Carolina.

Here is a statement from their company. They will lose a \$300 million contract, lots of jobs in my district in North Carolina, to Japanese competitors. There is just one.

Here is Caterpillar, not in my district. They are going to lose a \$650 million opportunity in a competition to an Asian competitor. How many jobs would that be in Illinois? They are not my district. It is for a project in Australia.

We are not financing any foreign operations. We are financing American products and supporting American jobs. We absolutely must reauthorize this important program.

□ 1900

Mr. NEWHOUSE. One of the great things about this body is having people with so many different kinds of experiences. Mr. MICA, you personally know the importance because of your experience in being in other countries, of selling American products abroad, how important this tool is to the American businesses.

Mr. MICA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWHOUSE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MICA. I thank the gentleman.

And that is where the markets are, and that is a small area we should be supporting, where we are just minor players right now. We should actually be expanding.

But I thank you for bringing this to the attention of the Congress and the American people. And you are going to hear about agriculture and how important that is in all of this, and jobs and opportunities for Americans.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. I thank the gentleman.

And that is a great segue into who I would like to share some of this time with next. I yield to the gentleman, also from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), the former chairman of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Congressman NEWHOUSE, I am very appreciative of you organizing this Special Order to discuss an issue that perhaps not many of our neighbors back home have had time to focus on and to have speakers from a variety of perspectives discuss what it really means in job creation, economic growth, opportunities in their home districts and their communities, the Export-Import Bank.

I would be remiss if I didn't note to our colleagues, you and I are both farmers, and one of the common threads in agriculture throughout this great country is, since colonial times, we have always produced more than we could consume in this country. We have always had to sell our surplus in the world markets. That is the only way that we could maintain a healthy production agriculture, to have reasonable job opportunities, a reasonable standard of living in our agricultural communities.

Export-Import touches on many of those issues, created in the 1930s as a tool to help all parts of the American economy have the credit and the ability to sell in the world markets.

As a matter of fact, the concept is so practical, it has been so well-defined, as you and I both know, 50-plus other countries have the same type of a system to help their manufacturers, their producers, their economic interests do business into the outside world.

Now, that said, we have been engaged for some time on the Financial Services Committee and in this body in a very, at times, heated debate about whether not just should Export-Import Bank be reformed to make it more efficient, make it more accountable, more responsible to the taxpayers, but whether it should even exist at all.

Now, some of our colleagues believe that, with a lack of action, the official expiration of the authorization, it is gone. We have heard our friends say here today that until all of the loans that are outstanding, all of the guarantees, all of the obligations that have been committed to are completed, the institution will continue to exist. It simply cannot provide new economic opportunities to do business around the world for our people.

And that brings us to this point, and I think it is the point that I want to stress. Can Export-Import Bank, in its present form, be reformed? Can it be made better? Can it be made more accountable?

Of course. There is not an institution in government anywhere that can't be made better, more efficient, more effective, more accountable to the taxpayers.

But the real tragedy of what is going on here is we have been presented, many of us, with the stark debate of end it all or, through circumstances beyond our control, have it reauthorized, most likely in its present form, without any of those reforms. That is why many of us are on the Fincher bill, because we believe Export-Import serves a purpose in helping create better jobs, more economic opportunities for many of our citizens, but that it needs to be done in a more responsible, accountable fashion.

I have been highly disappointed that we have not had a debate, a markup in committee on this very issue that would have ultimately led, I believe, to a debate and consideration on the floor of this United States House so that we

could potentially have sent a better product than we have now to the other body. We have not been allowed to do that.

So now we are faced with a stark contrast. How do we continue this very effective effort at moving our products into the world markets, creating those jobs here at home for our fellow citizens?

Either we have to wait for a bill to come from the other body, most likely not containing the level of reforms that we would have placed in such a reauthorization bill in the House, or, at some point, we will have a markup, either in committee or on the floor, of another piece of legislation where there will be an effort to attach it. That kind of an effort probably won't contain the level of Fincher reforms that we all want.

That is the tragedy, Congressman. We are going to reauthorize Export-Import. It is just, in what form will it be reauthorized?

We cannot allow 50-plus of our competitors around the world to have a tool, a resource, an ability for their businesses to push their products into the American economy that we don't match punch for punch economically. We cannot allow that to happen.

I hope we are going to work on behalf of our fellow workers, our fellow citizens, our fellow businesspeople in this country. But it is a tragedy, Congressman, that we are not going to have the kind of discussion and debate where we could create a dramatically improved, refined, or reformed Export-Import Bank.

We each represent our constituents. I care about mine just as you care about every one of yours, and making sure that we have the ability—the ability—for all those citizens to have good jobs, good-paying jobs, good, new economic opportunities, is just too important for us to back away—too important for us to back away.

If we don't get the reforms that our fellow citizens deserve, it won't be because you and I didn't try. We have tried for months. It will be because the choices thrust upon us by others are either all or nothing at all, present or nothing.

I want to keep selling those products that our hard-working fellow citizens make into the world market. I want to keep competing economically, blow for blow, with the rest of the world.

You know, some have said: Let's just do away with Export-Import. We will establish the principle, and the rest of the world will follow us.

Does anybody really believe that, that when we give up our ability to sell our products into other markets they will suddenly say: Oh, what a great principle. We will stop selling into your markets.

That is not the way it works, Dan, not the way it works.

I appreciate the gentleman's time, his effort on this critically important issue. Something will happen; it is just how soon and in what form.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. I yield back the balance of my time.

IRAN'S NUCLEAR DEAL

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of tragedy going on in the world. I know that at times there are people around this Congress that have felt very much alone.

I know there have been times when Presidents have felt very much alone, like Abraham Lincoln, a year or so after his son had died. His wife was fussing at him. He was going to commemorate a battlefield. There have been people who have been very alone in this town. But, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that no one in the world feels more betrayed and dejected than the leader of our former friend, Israel.

Now, Israel is still the friend of many of ours. We still hold it in the highest regard because of its similarity in belief and human rights that we have here, even there in the midst of the Middle East.

The President has announced that he is going to the United Nations to get their approval before he would even ask for a vote in Congress. That struck a chord. That rang a bell.

March of 2011, a letter from the White House in which the President advises that, he says:

At my direction, U.S. military forces commenced operations to assist an international effort authorized by the United Nation's Security Council and undertaken with the support of European allies and Arab partners to prevent a humanitarian catastrophe and address the threat posed to international peace and security by the crisis in Libya.

The trouble is, Mr. Speaker, that our President created the catastrophe, created the crisis, the real crisis in Libya, as it exists today, far worse than anything that anybody conceived would or could exist in 2011 before the President went to the U.N. to seek authority instead of coming to Congress.

Since 2003, Qadhafi had given up all efforts at supporting terrorism. He had given up efforts, all efforts, at pursuing weapons that the United States did not give him authority to keep.

As some of our Muslim Arab leaders in the Middle East have told some of us privately, since 2003, Qadhafi was doing more to help you tamp out terrorism than most anybody in the world, and yet this President decided that a small problem in Libya was enough to justify him taking out Qadhafi.

Oh, I know, we were going to create a no-fly zone, but let's be serious. The President's bombing runs that he authorized ended up, even in the face of Qadhafi asking to be allowed to just leave, and leave the country peaceably, he asked for a response within 3 days, and this President authorized bombing, apparently, as an answer.

So make no mistake, the incredibly bad judgment in this White House created a debacle in northern Africa that has spilled into other nations around Libya, that has created all kinds of human atrocities, that has created a massive movement of people heading for boats from Libya, heading north to anywhere they can go.

This President did that without authorization of Congress. He caused that without authorization of Congress. But he did have the consent of the United Nations, as he now says he is going to seek before he gets approval for his Iranian deal in Congress.

March 21 of 2011, an article by Charlie Savage in *The New York Times*, points out: "Some Democratic lawmakers—including Representatives JERROLD NADLER of New York, BARBARA LEE of California and MICHAEL E. CAPUANO of Massachusetts—complained in the House Democratic Caucus conference call as the bombing began that Mr. Obama had exceeded his constitutional authority by authorizing the attack without Congressional permission."

I would have to say that my friend, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LEE, Mr. CAPUANO of Massachusetts, they were right. I haven't said that a whole lot about my friend, Mr. NADLER, but he was right.

The article goes on: "On Monday, Mr. Obama sent Congress a two-page letter saying that as commander in chief, he had constitutional authority to authorize the strikes, which were undertaken with French, British and other allies."

The article points out: "As a presidential candidate who promoted his background as an instructor of constitutional law, Mr. Obama appeared to adopt a more limited view of executive power when he answered a question about whether a president could order the bombing of Iranian nuclear sites without a use-of-force authorization from Congress."

□ 1915

Then it quotes Mr. Obama. It says:

"The President does not have power under the Constitution to unilaterally authorize a military attack in a situation that does not involve stopping an actual or imminent threat to the nation," Mr. Obama told *The Boston Globe* in December of 2007.

It mentions further down that, in the *Globe* survey, Vice President JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr., then a Senator, argued that a President would have no authority under the Constitution to bomb Iranian nuclear sites without congressional authorization because even limited strikes can unintentionally prompt all-out war.

Well, they have violated what Mr. Obama and Mr. BIDEN said before they were in the White House and the Vice President's quarters. They created a disaster in northern Africa because they believed that their opinion was adequate and that the massive number of countries in the United Nations that hate Israel were better confidants than

Congress. Regardless of whether that is true or not, it is not constitutional.

In March of 2011, there was a national review article by Bill Burk which points out: "President Obama's war in Libya is unconstitutional without congressional authorization. But that is so only because the President has not yet given us a reason to fight that is constitutionally sound." And it goes on.

So the President helped create this massive disaster in northern Africa that has human tragedy occurring day after day, people fleeing in boats, some dying trying to get away from the Libya that he created because he decided it was time for Qadhafi to go.

Some of our Muslim leader friends in north Africa and the Middle East continue to ask: "Does your President not understand that he keeps helping the people that are at war with the United States? Does your President not understand that he is harming the people that are helping stop terrorism in the world?"

This deal that has now been cut with Iran, the largest supporter of terrorism in the world, is going to do for the Middle East and the world what President Obama's bombing did for Libya.

It has to be stopped. This deal has to be stopped. It does not meet any of the requirements that the President and all his minions said were going to come out of a deal with Iran.

And, oh, yes, there were celebrations here in Washington because they were able to convince Iran into taking back over \$100 billion. And, also, we were able to convince them to allow us to take them off the arms embargo so they could go ahead and start buying weapons from Russia, from China, wherever they wish.

Let's help the Russian economy. Let's help the Chinese economy. Let's give hundreds of billions of dollars to the largest supporter of terrorism in the world and allow them to pursue arms with that money.

Isn't there enough terrorism in the world today without this administration being accomplices to death and destruction the world over through the assistance, through this so-called deal that it has cut with Iran?

An article from certainly not a great press friend of the United States, but AFP—the *Agence France-Presse* has an article from Tehran which says, "Hard-Liners in Tehran, brought up on chants of 'death to America,' have repeatedly voiced opposition to the quest for a deal with a power derided as the 'great Satan' ever since the Islamic revolution of 1979.

The article goes on further: "Rather than representing submission to the West, the agreement is likely to consolidate Khamenei's rule, according to Davoud Hermidas Bavand, a veteran political analyst at Tehran University."

And make no mistake, this is Tehran that is in Iran, from a veteran political analyst that serves at the pleasure—o keeps his life at the pleasure of Khomeini.

The article says, "And whatever the evident contradictions of a pact with 'the great Satan,' the core of Iran's nuclear program has been preserved."

Thank you, President Barack Hussein Obama.

Yes, I know there are people celebrating in Washington. Yes, we got a great deal. We got them to take \$100 billion off our hands. We got them to agree to start being able for they themselves to buy arms.

We got them off the terrorist watch list so they can move more freely as they want to create terrorism. It is a great day. Oh, it is time to celebrate.

This article, in what may be one of the most understated comments about the deal, says, "It probably amounts to a marginal win over Israel, Saudi Arabia, and even Turkey." And that is from Mr. Bavand, describing the nuclear deal as a step forward for a war-wracked Middle East.

An article from Max Boot in *commentarymagazine.com* points out that, for a more succinct account, go right to the statement issued by Tehran's official Islamic news agency. And this comes from that.

"World powers have recognized Iran's peaceful nuclear program and are to respect the nuclear rights of Iranian nation within international conventions."

The second says—and this is from Iran—"The Islamic Republic of Iran is to be recognized as a nuclear technology power authorized to have peaceful nuclear programs, such as complete nuclear fuel cycle and enrichment to be identified by the United Nations."

"All unfair sanctions imposed by the UN Security Council, including economic and financial sanctions on Iran, are to be lifted, as per the agreement and through issuance of a new resolution by the United Nations Security Council," most all of which hate Israel.

"All nuclear installations and sites are to continue their work, contrary to the early demands of the other party"—that would be the United States—"None of them will be dismantled."

That is Iran's interpretation of the deal being celebrated down the street here, down Pennsylvania Avenue. They are celebrating because they say none of their nuclear facilities have to be dismantled.

It goes on: "The policy on preventing enrichment uranium is now failed, and Iran will go ahead with its enrichment program."

Further from Iran, they declare that "Iran's nuclear infrastructure will remain intact; no centrifuges will be dismantled; and research and development on key and advanced centrifuges . . ." "will continue."

And that is rather amazing. We heard the President say that they were going to have to dismantle like two-thirds of their centrifuges.

But it appears, from what we can find out about the deal so far, that, actually, they may dismantle some of the

centrifuges, but only because we are going to help them install and work with the most advanced centrifuges in the world, more advanced than anything Iran would have now. So far as we know, this is a huge boom to their nuclear efforts.

This article says, "The agreement specifies that it would take no fewer than 24 days to compel an inspection." It is talking about the nuclear sites. "That's plenty of time for the Iranians to 'sanitize' any suspect site so as to remove any evidence of nuclear activity; and it's far removed from the kind of '24/7 access' that President Obama said just today that inspectors would have."

"The Iranians had insisted that the agreement stick only to the nuclear issue—that's why, for example, the Iranians did not agree, as part of this deal, to release the American hostages they are holding or to end their support for terrorism or their commitment to Israel's destruction. But it turns out the agreement isn't just limited to nuclear issues. It includes a commitment to lift the conventional arms embargo on Iran in no more than 5 years and the embargo on missile sales to Iran in no more than 8 years and possibly sooner, if Iran is said to be in compliance with the nuclear accord."

And, gee, won't that be interesting. They may be able to have people that hate Israel give them the go-ahead much earlier than 8 years.

This article points out, "What this means is that Iran will soon have more than \$100 billion extra to spend not only on exporting the Iranian revolution and dominating neighboring states, but that it will also, before long, be free to purchase as many weapons—even ballistic missiles—as it likes on the world market. No wonder Vladimir Putin appears to be happy: This deal is likely to become a windfall for Russian arms makers, although you can be sure that Iran will also spread its largesse to manufacturers in France and, if possible, the U.K. so as to give those countries an extra stake in not re-imposing sanctions."

And that is good news for Ukraine, good news for Georgia, because this means that this deal, if it goes through—and the President is already saying, "We are going to lift these sanctions. We are going to get them the \$100 billion plus." Some say it is going to be \$150 billion.

Can you imagine what Russia can do with money that Iran pays it? Why, they could probably take over all of Ukraine with that kind of money.

And then the Russians, as they take over more and more of Ukraine, can be putting big posters on their tanks saying "Thank you, President Obama. Without your deal with Iran, we would never have had the money to take over Ukraine."

And what about Egypt? This is devastating news that this deal is coming to fruition for Egypt. When over 30 mil-

lion Egyptians come to the street—it would be like over 100 million Americans going to the streets and demanding the ouster of the Muslim Brother president that was seizing all power and demanding that he be gotten rid of. The military did as the people of Egypt ordered. What an incredible peaceful uprising.

□ 1930

That was impeachment as peaceably as it could be done since the Americans assisting Egypt did not even help them put in an impeachment provision in their constitution.

Mr. Speaker, it is bad news obviously for Saudi Arabia. It is bad news for Jordan. It is bad news for all countries in the Middle East. It is bad news for Syria. It is bad news for Turkey.

Oh, there will be some in Turkey and some in Syria that will be just shouting with joy, particularly President Assad. He may need to send President Obama a thank you note for the money that comes flowing in to help him in Syria perhaps; but there is going to be money spread all around to weapons makers and to people who peddle war and destruction because of what this President has done and agreed to without any promise—not even a promise—of giving up terrorism—not even a promise, not even a verbal promise, for Heaven's sake, that Iran will not try to destroy Israel.

We have this article from AFP also back in March 2 of 2015, this year. The article says: "Obama told Reuters if 'Iran is willing to agree to double-digit years of keeping their program where it is,'" there will be a deal.

Well, that is not what President Obama agreed to. This article goes on—and, again, this is March—"Netanyahu on Monday told a pro-Israel conference that a deal with Iran would 'threaten the survival of Israel.'

"Obama said that sentiment is wrongheaded, noting Netanyahu's previous opposition to an interim Iran deal as evidence Israel should back the talks.

"Netanyahu made all sorts of claims. This was going to be a terrible deal. This was going to result in Iran getting \$50 billion worth of relief. Iran would not abide by the agreement. None of that has come true."

Well, Mr. Speaker, it turns out the President was the one who was wrong, and Prime Minister Netanyahu is the one that was exactly right that it was a bad deal, that this was a terrible deal. He was right.

Now, I have to admit, Mr. Speaker, that Prime Minister Netanyahu was extremely wrong about one aspect of the Iranian deal between it and President Obama; I have to admit.

I think the world of Prime Minister Netanyahu; he is a great man, and he has the potential of being one of Israel's truly great leaders, but he was wrong when he said that this deal was going to result in Iran getting \$50 billion worth of relief.

He was way wrong because they are going to get maybe \$150 billion of relief, but certainly over \$100 billion of relief. We have to chalk it up as the one area that President Obama was right about Netanyahu being wrong.

Netanyahu understated the amount of cash this administration was willing to fork over to the terrorist state of Iran. It wasn't \$50 billion; it was over \$100 billion, possibly \$150 billion. There it is on the record; Netanyahu was wrong. He said \$50 billion is what Iran would get, and it was over \$100 billion.

Mr. Speaker, let's look at this deal and what has been said in the past about it. Under Secretary of State Wendy Sherman—Mr. Speaker, you will remember that she is the one who was key in the negotiations with North Korea where we gave them nuclear power plants and material and all we got in return was a promise that, if we just gave them everything they needed, all the technology to make nuclear bombs, they would use it for nuclear power plants. Of course, we know they broke their word.

When you are dealing with a scorpion and it stings you, you shouldn't ask later: Why did you do that? You know why. The answer in the old fable is: It is because I am a scorpion; it is what I do. That is what the leader of North Korea is, and it is what he did.

If you look at the leaders of Iran, there is a similar fable about the snake. Someone warms the snake up, and it ends up biting him. Why did you do that? It is because I am a snake. Perhaps in the near future, President Obama and Secretary Kerry will be heard to ask: Why did you break all these terms?

The answer should be: It is because we are snakes; that is what we do.

Mr. Speaker, Wendy Sherman said, on February 4 of 2014, nearly a year and a half ago, about the Iranian deal:

We raised possible military dimensions. In fact, in the Joint Plan of Action, we have required that Iran come clean on its past actions as part of any comprehensive agreement.

Well, that didn't happen. Wendy Sherman was as wrong about that as she was about North Korea not using the nuclear capacity we gave them to make nuclear weapons.

Of course, December 7, 2013, President Obama himself said: "It is my strong belief that we can envision an end state that gives us an assurance that even if they have some modest enrichment capability, it is so constrained and the inspections so intrusive that they, as a practical matter, do not have breakout capacity."

Now, that is a great statement there because he is not saying that we will get Iran to that point. If you look carefully, he says that we will have "an end state that gives us an assurance."

Well, Iran is willing to give us assurance, but they are not even willing to give us an assurance of what President Obama hoped for, for goodness' sake.

Secretary Kerry said, on November 24, 2013: "There is no right to enrich.

We do not recognize a right to enrich. It is clear.” in the NPT, “in the non-proliferation treaty, it’s very, very clear that there is no right to enrich.”

Well, now, we know that Secretary Kerry was very, very wrong about it being very, very clear there was no right to enrich; not only is there a right to enrich, we are going to help Iran enrich. Thank you, President Obama.

Sanctions relief, here is a quote from John Kerry from March 3. Secretary of State Kerry said: “Iran is not open for business until Iran is closed for nuclear bombs.”

Well, we know that is not going to be the case. They are open for business, and they are still enriching.

Again, Under Secretary of State Wendy Sherman said: “This includes a lot of dismantling of their infrastructure.”

Well, it turns out that is not the case, either.

Under Secretary of State Wendy Sherman, February 4 of 2014, said: “It is true that in these first six months we’ve not shut down all of their production of any ballistic missile.”

Well, it turns out they are not going to at all—how about that.

March 5, 2015, Secretary Kerry: “It will reduce the pressure for a regional nuclear arms race, and it will increase the strength of the international non-proliferation regime. It will also vastly improve the prospects for peace both here and elsewhere.”

Secretary Kerry was wrong, wrong, wrong.

Now, they want the U.N. to pass the deal. Well, gosh, I am sure they will get plenty of votes from people that want the money that the U.S. is going to make sure Iran has to buy nuclear weapons.

Prime Minister Netanyahu says that the Iran deal is a grave mistake, and he is as right now as he was before. This deal has to be stopped for the sake of mankind.

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

applicable budget allocations and aggregates pursuant to section 3(e)(1)(B) of H. Res. 5 and section 4509 of S. Con. Res. 11, the Fiscal Year 2016 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget.

For fiscal year 2015, the applicable budget allocations and aggregates set forth in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2014, as adjusted in the 113th Congress, are revised. For fiscal years 2016 through 2025, the applicable budget allocations and aggregates provided by S. Con. Res. 11 are revised. These revisions are designated for H.R. 3038, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015, Part II. Corresponding tables are attached.

This revision represents an adjustment for purposes of budgetary enforcement. These revised allocations and aggregates are to be considered as the aggregates and allocations included in the budget resolution, pursuant to S. Con. Res. 11, as adjusted. Pursuant to section 3402 of such concurrent resolution, this revision to the allocations and aggregates shall apply only while H.R. 3038 is under consideration or upon its enactment.

Sincerely,
TOM PRICE, M.D.,
Chairman.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISIONS TO THE AGGREGATES AND ALLOCATIONS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2015 AND 2016 BUDGET RESOLUTIONS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, July 15, 2015.

MR. SPEAKER: I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record revisions to the

TABLE 1—REVISION TO ON-BUDGET AGGREGATES
[Budget aggregates—on-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal Year		
	2015	2016	2016–2025
Current Aggregates:			
Budget Authority	3,033,319	3,040,298	1
Outlays	3,027,686	3,092,366	1
Revenues	2,535,978	2,676,733	32,237,371
Adjustment for the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015, Part II:			
Budget Authority	8,068	0	1
Outlays	8,068	0	1
Revenues	19	171	4,889
Revised Aggregates:			
Budget Authority	3,041,387	3,040,298	1
Outlays	3,035,754	3,092,366	1
Revenues	2,535,997	2,676,904	32,242,260

¹ Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2017–2025 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

TABLE 2—REVISION TO THE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE
[Authorizing committee 302(a) allocations—on-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	2015		2016		2016–2025 Total	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Current Allocation	71,391	17,102	57,975	16,407	520,762	184,208
Adjustment for the Highway & Transportation Funding Act of 2015	8,068	8,068	0	0	0	0
Revised Allocation	79,459	25,170	57,975	16,407	520,762	184,208

TABLE 3—REVISION TO THE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY
[Authorizing committee 302(a) allocations—on-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	2015		2016		2016–2025 Total	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Current Allocation	1,913	1,887	1,808	1,793	3,591	3,736
Adjustment for the Highway & Transportation Funding Act of 2015	0	0	0	0	–3,160	–3,160
Revised Allocation	1,913	1,887	1,808	1,793	431	576

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. 756. An act to require a report on accountability for war crimes and crimes against humanity in Syria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o’clock and 38 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 16, 2015, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

2165. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final

rule — Viruses, Serums, Toxins, and Analogous Products; Single Label Claim for Veterinary Biological Products [Docket No.: APHIS-2011-0049] (RIN: 0579-AD64) received July 13, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2166. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General Larry O. Spencer, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2167. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement Rear Admiral Michael H. Miller, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2168. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization for Brigadier General John D. Bansenmer to wear the insignia of the grade of major general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2169. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing twenty-two officers on an enclosed list to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, as indicated, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2170. A letter from the Secretary, Army, Department of Defense, transmitting a notification to Congress on the details of the Army's plan to reduce more than 1,000 members of the Armed Forces assigned at several military installations, in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 993; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2171. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled "2014 Actuarial Report on the Financial Outlook for Medicaid", pursuant to Sec. 506 of the Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2009 (Pub. L. 111-3); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2172. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the FY 2014 report on the financial aspects of the implementation of the Biosimilar User Fee Act of 2012, pursuant to Public Law 112-144; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2173. A letter from the Deputy Director/ODRM, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rules — Coverage of Certain Preventive Services Under the Affordable Care Act [CMS-9940-F] (RIN: 0938-AS50) received July 14, 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.

2174. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled "National Plan to Address Alzheimer's Disease: 2015 Update", pursuant to Pub. L. 111-375; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2175. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the report entitled "Report to Congress on the Prevention and Reduction of Underage Drinking", pursuant to Pub. L. 109-422, Sec. 2(c)(1)(F); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2176. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Assessment and

Collection of Regulatory Fees for Fiscal Year 2015; Amendment of Part 1 of the Commission's Rules; Assessment and Collection of Regulatory Fees for Fiscal Year 2014 [MD Docket No.: 15-121] [MD Docket No.: 15-121] [MD Docket No.: 14-92] received July 13, 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.

2177. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance to the Republic of Korea, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Pub. L. 94-329, Transmittal No.: 15-33; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2178. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Executive Order 13637, Transmittal No.: 6-15, informing the Congress of the Department's intent to sign a Memorandum of Understanding with Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2179. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Federal Employees' Retirement System; Present Value Conversion Factors for Spouses of Deceased Separated Employees (RIN: 3206-AN16) received July 13, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2180. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Federal Employees Health Benefits Program: FEHB Plan Performance Assessment System (RIN: 3206-AN13) received July 13, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2181. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled "Certification of Fiscal Year 2015 Total Local Source General Fund Revenue Estimate (Net of Dedicated Taxes) in Support of the District's Issuance of General Obligation Bonds (Series 2015A and 2015B)"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2182. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the 28th Annual Report of Accomplishments under the Airport Improvement Program for FY 2011, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 47131; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2183. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel (02REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Agency Interpretation of Prosthetic Replacement of a Joint (RIN: 2900-AP38) received July 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2184. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel (02 REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards; Updating References (RIN: 2900-AP22) received July 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2185. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the report entitled "Part D

Plans Generally Include Drugs Commonly Used by Dual Eligibles: 2015" (OEI-05-15-00120), pursuant to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

The Committee on Energy and Commerce discharged from further consideration S. 984 referred to the 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. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. ESTY, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 3064. A bill to authorize highway infrastructure and safety, transit, motor carrier, rail, and other surface transportation programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, Science, Space, and Technology, Natural Resources, Oversight and Government Reform, the Budget, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 3065. A bill to prevent conflicts of interest that stem from executive Government employees receiving bonuses or other compensation arrangements from nongovernment sources, from the revolving door that raises concerns about the independence of financial services regulators, and from the revolving door that casts aspersions over the awarding of Government contracts and other financial benefits; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, 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. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Ms. MENG, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 3066. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to clarify that houses of worship are eligible for certain disaster relief and emergency assistance on terms equal to other eligible private nonprofit facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself and Mr. HECK of Nevada):

H.R. 3067. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to authorize local educational agencies and schools to carry out child sexual abuse awareness and prevention programs or activities; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana,

Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARR, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RIBBLE, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SIREN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKAL, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 3068. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to review the discharge characterization of former members of the Armed Forces who were discharged by reason of the sexual orientation of the member, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VEASEY (for himself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 3069. A bill to amend section 240(c)(7)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the time limit on the filing of a motion to reopen a removal proceeding if the basis of the motion is fraud, negligence, misrepresentation, or extortion by, or the attempted, promised, or actual practice of law without authorization on the part of, a representative; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 3070. A bill to clarify that for purposes of all Federal laws governing marine fisheries management, the landward boundary of the exclusive economic zone between areas south of Montauk, New York, and Point Judith, Rhode Island, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS,

Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BEYER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 3071. A bill to permit employees to request changes to their work schedules without fear of retaliation and to ensure that employers consider these requests, and to require employers to provide more predictable and stable schedules for employees in certain occupations with evidence of unpredictable and unstable scheduling practices that negatively affect employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, Oversight and Government Reform, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. POMPEO):

H.R. 3072. A bill to remove the authority of the Secretary of Energy to amend or issue new energy efficiency standards for ceiling fans; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DESJARLAIS:

H.R. 3073. A bill to prohibit the receipt of Federal financial assistance by sanctuary cities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. HARPER, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 3074. A bill to mandate the monthly formulation and publication of a consumer price index specifically for senior citizens for the purpose of establishing an accurate Social Security COLA for such citizens; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 3075. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a grant program to establish counter-messaging campaigns targeting terrorist propaganda; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 3076. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 2014 to increase the number of base acres upon which agricultural producers are authorized to grow fruits and vegetables without a resulting reduction in payment acres on their farm when the resulting

produce is used to help alleviate a food desert, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. TIBERI, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

H.R. 3077. A bill to require any amounts remaining in Members' Representational Allowances at the end of a fiscal year to be deposited in the Treasury and used for deficit reduction or to reduce the Federal debt; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 3078. A bill to establish a commission to study how Federal laws and policies affect United States citizens living in foreign countries; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Ways and Means, the Judiciary, House Administration, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCLINTOCK:

H.R. 3079. A bill to take certain Federal land located in Tuolumne County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself and Mr. ZINKE):

H.R. 3080. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exception to the employer health insurance mandate for Indian tribal governments and tribally owned businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself, Mr. PAL-LONE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 3081. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit certain Medicare providers licensed in a State to provide telemedicine services to certain Medicare beneficiaries in a different State; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. FLEMING):

H.R. 3082. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5919 Chef Menteur Highway in New Orleans, Louisiana, as the "Daryle Holloway Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 3083. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the dividends received deduction for repatriated foreign earnings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas:

H. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that any Executive order that infringes on the powers and duties of the Congress under article I, section 8 of the Constitution, or that would require the expenditure of Federal funds not specifically appropriated for the purpose of the Executive order, is advisory only and has no force or effect unless enacted as law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H. Res. 363. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the power of Congress to protect the right to vote; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. EDWARDS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. MENG, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HONDA, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. FARR, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. ISRAEL):

H. Res. 364. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Fédération Internationale de Football Association should immediately eliminate gender pay inequity and treat all athletes with the same respect and dignity; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 365. A resolution expressing support for dancing as a form of valuable exercise and of artistic expression, and for the designation of July 25, 2015, "National Dance Day"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

78. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 11, urging the President and the Congress of the United States to recognize the unique military value of California's defense installations and the disproportionate sacrifices California has endured in previous base realignment and closure rounds; to the Committee on Armed Services.

79. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 14, urging the federal government to recognize that service members need additional GI Bill support in order to achieve their goals of a college education and related employment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

80. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 6, urging the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to establish guarantees by the federal government to support the responsible sale of postearthquake bonds by financially sound residential-earthquake-insurance programs operated by any of the several states on an actuarially sound basis; to the Committee on Financial Services.

81. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 14, urging the Congress to support legislation reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank of the United States; to the Committee on Financial Services.

82. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to Senate Joint

Resolution 17, stating that the Legislature of the state of Utah recognizes the 800th anniversary of Magna Carta; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

83. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, relative to House Joint Resolution 28, urging the President, the Secretary of the Department of Labor, the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, and the members of Congress to update the regulations implementing Executive Order 11246; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

84. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution 5, urging the members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives to repeal the Act of June 30, 1948, that conferred on the State of Iowa jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Meskwaki Settlement; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

85. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, declaring support for the negotiated settlement of federal reserved water rights between the Navajo Nation and representatives of the state of Utah; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

86. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution 4, urging Congress to create a process for establishing a national monument that includes public participation and local and state involvement; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

87. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 7, urging the United States Congress to create a process for transferring to the state of Utah authority to protect and manage feral horses and burros within its borders; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

88. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 6, urging the United States Congress to pass legislation for fair and constitutional collection and remittance of state and local sales and use taxes by both in-state and remote sellers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

89. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 7, requesting the Congress of the United States call a convention of the States to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

90. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 13, asking Congress to eliminate the freeze on longer combination vehicles and consent to the creation of a voluntary compact between western states that will establish uniform standards for operation of longer combination vehicles; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

91. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to House Joint Resolution 13, urging the federal government to recognize its unreported liabilities in its financial statements and enact changes that will resolve the national debt crisis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

92. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to House Concurrent Resolution 8, urging the President of the United States to direct federal agencies that implement management practices that increase soil carbon sequestration to develop comprehensive plans that achieve the maximum amount of carbon sequestration possible and increase the economic and environmental productivity of rangelands and urges similar action within each state; jointly to

the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Agriculture.

93. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 1, urging actions to promote the interstate sharing of putative father registry information; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Ways and Means.

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. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 3064.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 3065.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 3066.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3067.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 3068.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. VEASEY:

H.R. 3069.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4: The Congress shall have the Power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 3070.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 3071.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 3072.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. DESJARLAIS:

H.R. 3073.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 3074.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

Section 1. All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Section 8.

1) The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 3075.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 3076.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 3 (“The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes [.]”)(This bill would alter crop insurance policy to create incentives for farmers to plant more fruits and vegetables, and for those fruits and vegetables to be sold or donated to communities that lack access to traditional grocery stores—causing a shift in allocation and supply of fruits and vegetables. Such a shift of produce allocation alters commercial activity—making the bill a valid exercise of the Commerce Clause).

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 3077.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 3078.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 10

The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. MCCLINTOCK:

H.R. 3079.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) U.S. Constitution, Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (the Property Clause), which confers on Congress the authority over lands belonging to the United States, including the placement of such lands into trust for Native American Tribes.

(2) U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (the Commerce Clause) and U.S. Constitution, Article II, Section 2 (the Treaty Clause), which confer on Congress plenary authority over Native American affairs.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 3080.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 3081.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 3082.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 3083.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 38: Mr. JOYCE.
 H.R. 93: Mr. DENT.
 H.R. 167: Mr. KLINE.
 H.R. 210: Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 217: Mr. PALMER.
 H.R. 249: Mr. HECK of Washington.
 H.R. 276: Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 300: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 303: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
 H.R. 320: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
 H.R. 333: Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 343: Mr. KIND.
 H.R. 402: Mr. BABIN.
 H.R. 423: Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 483: Mr. McDERMOTT and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
 H.R. 503: Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 532: Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 540: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. ROKITA.
 H.R. 577: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
 H.R. 605: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 664: Mr. NADLER, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. ASHFORD.
 H.R. 692: Mr. LONG.
 H.R. 699: Mr. STEWART.
 H.R. 702: Mr. DUFFY.
 H.R. 757: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. KLINE.
 H.R. 816: Mr. GOSAR and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
 H.R. 865: Mrs. NOEM.
 H.R. 868: Mr. HONDA and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
 H.R. 879: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 912: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 918: Mr. ZINKE and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 940: Mrs. NOEM.
 H.R. 953: Mr. MEEHAN.
 H.R. 961: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 969: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. DENHAM, and Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 985: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. ROSS.
 H.R. 1019: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1086: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. BABIN.
 H.R. 1100: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. TURNER, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 1151: Mrs. NOEM.
 H.R. 1178: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1211: Mrs. DINGELL.
 H.R. 1247: Mr. LYNCH.
 H.R. 1277: Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 1312: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 1356: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 1384: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COOK, and Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 1388: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 1399: Mr. MICA.
 H.R. 1427: Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1441: Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 1460: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 1482: Mr. AGUILAR.
 H.R. 1490: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 1516: Mrs. DINGELL.
 H.R. 1523: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia and Mr. REED.

H.R. 1553: Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 1567: Mr. LYNCH.
 H.R. 1594: Mr. CALVERT and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1599: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. BUCK, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. BOST, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. YOHO, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 1603: Mrs. NOEM and Mr. BOST.
 H.R. 1610: Mr. OLSON, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1628: Mrs. DINGELL.
 H.R. 1635: Mr. WITTMAN and Mrs. WAGNER.
 H.R. 1644: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 1684: Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 1711: Mr. JORDAN.
 H.R. 1752: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 1779: Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 1786: Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 1788: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 1801: Mrs. DINGELL.
 H.R. 1817: Ms. MCSALLY.
 H.R. 1843: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1881: Ms. TITUS.
 H.R. 1893: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1919: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 1933: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H.R. 1976: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 1994: Mr. BOST, Mr. RIGELL, and Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.

H.R. 2017: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mrs. HARTZLER.
 H.R. 2019: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 2030: Mr. PETERS.
 H.R. 2043: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. RIGELL, and Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 2052: Ms. DELAURO.
 H.R. 2059: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2076: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 2134: Mr. BABIN.
 H.R. 2141: Mr. WALKER.
 H.R. 2142: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 2145: Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 2168: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
 H.R. 2191: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 2205: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 2217: Mr. ELLISON.
 H.R. 2221: Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 2257: Mr. NOLAN.
 H.R. 2282: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. PETERS.
 H.R. 2315: Mr. PAULSEN.
 H.R. 2320: Mr. COOPER.
 H.R. 2369: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. YOHO, Mr. BOST, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.
 H.R. 2398: Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 2407: Mrs. HARTZLER.
 H.R. 2410: Mr. AGUILAR.
 H.R. 2411: Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 2412: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 2429: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. PETERS.
 H.R. 2458: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, and Mr. ABRAHAM.
 H.R. 2460: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2464: Mr. CRAMER.
 H.R. 2465: Ms. BORDALLO.
 H.R. 2494: Mr. LOBONDO and Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.
 H.R. 2513: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 2530: Ms. LEE, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. CICILLINE.
 H.R. 2568: Mr. LAMALFA.
 H.R. 2606: Mr. ZINKE.
 H.R. 2623: Mr. PETERSON.
 H.R. 2646: Mr. OLSON, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. BUCSHON, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. SENBRENNER and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2654: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. GALLEGRO, and Mrs. BEATTY.
 H.R. 2657: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 2675: Mr. GUTHRIE.
 H.R. 2694: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
 H.R. 2697: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 2716: Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
 H.R. 2726: Mrs. ROBY and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
 H.R. 2734: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 2775: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BARTON, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 2777: Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 2799: Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 2812: Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 2835: Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 2856: Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 2868: Mr. OLSON, Mr. COLE, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 2899: Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 2902: Mr. MOULTON.
 H.R. 2903: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. POLIQUIN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
 H.R. 2937: Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 2939: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 2942: Mr. FLORES, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 2944: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. OLSON, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 2948: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. JOLLY.
 H.R. 2964: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 2972: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. ESTY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2973: Mr. CHAFFETZ and Mr. GROTHMAN.
 H.R. 2976: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 2978: Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 2983: Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 2999: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
 H.R. 3002: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. OLSON, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. ABRAHAM.
 H.R. 3005: Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 3008: Mrs. DINGELL.
 H.R. 3009: Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 3011: Mr. PERRY, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 3016: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
 H.R. 3025: Mr. AGUILAR.
 H.R. 3037: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. HASTINGS.
 H.R. 3040: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 3052: Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 3060: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. HONDA.
 H.J. Res. 9: Mr. BABIN and Mr. OLSON.

H.J. Res. 59: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. JONES, and Mr. CHAFFETZ.
 H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. JOLLY and Mr. MEEHAN.
 H. Con. Res. 33: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
 H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. CICILLINE and Mrs. BEATTY.
 H. Con. Res. 40: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. MARINO.
 H. Res. 54: Mr. KATKO.
 H. Res. 112: Mr. HASTINGS.
 H. Res. 209: Mr. OLSON.
 H. Res. 230: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
 H. Res. 294: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PETERS, and Mrs. NOEM.
 H. Res. 318: Mr. OLSON.
 H. Res. 359: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BARTON, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. WALBERG.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 2722: Mr. ROUZER.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

16. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Board of Chosen Freeholders of the County of Monmouth, relative to Official Resolution No. 2015-0539, opposing the Base Realignment and Closure Commission's potential closure of Federal Military Bases in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Armed Services.

17. Also, a petition of City of Miami, relative to Miami City Commission Resolution R-15-0259, urging the Congress and President to pass legislation requiring that imported construction materials meet the same safety standards as domestic construction materials and that the Environmental Protection Agency and/or CPSC promulgate rules to protect consumers from potential adverse health effects from such materials; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.