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

Printed on recycled paper.

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

NAYS—182

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

NOT VOTING—6

Beyer
Cramer
Engel
Garamendi
Keating
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:

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

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

NOES—183

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

NOT VOTING—5

Beyer
DeLauro
Engel
Fortenberry
Keating

□ 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 304/365 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 79/366 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 304/365 of such unobligated balance'' and inserting ''for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 18, 2015, that is equal to 79/366 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'', 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 Financial 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 infrastructure; 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 cosponsors. 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 highway 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 stopgap 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 experiencing, 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 Senate 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 noes 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
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—244

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

Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—4

Beyer
Bishop (UT)
Engel
Schrader

□ 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
Adams
Aderholt
Allen
Ashford
Babin
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Benishek
Bera
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dold
Donovan
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
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
Joyce
Katko
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Pallone
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Reed
Reichert
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Titus
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—119

Aguilar
Amash
Amodei
Barletta
Becerra
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Buck
Byrne
Cárdenas
Carney
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Clark (MA)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Collins (GA)
Cooper
Courtney
Cummings
DeGette
DeLauro
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Farenthold
Fleming
Flores
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Garrett
Gohmert
Gosar
Graves (GA)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Gutiérrez
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hice, Jody B.
Huelskamp
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Labrador
Lamborn
Larson (CT)
Latta
Loudermilk
Lummis
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Moore
Moulton
Mulvaney
Neal
Neugebauer
Palazzo
Palmer
Pascrell
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Rothfus
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Schakowsky
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Speier
Thompson (MS)
Tipton
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walker
Weber (TX)
Welch
Westmoreland
Yoder
Yoho

NOT VOTING—2

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
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais

Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
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
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, 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
Meeks
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
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
Schrader
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
Swalwell (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

HOUR 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 NFC 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 counterproductive.

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 ammunitions 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 answered, ''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 machine 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 undue 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 cosponsor. 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 gentlewoman 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 allowed 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 Litania 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—or 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 million 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 nonproliferation 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 nonproliferation 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.

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 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.

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. Bansemer 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 Preventative 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. SIRES, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKAI, 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. PALLONE, 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 1, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. 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. LOBIONDO 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. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2654: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. GALLEGO, 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.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 15, 2015 No. 110

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Answer us when we call, O God, and bless our Nation.

May our lawmakers work to do Your will, remembering that You have set apart the Godly for yourself. Inspire our Senators to find refuge in You and to discover blessings and joy in Your favor.

Lord, continue to supply our needs according to Your riches in glory, encouraging us to learn contentment by trusting the unfolding of Your loving providence. Keep us from stumbling or slipping as we find safety by walking with integrity.

Eternal God, to Your precious Name we ascribe glory, majesty and might, dominion and power, now and always. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAUL). The majority leader is recognized.

KENTUCKY FLOODING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this morning we are all thinking of the many Kentuckians who have been impacted by severe flooding over the past couple of days. Eastern Kentucky has been especially hard hit. Governor Beshear has declared a state of emergency, and the Kentucky delegation stands ready to assist in this effort.

The tragic flooding has already claimed two lives in Johnson County. Six remain missing. Others were forced to watch as homes and cherished memories were swept away. We can only imagine what these Kentuckians and their families must be going through.

This has been an especially trying task for our first responders as well. They have had to battle against debris and downed power lines. They have worked to rescue Kentuckians from trees. It hasn't been easy, but it reminds us again of why we owe these men and women so very much. I join Kentuckians in thanking them for all they have done and all they continue to do.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on an entirely different matter, I said yesterday the Senate would thoroughly review the White House deal with Iran. I said we would hold hearings and we would call witnesses and ultimately vote to approve or disapprove the deal in accordance with the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. That is what we have long planned to do, and once the administration fully transmits the text, that is just what we will do.

Senators are already taking a close look at what they have been able to get their hands on thus far, but the Senate eagerly awaits the full transmission of that text and the required certifications. We await the beginning of a comprehensive review process premised on a simple question: Can the agreement meet its essential test of leaving our country and our allies safer?

EVERY CHILD ACHIEVES ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Finally, Mr. President, turning to the business currently before the Senate, the bipartisan education debate we are having in the new Senate is good for our country and it was long overdue.

For too long, bureaucrats in Washington tried to dictate top-down, one-size-fits-all education policies to millions of students and families across our country. It was hurting our kids, and it needed to change. So a new Senate that is back to work for the American people decided to work together to do something about it. We thought it was past time to place more education decisionmaking power where it truly belongs—with parents, with teachers, with States, and with school boards, not with a distant Federal bureaucracy.

The pundits said Washington could never address these challenges, but the bipartisan Every Child Achieves Act actually received unanimous support from every Democrat and every Republican in committee. Just think about that for a moment. It is an impressive achievement, and it wouldn't have been possible without a functioning Senate and a lot of dedication and determination from the bill's primary sponsors, the Republican Senator from Tennessee and the Democratic Senator from Washington.

This debate may be years overdue, but Republicans and Democrats are certainly having their voices heard today. They are working across the aisle, they are representing the views of their constituents, and they are offering amendments. The new Senate has processed over two dozen amendments to this bill already, and we have adopted quite a few of them. In fact, we have now taken more rollcall amendment votes this year in the new Congress than throughout the entirety of the last Congress combined. That is an achievement both parties can celebrate. It represents progress for our country. And this afternoon we have a chance to make more because, with cooperation from our friends across the

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

aisle, we can continue to advance the Every Child Achieves Act later today and set up final passage soon. That would mean another bipartisan achievement for our country and a long-overdue win for our kids.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my heart goes out to the people in Eastern Kentucky, with the devastating floods. The issue before our entire country is that we have storms like this appearing from nowhere, storms like we have never had before. I don't know the history of Kentucky, but I have watched and been briefed on what is going on around the rest of the Nation, and these storms are coming all the time—untoward.

It is too bad that my Republican colleagues have denied climate change. We have to do something, and we have to do something very soon.

There was a meeting a few days ago at the White House where the President announced that with regard to climate change we have to do something now. He said that by the year 2100, scientists say, the seas will have risen 16 feet. What does that mean? It means that much of Florida will be underwater.

We have things happening that have never been recorded before. In the Sierras, some bears are not hibernating. We have an average rainfall and snowpack in upper Colorado, and none of it gets into the river. So I would hope my friends would join with us in doing something positive with regard to climate change.

PUBLIC SAFETY AND THE HIGHWAY BILL

Mr. REID. Mr. President, more than 62 million vehicles were recalled last year in our country—twice the previous record. The number of safety complaints to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration doubled. Over the past year, for example, faulty ignition switches led to the recall of 2.6 million cars. At least 124 people died and almost 300 were injured by this ignition switch problem, which did many different things, one of which was to stall a car in traffic and during the process disable the airbags. The manufacturer was aware of the defect for more than a decade and did nothing about it. Exploding airbags—another problem—claimed the lives of at least 8 people and led to the recall of 34 million vehicles—the largest recall of any consumer product in the United States ever. Once again, it appears the manufacturer knew of the defect years before notifying Federal regulators.

Given the number of recalls, Congress should be investing the resources to improve public safety and give regulators the tools to keep us safe. But it appears Senate Republicans have learned nothing from the many recalls just this year. The Republican highway safety bill, which is being considered in the committee on commerce today, does not increase funding for Federal traffic programs. In fact, it cuts them back. Why? The bill does not provide any new resources to address the record level of safety recalls and consumer complaints. Under the Republican bill that is being considered, automakers that cover up defects will continue to face the same very limited penalties. Their executives will be able to continue to escape accountability.

But that isn't all of it. The highway bill the Republicans are pushing forward is loaded with harmful provisions that roll back efforts to strengthen public safety. The bill would allow 18-year-old young men and women—18 years old—to drive commercial 18-wheelers across State lines. Think about that. Despite studies which show that these young drivers have a fatal crash rate almost 70 percent higher than older drivers, the Republican safety plan would allow these inexperienced teenagers to drive the largest trucks that appear on the road.

If this odyssey of the Republicans in the commerce committee is signed into law, it will lead to more crashes and, sadly, more injuries and more deaths.

Every day, 30 people in our great country are killed by drunk drivers—30 people killed by drunk drivers. I just learned a couple of days ago of a person who worked for me, who was a tremendously great employee of the Senate—their brother-in-law was killed by a drunk driver. It is so sad that we are not doing more to not only stop drunk driving but to punish drunk drivers. The policy Republicans propose today hurts our efforts to combat drunk driving.

Listen to this one. The Republicans' bill would lessen incentives for States that develop programs to prevent people who have been convicted of drunk driving from starting their cars if they have been drinking—for example, just a simple, inexpensive device on a car. If someone has been drinking too much, the car won't start. But Republicans are going to take care of this and get rid of it. No longer will States have the ability to do that. The Federal Government should not be involved in programs like that.

The Republicans' plan also undermines safety measures that protect passengers and trains and, of course, the safety of all of us because of the problems we have with freight trains. There is a program that was designed by science—it has been available for a long time—called positive train control which overrides operator error. A perfect example of this is what happened in Philadelphia. If that had been in effect, that accident would not have occurred. But the Republicans fixed this—they are going to stop the program for 3 years.

Under the present law, these programs had to be implemented by the end of this year—not with the Republicans in the commerce committee, which will be part of any highway bill we have. They will just stop it for 3 years, and that will lead to more deaths, more injuries, and more terror.

I can't understand why the Republicans would propose doing that—delaying the deadline for positive train control by more than 3 years. I said 3 years, but it is actually more than that. There is no reason to roll back deadlines for important safety measures for our passenger trains. Is this the best Republicans can do? I ask that.

For Americans who live near rail lines, trains are increasingly carrying more and more flammable materials—oil, ethanol, and other explosive products. In February of this year, a train carrying oil derailed in West Virginia, sending exploding fireballs into the air and causing large necessary evacuations.

This and other crashes led the Department of Transportation to require the installation of new electronic brakes for any train moving flammable materials. Requiring better brakes when carrying these materials seems like a commonsense safety measure.

What do the Republicans do? Their bill repeals an important freight rail provision, jeopardizing communities across the country with tragic spills. We don't need more accidents. We need fewer accidents. We need to move forward and to continue the minimal programs we have, not roll them back. It is clear the Republicans have not learned anything from the auto recalls or the train crashes. The Senate can do better than adopting the Republican's attack on public safety. If the Republicans choose to put those measures in the highway bill that I am told is coming forward, it will not survive the Senate. We can't have stuff like that. It would be just untoward and wrong.

Mr. President, there is no one on the floor, and I ask that the Chair announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

EVERY CHILD ACHIEVES ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1177, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1177) to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that every child achieves.

Pending:

Alexander/Murray amendment No. 2089, in the nature of a substitute.

Murray (for Peters) amendment No. 2095 (to amendment No. 2089), to allow local educational agencies to use parent and family engagement funds for financial literacy activities.

Murray (for Warren/Gardner) amendment No. 2120 (to amendment No. 2089), to amend section 1111(d) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 regarding the cross-tabulation of student data.

Alexander (for Kirk) amendment No. 2161 (to amendment No. 2089), to ensure that States measure and report on indicators of student access to critical educational resources and identify disparities in such resources.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 10:30 a.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, is the time under this quorum call we will be in equally divided?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is not equally divided.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I rise to address an amendment I am proposing to the bill, the Every Child Achieves Act. I am not going to ask to call up the amendment at this time, but I certainly would like to do so at a later point in the day. I hope this amendment will be part of any effort to wrap-up debate on this bill because it addresses an important component that is being left out of discussion on the Every Child Achieves Act.

The Every Child Achieves Act is the authorization act, but it leaves out the vision for school policy. This is a bipartisan bill. It is a bill that would give a lot more flexibility to our States, and it has been an important effort to address many shortcomings in the former act, the No Child Left Behind Act, that in fact left a lot of children behind. In my discussions with educators throughout the State of Oregon, with parents, administrators, and teachers, they found a great number of difficulties and problems with an act that was undermining the success of our public schools, leaving a huge number of children behind, and focusing on what these educators referred to as ''the bubble''—that is, those children who are close enough to the testing line to get them over the top, while decreasing attention paid to those children who could already meet the testing line or those they think were not able to get to that line. That is not a holistic, comprehensive education system addressing the needs of all our children. So I am delighted to see this reform on the floor of the Senate. The focus on assisting every child in achieving is appropriate.

But we cannot achieve a world-class education system that responds to a world knowledge economy, preparing our children to be fully successful members of that world knowledge economy, if we do not provide the resources necessary for our schools to thrive. It strikes me as a real failure of our legislative process that a generation after I went through elementary and secondary education, we are a far richer nation, but our schools have far fewer resources.

My children have been attending public schools in the same blue-collar school district I grew up in. I have a firsthand view of the difference between what the school provided when I was there and what has been provided while my children are there. The short conclusion is that our classrooms are more crowded and our schools are unable to provide the same range of options that benefited my generation.

How is it that we are a much richer nation, but we are undervaluing and underfunding our elementary and secondary education system in this Nation? Well, we can tie that back to a lot that has transpired, including a huge growth in inequality in our Nation. But here is the key point: While we sit here on the floor debating better education policy, shouldn't we also be recognizing explicitly this huge failure to provide basic resources to the elementary and secondary education system?

The funding cuts that are currently anticipated under the sequester would bring Federal investments and programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to their lowest levels since fiscal year 2002. Let me repeat that: the lowest level since fiscal year 2002. Of the lowest achieving 5 percent of schools that receive funds under part A of title I of such act, about two-thirds of students are not meeting their grade-level standards. It is certainly a more difficult task for teachers to enable students to meet those standards when our classrooms are more crowded.

The proposed appropriations act cuts funding for part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 by $850 million as compared to the President's budget and the Democratic funding alternative.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to extend the time allotted to complete my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, research shows that high-quality early education is critical to the educational development of every child. There, too, we are underfunding the effort. The proposed appropriations act provides no funding for preschool development grants and a cut of $750 million as compared to the President's budget and the Democratic alternative.

Now, this is happening—this underfunding of education—within the construct known as the sequester. The sequester was partially alleviated 2 years ago by a budget deal known as Ryan-Murray. That Ryan-Murray agreement led to saying that according to the sequester principle defense spending and nondefense spending would be treated equally. If one is capped, the other is capped. If one is raised, the other is raised.

That fundamental understanding led to an improvement over the last 2 years. But that improvement is gone. So at the very moment, we are talking about better education policy, and we are talking about worse education funding. That is simply wrong—wrong for our children, wrong for the next generation and the success of America. So let's embrace that second half of the conversation and through my amendment—amendment No. 2203—call for an intense negotiation to occur, essentially to restore appropriate funding on the nondefense programs.

This is a rational counterpart to the debate over the bill that we have before us right now. It is certainly important for America to recognize that you cannot, on the one hand, call for better education policy and on the other hand devastate the funding for early childhood education and devastate the funding for K–12 education and feel like you have done something to make American education work better, because you have not.

If you have underfunded education, you have undervalued our children, and you have undermined the future success of our Nation. I hope that amendment No. 2203, which calls upon the House and Senate to come together and address this failure of funding, will be a significant part of our conversation as we work to wrap up debate on the Every Child Achieves Act.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Maine be allowed to speak for 5 minutes following my comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. For the information of Senators, within a few minutes we hope to have a cloture vote. We are still working out an agreement, but we hope to have that done within a very few minutes and may begin to move on

that shortly after the Senator from Maine finishes his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. KING. ''Fellow-citizens, we cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration, will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance, or insignificance, can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass, will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation.'' That was Abraham Lincoln in a message to Congress on December 1, 1862. I think his words echo today as we talk about the serious and solemn issues before us and the one that will be coming up within 60 days, the consideration of the agreement with Iran.

We are embarked on a historic process, a process that will result in one of the most important votes that any of us will ever take in this body, a vote that entails risks of war and peace, of life and death, of relationships in the Middle East and throughout the world.

I have been thinking in the last 24 hours about how to approach this decision, and I would like to share that today. This is a solemn responsibility. The first step for this Senator is to read the agreement word for word and to note in the margins the questions, data, and analysis that we think we need in order to make this decision. That is No. 1.

No. 2 is to seek expertise, to reach outside of this body to people in the nuclear field—one literally needs to be a nuclear physicist to understand some parts of this agreement—to arms inspection people, to economists, to foreign policy experts. I hope and expect this will happen in hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee and other committees of this Senate, but it is also incumbent upon us as individuals to reach out and to try to gain as much knowledge and expertise in the facts of this agreement as we possibly can.

Then I think we need to debate—to really debate with the Senators here in the Chamber, face to face. Our legal system is based upon the principle of an adversarial system where truth emerges from the fire of argument. And I believe that is something we owe the American people, not the strange debate we have where one person comes and speaks to an empty Chamber and then another person comes and speaks to an empty Chamber. I think this is an occasion where Senators should confront one another with their best arguments, their best facts, and listen to one another and make their decisions based upon what they learn and what they hear.

Of course, the context of the decision is important. We must consider the alternatives. What happens if we don't accept this agreement? What happens if we do? No agreement like this can be judged solely in isolation; it has to be viewed in terms of what are the alternatives. What if nothing happens? What does Iran do then? What are the relationships in the Middle East? What is Iran's path to a bomb if this agreement is not approved?

Mr. President, I did not plan to come to the floor today, but I am here because I have been shocked and, frankly, surprised at the outpouring of reaction from people who haven't read the agreement, who haven't studied the implications, who haven't gained the facts. To denounce an agreement or a deal before the ink is even dry strikes me as an abdication of our responsibility.

My message today is, let's slow down and take a deep breath. Let's listen to one another. Let's gain the facts.

I have not yet made my decision. And I commend that position to my colleagues. This is too important to become just another political issue. Even though we are headed into a Presidential year, even though there are partisan differences, even though there are differences with this President, this is a historic vote and it is a solemn responsibility. We owe our constituents, we owe the people of our States and America a close reading of the facts, a balanced weighing of the alternatives, and our best judgment. That is what the people of Maine expect of this Senator, and I believe that is what the people of America expect of us.

The Senate has an extraordinary opportunity to regain its place in this country as the world's greatest deliberative body, and that means we have to deliberate and listen and learn the facts, and that is how we should approach this momentous decision.

History will judge us. History will judge us not only on our ultimate decision but how we reached it, how we wrestled with the facts and the alternatives and the consequences, and how we made this decision that will have long-term implications for this country, for the Middle East, for our allies, and for the world.

Mr. President, I have confidence in this institution. I have confidence that we can make this decision in a thoughtful, deliberative, and consciously deliberate way to reach a conclusion that is in the best interests of the people of America.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding rule XXII, there be 10 minutes of debate equally divided before the vote to invoke cloture on the Alexander-Murray substitute amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, for the information of Senators, we have an agreement on the amendments to our legislation to fix No Child Left Behind.

The agreement represents all of the amendments that we will be dealing with. The exact time of the final passage will be determined by the Republican and Democratic leaders.

This is how we will proceed. First, we will propose and hopefully adopt by consent a managers' package of 21 amendments. Second, we will lock in an agreement by consent to vote on 24 more amendments. That voting will begin this afternoon, perhaps, at 2:30 p.m. or 3 p.m. There are slightly more Democratic amendments than Republican amendments in that group of 45 amendments.

Following the reading of that, Senator MURRAY and I will each have 3 or 4 minutes of remarks that we would like to make, and then we will have a cloture vote, and that will be all we will do before lunch.

Following lunch, as I said, at about 2:30 p.m. or 3 p.m., we will move to vote.

I am now going to move to the managers' package, a list of 21 amendments that have been cleared by both the Republican and Democratic sides.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 2111; 2141; 2145; 2149; 2150; 2151, AS MODIFIED; 2154; 2155; 2157; 2234; 2170; 2178; 2181; 2185; 2195; 2216; 2199; 2201; 2225; 2224; AND 2227 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2089

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be called up and agreed to en bloc: McCain-Reid No. 2111; Bennet-Ayotte No. 2141; Ayotte No. 2145; Udall No. 2149; Feinstein-Cornyn-Gardner No. 2150; Carper-Ayotte No. 2151, as modified with the changes at the desk; King-Capito No. 2154; Thune No. 2155; Flake No. 2157; Lee No. 2234; Booker No. 2170; Coons-Reed-Blunt No. 2178; McCain No. 2181; Whitehouse No. 2185; Blunt-Cardin-Mikulski-Collins No. 2195; Gillibrand No. 2216; Graham No. 2199; Alexander No. 2201; Bennet No. 2225; Booker No. 2224; and Cornyn No. 2227.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments (Nos. 2111; 2141; 2145; 2149; 2150; 2151, as Modified; 2154; 2155; 2157; 2234; 2170; 2178; 2181; 2185; 2195; 2216; 2199; 2201; 2225; 2224; and 2227) proposed and agreed to are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 2111

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress that John Arthur ''Jack'' Johnson should receive a posthumous pardon for the racially-motivated conviction in 1913 that diminished the athletic, cultural, and historical significance of Jack Johnson and unduly tarnished his reputation)

At the end of part B of title X, add the following:

SEC. _____. POSTHUMOUS PARDON.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) John Arthur ''Jack'' Johnson was a flamboyant, defiant, and controversial figure in the history of the United States who challenged racial biases.

(2) Jack Johnson was born in Galveston, Texas, in 1878 to parents who were former slaves.

(3) Jack Johnson became a professional boxer and traveled throughout the United States, fighting White and African-American heavyweights.

(4) After being denied (on purely racial grounds) the opportunity to fight 2 White champions, in 1908, Jack Johnson was granted an opportunity by an Australian promoter to fight the reigning White title-holder, Tommy Burns.

(5) Jack Johnson defeated Tommy Burns to become the first African-American to hold the title of Heavyweight Champion of the World.

(6) The victory by Jack Johnson over Tommy Burns prompted a search for a White boxer who could beat Jack Johnson, a recruitment effort that was dubbed the search for the ''great white hope''.

(7) In 1910, a White former champion named Jim Jeffries left retirement to fight Jack Johnson in Reno, Nevada.

(8) Jim Jeffries lost to Jack Johnson in what was deemed the ''Battle of the Century''.

(9) The defeat of Jim Jeffries by Jack Johnson led to rioting, aggression against African-Americans, and the racially-motivated murder of African-Americans throughout the United States.

(10) The relationships of Jack Johnson with White women compounded the resentment felt toward him by many Whites.

(11) Between 1901 and 1910, 754 African-Americans were lynched, some simply for being ''too familiar'' with White women.

(12) In 1910, Congress passed the Act of June 25, 1910 (commonly known as the ''White Slave Traffic Act'' or the ''Mann Act'') (18 U.S.C. 2421 et seq.), which outlawed the transportation of women in interstate or foreign commerce ''for the purpose of prostitution or debauchery, or for any other immoral purpose''.

(13) In October 1912, Jack Johnson became involved with a White woman whose mother disapproved of their relationship and sought action from the Department of Justice, claiming that Jack Johnson had abducted her daughter.

(14) Jack Johnson was arrested by Federal marshals on October 18, 1912, for transporting the woman across State lines for an ''immoral purpose'' in violation of the Mann Act.

(15) The Mann Act charges against Jack Johnson were dropped when the woman refused to cooperate with Federal authorities, and then married Jack Johnson.

(16) Federal authorities persisted and summoned a White woman named Belle Schreiber, who testified that Jack Johnson had transported her across States lines for the purpose of ''prostitution and debauchery''.

(17) In 1913, Jack Johnson was convicted of violating the Mann Act and sentenced to 1 year and 1 day in Federal prison.

(18) Jack Johnson fled the United States to Canada and various European and South American countries.

(19) Jack Johnson lost the Heavyweight Championship title to Jess Willard in Cuba in 1915.

(20) Jack Johnson returned to the United States in July 1920, surrendered to authorities, and served nearly a year in the Federal penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kansas.

(21) Jack Johnson subsequently fought in boxing matches, but never regained the Heavyweight Championship title.

(22) Jack Johnson served the United States during World War II by encouraging citizens to buy war bonds and participating in exhibition boxing matches to promote the war bond cause.

(23) Jack Johnson died in an automobile accident in 1946.

(24) In 1954, Jack Johnson was inducted into the Boxing Hall of Fame.

(25) Senate Concurrent Resolution 29, 111th Congress, agreed to July 29, 2009, expressed the sense of the 111th Congress that Jack Johnson should receive a posthumous pardon for his racially-motivated 1913 conviction.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS.—It remains the sense of Congress that Jack Johnson should receive a posthumous pardon—

(1) to expunge a racially-motivated abuse of the prosecutorial authority of the Federal Government from the annals of criminal justice in the United States; and

(2) in recognition of the athletic and cultural contributions of Jack Johnson to society.

AMENDMENT NO. 2141

(Purpose: To provide for shared services strategies and models)

On page 622, line 18, insert ''such as through entities administering shared services,'' after ''strategies,''.

On page 624, line 9, insert ''which may include the use of shared services models'' after ''time in program''.

AMENDMENT NO. 2145

(Purpose: To allow States to use State activity funds provided under part A of title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 for certain evidence-based mental health awareness programs)

On page 430, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

''(ix) designing and implementing evidence-based mental health awareness training programs for the purposes of—

''(I) recognizing the signs and symptoms of mental illness;

''(II) providing education to school personnel regarding resources available in the community for students with mental illnesses and other relevant resources relating to mental health; or

''(III) providing education to school personal regarding the safe de-escalation of crisis situations involving a student with a mental illness; and

AMENDMENT NO. 2149

(Purpose: To allow the Bureau of Indian Education to apply for certain competitive grants under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965)

On page 799, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 9114A. APPLICATION FOR COMPETITIVE GRANTS FROM THE BUREAU OF INDIAN EDUCATION.

Subpart 2 of part F of title IX (20 U.S.C. 7901 et seq.), as amended by sections 4001(3) and 9114 and redesignated by section 9106(1), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 9539. APPLICATION FOR COMPETITIVE GRANTS FROM THE BUREAU OF INDIAN EDUCATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act and subject to subsection (b), the Bureau of Indian Education may apply for, and carry out, any grant program awarded on a competitive basis under this Act, as appropriate, on behalf of the schools and the Indian children that the Bureau serves, and shall not be subject to any provision of the program that requires grant recipients to contribute funds toward the costs of the grant program.

''(b) LIMITATION.—In the case of any competitive grant program described in subsection (a) that also provides a reservation of funds to the Bureau of Indian Education, the Bureau shall not, for any fiscal year, receive both a grant and a reservation under the competitive grant program.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 2150

(Purpose: To allow eligible entities to use funds provided under part A of title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 for bilingual paraprofessionals and linguistically responsive materials)

On page 403, strike line 15 and insert the following:

''(B) intensified instruction, which may include linguistically responsive materials; and

''(C) bilingual paraprofessionals, which may include interpreters and translators.

AMENDMENT NO. 2151, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To amend part A of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improve preparation programs and strengthen support for principals and other school leaders)

On page 287, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

''(J) A description of actions the State may take to improve preparation programs and strengthen support for principals and other school leaders based on the needs of the State, as identified by the State educational agency.

AMENDMENT NO. 2154

(Purpose: To authorize the Institute of Education Sciences to conduct a study on student access to digital learning resources outside of the school day)

On page 264, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

SEC. 1018. REPORT ON STUDENT HOME ACCESS TO DIGITAL LEARNING RESOURCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Institute of Education Sciences, in consultation with relevant Federal agencies, shall complete a national study on the educational trends and behaviors associated with access to digital learning resources outside of the classroom, which shall include analysis of extant data and new surveys about students and teachers that provide—

(1) a description of the various locations from which students access the Internet and digital learning resources outside of the classroom, including through an after-school or summer program, a library, and at home;

(2) a description of the various devices and technology through which students access the Internet and digital learning resources outside of the classroom, including through a computer or mobile device;

(3) data associated with the number of students who lack home Internet access, disaggregated by—

(A) each of the categories of students, as defined in section 1111(b)(3)(A) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;

(B) homeless students and children or youth in foster care; and

(C) students in geographically diverse areas, including urban, suburban, and rural areas;

(4) data associated with the barriers to students acquiring home Internet access;

(5) data associated with the proportion of educators who assign homework or implement innovative learning models that require or are substantially augmented by a student having home Internet access and the frequency of the need for such access;

(6) a description of the learning behaviors associated with students who lack home Internet access, including—

(A) student participation in the classroom, including the ability to complete homework and participate in innovative learning models;

(B) student engagement, through such measures as attendance rates and chronic absenteeism; and

(C) a student's ability to apply for employment, postsecondary education, and financial aid programs;

(7) an analysis of the how a student's lack of home Internet access impacts the instructional practice of educators, including—

(A) the extent to which educators alter instructional methods, resources, homework assignments, and curriculum in order to accommodate differing levels of home Internet access; and

(B) strategies employed by educators, school leaders, and administrators to address the differing levels of home Internet access among students; and

(8) a description of the ways in which State educational agencies, local educational agencies, schools, and other entities, including through partnerships, have developed effective means to provide students with Internet access outside of the school day.

(b) PUBLIC DISSEMINATION.—The Director of the Institute of Education Sciences shall widely disseminate the findings of the study under this section—

(1) in a timely fashion;

(2) in a form that is understandable, easily accessible, and publicly available and usable, or adaptable for use in, the improvement of educational practice;

(3) through electronic transfer and other means, such as posting, as available, to the website of the Institute of Education Sciences, or the Department of Education; and

(4) to all State educational agencies and other recipients of funds under part D of title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(c) DEFINITION OF DIGITAL LEARNING.—In this section, the term ''digital learning''—

(1) has the meaning given the term in section 5702 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; and

(2) includes an educational practice that effectively uses technology to strengthen a student's learning experience within and outside of the classroom and at home, which may include the use of digital learning content, video, software, and other resources that may be developed, as the Secretary of Education may determine.

AMENDMENT NO. 2155

(Purpose: To require a report on responses to Indian student suicides)

At the end of title VII, insert the following:

SEC. 7006. REPORT ON RESPONSES TO INDIAN STUDENT SUICIDES.

(a) PREPARATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Education, in coordination with the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall prepare a report on efforts to address outbreaks of suicides among elementary school and secondary school students (referred to in this section as ''student suicides'') that occurred within 1 year prior to the date of enactment of this Act in Indian country (as defined in section 1151 of title 18, United States Code).

(2) CONTENTS.—The report shall include information on—

(A) the Federal response to the occurrence of high numbers of student suicides in Indian country (as so defined);

(B) a list of Federal resources available to prevent and respond to outbreaks of student suicides, including the availability and use of tele-behavioral health care;

(C) any barriers to timely implementation of programs or interagency collaboration regarding student suicides;

(D) interagency collaboration efforts to streamline access to programs regarding student suicides, including information on how the Department of Education, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Health and Human Services work together on administration of such programs;

(E) recommendations to improve or consolidate resources or programs described in subparagraph (B) or (D); and

(F) feedback from Indian tribes to the Federal response described in subparagraph (A).

(b) SUBMISSION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education shall submit the report described in subsection (a) to the appropriate committees of Congress.

AMENDMENT NO. 2157

(Purpose: To reserve funds for an evaluation of early learning alignment and improvement grants)

On page 615, between lines 22 and 23, insert the following:

''(3) RESERVATION FOR EVALUATION.—From the amounts appropriated under section 5903 for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve one-half of 1 percent to conduct, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, an evaluation to determine whether grants under this part are—

(A) improving efficiency in the use of Federal funds for early childhood education programs;

(B) improving coordination across Federal early childhood education programs; and

(C) increasing the availability of, and access to, high-quality early childhood education programs for eligible children.

AMENDMENT NO. 2234

(Purpose: To establish a rule of construction regarding travel to and from school)

After section 9115, insert the following:

SEC. 9116. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING TRAVEL TO AND FROM SCHOOL.

Subpart 2 of part F of title IX (20 U.S.C. 7901 et seq.), as amended by sections, 9114 and 9115, and redesignated by section 9601, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 9539A. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING TRAVEL TO AND FROM SCHOOL.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), nothing in this Act shall authorize the Secretary to, or shall be construed to—

''(1) prohibit a child from traveling to and from school on foot or by car, bus, or bike when the parents of the child have given permission; or

''(2) expose parents to civil or criminal charges for allowing their child to responsibly and safely travel to and from school by a means the parents believe is age appropriate.

''(b) NO PREEMPTION OF STATE OR LOCAL LAWS.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), nothing in this section shall be construed to preempt State or local laws.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 2170

(Purpose: To amend the early learning alignment and improvement grant program under part I of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that States support early childhood education programs that maintain disciplinary policies that do not include expulsion or suspension of participating children)

On page 623, strike line 8 and insert the following:

''(14) a description of how the State will support, through the use of professional development, early childhood education programs that maintain disciplinary policies that do not include expulsion or suspension of participating children, except as a last resort in extraordinary circumstances where—

''(A) there is a determination of a serious safety threat; and

''(B) policies are in place to provide appropriate alternative early educational services to expelled or suspended children while they are out of school; and''.

AMENDMENT NO. 2178

(Purpose: To encourage increasing the amount of funds available for parent and family engagement)

On page 170, strike lines 20 through 25, and insert the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each local educational agency shall reserve at least 1 percent of its allocation under subpart 2 to assist schools to carry out the activities described in this section, except that this subparagraph shall not apply if 1 percent of such agency's allocation under subpart 2 for the fiscal year for which the determination is made is $5,000 or less. Nothing in this subparagraph shall be construed to limit local educational agencies from reserving more than the 1 percent of its allocation under subpart 2 to assist schools to carry out activities described in this section.'';

AMENDMENT NO. 2181

(Purpose: To allow States to use funding under part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to replicate and expand successful practices from high-performing public schools)

On page 70, line 3, strike the period and insert the following: ''; and

''(iii) use funds under this part to support efforts to expand and replicate successful practices from high-performing charter schools, magnet schools, and traditional public schools.

AMENDMENT NO. 2185

(Purpose: To support innovation schools)

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of July 9, 2015, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

AMENDMENT NO. 2195

(Purpose: To amend section 1113(c) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to allow local educational agencies to address the needs of children in schools served by schoolwide programs by providing school-based mental health programs)

On page 132, line 1, insert ''school-based mental health programs,'' after ''counseling,''.

AMENDMENT NO. 2216

(Purpose: To require a report on cybersecurity education)

On page 385, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

''SEC. 2508. REPORT ON CYBERSECURITY EDUCATION.

''Not later than June 1, 2016, the Secretary, acting through the Director of the Institute of Education Sciences, shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives, a report describing whether secondary and postsecondary education programs are meeting the need of public and private sectors for cyberdefense. Such report shall include—

''(1) an assessment of the shortfalls in current secondary and postsecondary education needed to develop cybersecurity professionals, and recommendations to address such shortfalls;

''(2) an assessment of successful secondary and postsecondary programs that produce competent cybersecurity professionals; and

''(3) recommendations of subjects to be covered by elementary schools and secondary schools to better prepare students for postsecondary cybersecurity education.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 2199

(Purpose: To include entrepreneurship as a local educational agency allowable use of funds under title II)

On page 306, after line 23, insert the following:

''(V) providing educator training to increase students' entrepreneurship skills; and

AMENDMENT NO. 2201

(Purpose: To provide that State assessments not evaluate or assess personal or family beliefs and attitudes, or publicly disclose personally identifiable information)

Beginning on page 37, strike line 24 and all that follows through page 38, line 4, and insert the following:

''(iii) be used for purposes for which such assessments are valid and reliable, consistent with relevant, nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, objectively measure academic achievement, knowledge, and skills, and be tests that do not evaluate or assess personal or family beliefs and attitudes, or publicly disclose personally identifiable information;

AMENDMENT NO. 2225

(Purpose: To improve title I by including information about assessments in the categories of information that parents have a right to know about)

On page 111, between lines 24 and 25, insert the following:

''(2) TESTING TRANSPARENCY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), each local educational agency that receives funds under this part shall make widely available through public means (including by posting in a clear and easily accessible manner on the local educational agency's website and, where practicable, on the website of each school served by the local educational agency) for each grade served by the local educational agency, information on each assessment required by the State to comply with section 1111, other assessments required by the State, and where such information is available and feasible to report, assessments required districtwide by the local educational agency, including—

''(i) the subject matter assessed;

''(ii) the purpose for which the assessment is designed and used;

''(iii) the source of the requirement for the assessment; and

''(iv) where such information is available—

''(I) the amount of time students will spend taking the assessment, and the schedule and calendar for the assessment; and

''(II) the time and format for disseminating results.

''(B) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY THAT DOES NOT OPERATE A WEBSITE.—In the case of a local educational agency that does not operate a website, such local educational agency shall determine how to make the information described in subparagraph (A) widely available, such as through distribution of that information to the media, through public agencies, or directly to parents.

AMENDMENT NO. 2224

(Purpose: To assess and improve educator support and working conditions)

On page 306, after line 23, add the following:

''(V) regularly conducting, and publicly reporting the results of, an assessment and a plan to address such results, of educator support and working conditions that—

''(i) evaluates supports for teachers, leaders, and other school personnel, such as—

''(I) teacher and principal perceptions of availability of high-quality professional development and instructional materials;

''(II) timely availability of data on student academic achievement and growth;

''(III) the presence of high-quality instructional leadership; and

''(IV) opportunities for professional growth, such as career ladders and mentoring and induction programs;

''(ii) evaluates working conditions for teachers, leaders and other school personnel, such as—

''(I) school safety and climate;

''(II) availability and use of common planning time and opportunities to collaborate; and

''(III) community engagement; and

''(iii) is developed with teachers, leaders, other school personnel, parents, students, and the community; and

AMENDMENT NO. 2227

(Purpose: To reauthorize the Education Flexibility Partnership Act of 1999)

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of July 13, 2015, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding rule XXII, on behalf of myself and Senator MURRAY, that if cloture is invoked on the Alexander amendment No. 2089, the following amendments be made pending en bloc: Coons No. 2243; Cruz No. 2180; Heitkamp No. 2171; Hatch No. 2082; Warren No. 2106; Burr No. 2247, as modified with the changes at the desk; Murphy No. 2186; Brown No. 2100; Wicker No. 2144; Markey No. 2176; Murphy No. 2241; Sanders No. 2177; Casey No. 2242; Schatz No. 2130; Nelson No. 2215, as modified with the changes at the desk; Manchin No. 2222; Boozman No. 2231; Baldwin No. 2188; Capito No. 2156; Thune No. 2232; King No. 2256; Schatz No. 2240; and Warren No. 2249.

Following that, at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Democratic leader either today or tomorrow, the Senate vote in relation to the following amendments: Brown No. 2100; Heitkamp No. 2171, 60-vote threshold; Coons No. 2243, 60-vote threshold; Kirk No. 2161, 60-vote threshold; Burr No. 2247, as modified with the changes at the desk; Hatch No. 2082; Warren No. 2106; Wicker No. 2144, 60-vote threshold; Markey No. 2176, 60-vote threshold; Murphy No. 2241, 60-vote threshold; Sanders No. 2177, 60-vote threshold; Casey No. 2242, 60-vote threshold; Cruz No. 2180; Schatz No. 2130; Murphy No. 2186; Nelson No. 2215, as modified with the changes at the desk; Manchin No. 2222; Boozman No. 2231; Baldwin No. 2188; Capito No. 2156; Thune No. 2232; King No. 2256; Schatz No. 2240; and Warren No. 2249, with no second-degree amendments in order to any of the amendments prior to the votes, that there be 2 minutes equally divided prior to each vote; and that all after the first vote in each series be 10 minutes in length; also that the Warren amendment No. 2120 be withdrawn and that the following amendments in this agreement be subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold for adoption: Coons No. 2243, Heitkamp No. 2171, Kirk No. 2161, Wicker No. 2144, Markey No. 2176, Murphy No. 2241, Sanders No. 2177, and Casey No. 2242.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, in just a few minutes, after brief comments by Senator MURRAY and me, we will proceed to a cloture vote and then our next votes will be at 2:30.

I think, from the reading of the amendments, that the Senators can see that we have had a fair and open amendment process. Just to give you an example, in our committee consideration to fix No Child Left Behind, we adopted 29 amendments, and the committee was pleased enough with the process that they reported the bill unanimously.

The substitute amendment, one of the amendments I just listed, adopts the priorities of 52 Members into that substitute amendment.

On the Senate floor already since last week, we have adopted 27 amendments, and I just read the two consent requests. The manager's package has 21 amendments in it, and those have been adopted. Then there are the 21 more votes that we just secured approval to vote on either by voice or in fact.

So the vote we are about to have is a vote on whether to end debate on our bill to fix No Child Left Behind. I think the question before the Senators is this: Do you think there has been a fair process? Do you think it is open enough? Do you think the bill is worthy of having these votes and going toward final passage? I hope every single Senator will agree that yes, it has been.

This is the way the Senate is supposed to work. Basically, we are concluding the bill by a unanimous consent agreement, which is to say that virtually every Senator who wants an amendment has had that amendment considered, and we are going to dispose of it one way or another. We are going to adopt it or vote on it, whatever the Senate likes.

That is important for the country to see. This a bill that Newsweek magazine said is the education bill everyone wants fixed.

There is a remarkable consensus that we need to do it. After 7 years, this bill is overdue and a ''yes'' vote today on cloture says: We recognize that Governors, teachers, school board members, and school superintendents have united in a remarkable coalition to support the way we propose to fix it. So we have a consensus that it needs to be fixed, and we have a consensus on how to fix it. This is a vote about whether we are ready to do that—to do our job.

I thank Senator MURRAY principally for her leadership in this respect, making it possible to create this environment in which we have been able to have such a good process.

I thank the majority leader for putting the bill on the floor and giving us a week of time—more than a week—to deal with it.

I thank the majority whip for his efforts, especially in helping to bring this to a conclusion.

I thank the Democratic leader, Senator REID, as well as Senators SCHUMER, DURBIN and PATTY MURRAY, who is also part of that leadership, for creating the kind of working environment to give Senators on both sides of the aisle a chance to go home and say: We fixed No Child Left Behind. I had my say in it, and we are going to restore responsibility. We are going to keep the important measurements of student achievement, but restore to the classroom teachers, the Governors, the legislatures, the school boards, and to the parents the responsibility for student achievement.

I thank the Chair, and I urge my colleagues to vote yes on cloture so we can move toward these remaining 21 amendments on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I rise again to encourage all of our colleagues to support this vote to move us to a negotiated conclusion to this very important bill.

I thank the senior Senator from Tennessee, as well as the majority leader, for working with us to get this agreement so we can continue moving forward in a bipartisan way to get this done.

Across the country, students, parents, teachers, and communities are really counting on us to fix No Child Left Behind. I have been very pleased to work with Chairman ALEXANDER on this bipartisan bill called the Every Child Achieves Act.

This bill will give our States more flexibility, but it will also include some Federal guardrails to make sure all of our students do have access to quality education. It passed through our committee unanimously and, for the past week or so, we have made good progress on the Senate floor.

There is still some work to be done. There are a number of amendments that we will be voting on this afternoon and into tomorrow. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania is offering a very important amendment I support to expand high-quality early childhood education.

We have an amendment that we will be voting on to strengthen the Federal guardrails. It is the accountability amendment from Senators MURPHY, BOOKER, WARREN, and COONS to help make sure all of our kids, especially our most vulnerable students, have what they need.

There are many more amendments, as you know, from Democrats and Republicans, to finish this bill, but I urge our colleagues to vote yes on cloture. We are finishing this bill and working to make sure that we can fix a broken law.

I will have more to say about the amendments as we go through the process. But at this moment, I urge all of our colleagues to support this vote, continue this bipartisan process, and let's work to get this bill done.

I yield the floor.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Alexander amendment No. 2089 to S. 1177, an original bill to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that every child achieves.

Mitch McConnell, Orrin G. Hatch, Lamar Alexander, Cory Gardner, Steve Daines, Pat Roberts, Johnny Isakson, Susan M. Collins, Michael B. Enzi, Kelly Ayotte, John Cornyn, Lisa Murkowski, Tim Scott, Richard Burr, Thom Tillis, Lindsey Graham, John Hoeven.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the Alexander amendment No. 2089, offered by the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. ALEXANDER, to S. 1177, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 86, nays 12, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 237 Leg.]

YEAS—86

Alexander	Cotton	Kirk
Ayotte	Donnelly	Klobuchar
Baldwin	Durbin	Lankford
Barrasso	Enzi	Leahy
Bennet	Ernst	Manchin
Blumenthal	Feinstein	Markey
Booker	Fischer	McCain
Boozman	Flake	McCaskill
Boxer	Franken	McConnell
Brown	Gardner	Menendez
Burr	Gillibrand	Merkley
Cantwell	Grassley	Mikulski
Capito	Hatch	Murkowski
Cardin	Heinrich	Murphy
Carper	Heitkamp	Murray
Casey	Heller	Perdue
Cassidy	Hirono	Peters
Coats	Hoeven	Portman
Cochran	Inhofe	Reed
Collins	Isakson	Reid
Coons	Johnson	Roberts
Corker	Kaine	Rounds
Cornyn	King	Sanders
Schatz	Sullivan	Warner
Schumer	Tester	Warren
Scott	Thune	Whitehouse
Sessions	Tillis	Wicker
Shaheen	Toomey	Wyden
Stabenow	Udall	

NAYS—12

Blunt	Lee	Rubio
Crapo	Moran	Sasse
Cruz	Paul	Shelby
Daines	Risch	Vitter

NOT VOTING—2

Graham	Nelson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 86, the nays are 12.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 2243; 2180; 2171; 2082; 2106; 2247, AS MODIFIED; 2186; 2100; 2144; 2176; 2241; 2177; 2242; 2130; 2215, AS MODIFIED; 2222; 2231; 2188; 2156; 2232; 2256; 2240; 2249 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2089

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Cloture having been invoked, under the previous order, the 23 amendments enumerated earlier are now pending en bloc.

The amendments (Nos. 2243; 2180; 2171; 2082; 2106; 2247, as modified; 2186; 2100; 2144; 2176; 2241; 2177; 2242; 2130; 2215, as modified; 2222; 2231; 2188; 2156; 2232; 2256; 2240; 2249) are proposed, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 2243

(Purpose: To authorize the establishment of American Dream Accounts)

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of July 14, 2015, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

AMENDMENT NO. 2180

(Purpose: To provide for State-determined assessment and accountability systems, and for other purposes)

On page 28, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

''(vi) include in the plan a description of assessments referred to in paragraph (2), or an accountability system referred to in paragraph (3), of subsection (b), nor may the Secretary require inclusion of a description of such assessments or system in a plan or application, or use inclusion of such assessments or system as a factor in awarding Federal funding, under any other provision of this Act; or

On page 28, line 7, strike ''(vi)'' and insert ''(vii)''.

On page 36, strike line 18 and all that follows through line 25 on page 58, and insert the following:

''(2) ASSESSMENTS.—A State may include in the State plan a description of, and may implement, a set of high-quality statewide academic assessments.

''(3) ACCOUNTABILITY.—A State may include in the State plan a description of, and may implement, an accountability system.

On page 146, strike line 1 and all that follows through line 23, on page 166.

On page 183, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following

SEC. 1008A. STATE-DETERMINED ASSESSMENTS AND ACCOUNTABILITY.

After section 1118, as redesignated by section 1004(3), insert the following:

''SEC. 1119. STATE-DETERMINED ASSESSMENTS AND ACCOUNTABILITY.

''Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including any other provision of this Act, wherever in this Act a reference is made to assessments or accountability under this part, including a reference to a provision under paragraphs (2) or (3) of section 1111(b)—

''(1) in the case of a State that elects to implement assessments referred to in section 1111(b)(2), a reference to assessments under this part shall be deemed to be a reference to those assessments and shall be carried out to the extent practicable based on the State-determined assessments;

''(2) in the case of a State that elects to implement an accountability system referred to in section 1111(b)(3), a reference to accountability under this part shall be deemed to be a reference to accountability under that system, and shall be carried out to the extent practicable based on the State-determined accountability system; and

''(3) in the case of any State not described in paragraph (1) or (2), the reference shall have no effect.''.

On page 185, strike line 19 and all that follows through line 2 on page 228 and insert the following:

SEC. 1012. REPEAL.

Part B of title I (20 U.S.C. 6361 et seq.) is repealed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2171

(Purpose: To reinstate grants to improve the mental health of children)

On page 492, after line 22, insert the following:

SEC. 4006. GRANTS FOR THE INTEGRATION OF SCHOOLS AND MENTAL HEALTH SYSTEMS.

Title IV (20 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), as amended by sections 4001, 4004, and 4005, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''PART E—GRANTS TO IMPROVE THE MENTAL HEALTH OF CHILDREN

''SEC. 4501. GRANTS FOR THE INTEGRATION OF SCHOOLS AND MENTAL HEALTH SYSTEMS.

''(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary is authorized to award grants to, or enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with, State educational agencies, local educational agencies, Indian tribes or their tribal education agency, a school operated by the Bureau of Indian Education, or a Regional Corporation (as defined in section 3 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1602)) for the purpose of increasing student access to quality mental health care and support by developing innovative programs to link local school systems with local mental health systems, such as those under the Indian Health Service.

''(b) DURATION.—With respect to a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement awarded or entered into under this section, the period during which payments under such grant, contract or agreement are made to the recipient may not exceed 5 years.

''(c) USE OF FUNDS.—An entity that receives a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under this section shall use amounts made available through such grant, contract, or cooperative agreement for the following:

''(1) To enhance, improve, or develop collaborative efforts between school-based service systems and mental health service systems to provide, enhance, or improve prevention, diagnosis, and treatment services to students.

''(2) To enhance the availability of crisis intervention services and conflict resolution practices, such as those focused on decreasing rates of bullying, teen dating violence, suicide, trauma, and human trafficking (defined as an act or practice described in paragraph (9) or (10) of section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)), as well as provide appropriate referrals for students potentially in need of mental health services, and ongoing mental health services.

''(3) To provide training and professional development for the school personnel and mental health professionals who will participate in the program carried out under this section.

''(4) To provide technical assistance and consultation to school systems and mental health agencies as well as to families participating in the program carried out under this section.

''(5) To provide linguistically appropriate and culturally competent services.

''(6) To evaluate the effectiveness of the program carried out under this section in increasing student access to quality mental health services, and make recommendations to the Secretary about the sustainability of the program.

''(7) To engage and utilize expertise provided by institutions of higher education, such as a Tribal College or University, as defined in section 316(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

''(d) APPLICATIONS.—To be eligible to receive a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under this section, an entity described in subsection (a) shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may reasonably require, such as the following:

''(1) A description of the program to be funded under the grant, contract, or cooperative agreement.

''(2) A description of how such program will increase access to quality mental health services for students.

''(3) A description of how the applicant will establish a crisis intervention program or conflict resolution practices, or both, that provide immediate mental health services to the school community as necessary.

''(4) An assurance that—

''(A) persons providing services under the grant, contract, or cooperative agreement are adequately trained to provide such services;

''(B) the services will be provided in accordance with subsection (c);

''(C) teachers, administrators, parents or guardians, representatives of local Indian tribes, and other school personnel are aware of the program; and

''(D) parents or guardians of students participating in services under this section will be engaged and involved in the design and implementation of the services.

''(5) An assurance that the applicant will support and integrate existing school-based services with the program in order to provide appropriate mental health services for students.

''(6) An assurance that the applicant will establish a program that will support students and the school in improving the school climate in order to support an environment conducive to learning.

''(e) INTERAGENCY AGREEMENTS.—

''(1) DESIGNATION OF LEAD AGENCY.—A recipient of a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under this section shall designate a lead agency to direct the establishment of an interagency agreement among local educational agencies, juvenile justice authorities, mental health agencies, and other relevant entities in the State, in collaboration with local entities, such as Indian tribes.

''(2) CONTENTS.—The interagency agreement shall ensure the provision of the services described in subsection (c), specifying with respect to each agency, authority, or entity—

''(A) the financial responsibility for the services;

''(B) the conditions and terms of responsibility for the services, including quality, accountability, and coordination of the services; and

''(C) the conditions and terms of reimbursement among the agencies, authorities, or entities that are parties to the interagency agreement, including procedures for dispute resolution.

''(f) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall evaluate each program carried out under this section and shall disseminate the findings with respect to each such evaluation to appropriate public, tribal, and private entities.

''(g) DISTRIBUTION OF AWARDS.—The Secretary shall ensure that grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements awarded or entered into under this section are equitably distributed among the geographical regions of the United States and among tribal, urban, suburban, and rural populations.

''(h) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

''(1) to prohibit an entity involved with a program carried out under this section from reporting a crime that is committed by a student to appropriate authorities; or

''(2) to prevent State and tribal law enforcement and judicial authorities from exercising their responsibilities with regard to the application of Federal, tribal, and State law to crimes committed by a student.

''(i) SUPPLEMENT, NOT SUPPLANT.—Any services provided through programs carried out under this section shall supplement, and not supplant, existing mental health services, including any services required to be provided under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

''(j) CONSULTATION WITH INDIAN TRIBES.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall, in a timely manner, meaningfully consult, engage, and cooperate with Indian tribes and their representatives to ensure notice of eligibility.

''(k) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2016 through 2021.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 2082

(Purpose: To amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 relating to early learning)

On page 627, line 8, strike ''State.'' and insert ''State, such as pay for success initiatives that promote coordination among existing programs and meet the purposes of this part.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 2106

(Purpose: To amend title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to include specialized instructional support personnel in the literacy development of children)

On page 361, line 3, strike ''school leaders, and'' and insert ''school leaders, specialized instructional support personnel (as appropriate), and''.

On page 362, line 19, insert ''specialized instructional support personnel (as appropriate),'' after ''other school leaders,''.

On page 364, line 20, strike ''and school personnel'' and insert ''school personnel, and specialized instructional support personnel (as appropriate)''.

On page 366, line 5, strike ''and school personnel'' and insert ''specialized instructional support personnel (as appropriate), and school personnel''.

On page 367, line 2, insert ''or specialized instructional support personnel'' after ''librarians''.

AMENDMENT NO. 2247, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To amend the allocation of funds under subpart 2 of part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965)

Strike sections 1009, 1010, and 1011 and insert the following:

SEC. 1009. GRANTS FOR THE OUTLYING AREAS AND THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Section 1121 (20 U.S.C. 6331) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''and 1125A(f)''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(3)(C)(ii), by striking ''challenging State academic content standards'' and inserting ''challenging State academic standards''.

SEC. 1010. ALLOCATIONS TO STATES.

Section 1122 (20 U.S.C. 6332) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''(a) ALLOCATION FORMULA.—

''(1) INITIAL ALLOCATION.—For each of fiscal years 2016 through 2021 (referred to in this subsection as the 'current fiscal year'), the Secretary shall allocate $17,000,000,000 of the amount appropriated under section 1002(a) to carry out this part (or, if the total amount appropriated for this part is equal to or less than $17,000,000,000, all of such amount) in accordance with the following:

''(A) An amount equal to the amount made available to carry out section 1124 for fiscal year 2015 shall be allocated in accordance with section 1124.

''(B) An amount equal to the amount made available to carry out section 1124A for fiscal year 2015 shall be allocated in accordance with section 1124A.

''(C) An amount equal to 100 percent of the amount, if any, by which the amount made available under this paragraph for the current fiscal year for which the determination is made exceeds the amount available to carry out sections 1124 and 1124A for fiscal year 2001 shall be allocated in accordance with section 1125 and 1125A.

''(2) ALLOCATIONS IN EXCESS OF $17,000,000,000.—For each of the current fiscal years for which the amounts appropriated under section 1002(a) to carry out this part exceed $17,000,000,000, an amount equal to such excess amount shall be allocated in accordance with section 1123.'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''under this subpart'' and inserting ''under subsection (a)(1) for sections 1124, 1124A, 1125, and 1125A''; and

(ii) by striking ''and 1125'' and inserting ''1125, and 1125A''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting ''under subsection (a)(1)'' after ''become available''; and

(ii) by striking ''and 1125'' and inserting ''1125, and 1125A'';

(3) in subsection (c)(1), by inserting ''and to the extent amounts under subsection (a)(1) are available'' after ''For each fiscal year''; and

(4) in subsection (d)(1), by striking ''under this subpart'' and inserting ''under subsection (a)(1) for sections 1124, 1124A, 1125, and 1125A''.

SEC. 1011. EQUITY GRANTS.

Subpart 2 of part A of title I (20 U.S.C. 6331 et se.) is amended by inserting after section 1122 the following:

''SEC. 1123. EQUITY GRANTS.

''(a) AUTHORIZATION.—From funds appropriated under section 1002(a) for a fiscal year and available for allocation pursuant to section 1122(a)(2), the Secretary is authorized to make grants to States, from allotments under subsection (b), to carry out the programs and activities of this part.

''(b) DISTRIBUTION BASED UPON CONCENTRATIONS OF POVERTY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C), funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for a fiscal year shall be allotted to each State based upon the number of children counted under section 1124(c) in such State multiplied by the product of—

''(i) 40 percent of the average per-pupil expenditure in the United States (other than the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico); multiplied by

''(ii) 1.30 minus such State's equity factor described in paragraph (2).

''(B) PUERTO RICO.—For each fiscal year, the Secretary shall allot to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico an amount of the funds appropriated under subsection (a) that bears the same relation to the total amount of funds appropriated under such subsection as the amount that the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico received under this subpart for fiscal year 2015 bears to the total amount received by all States for such fiscal year.

''(C) STATE MINIMUM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section except for subparagraph (B), from the total amount available for any fiscal year to carry out this section, each State shall be allotted at least the lesser of—

''(i) 0.35 percent of the total amount available to carry out this section for such fiscal year; or

''(ii) the average of—

''(I) 0.35 percent of such total amount for such fiscal year; and

''(II) 150 percent of the national average grant under this section per child described in section 1124(c), without application of a weighting factor, multiplied by the State's total number of children described in section 1124(c), without application of a weighting factor.

''(2) EQUITY FACTOR.—

''(A) DETERMINATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall determine the equity factor under this section for each State in accordance with clause (ii).

''(ii) COMPUTATION.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—For each State, the Secretary shall compute a weighted coefficient of variation for the per-pupil expenditures of local educational agencies in accordance with subclauses (II), (III), and (IV).

''(II) VARIATION.—In computing coefficients of variation, the Secretary shall weigh the variation between per-pupil expenditures in each local educational agency and the average per-pupil expenditures in the State according to the number of pupils served by the local educational agency.

''(III) NUMBER OF PUPILS.—In determining the number of pupils under this paragraph served by each local educational agency and in each State, the Secretary shall multiply the number of children counted under section 1124(c) by a factor of 1.4.

''(IV) ENROLLMENT REQUIREMENT.—In computing coefficients of variation, the Secretary shall include only those local educational agencies with an enrollment of more than 200 students.

''(B) SPECIAL RULE.—The equity factor for a State that meets the disparity standard described in section 222.162 of title 34, Code of Federal Regulations (as such section was in effect on the day preceding the date of enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001) or a State with only one local educational agency shall be not greater than 0.10.

''(c) USE OF FUNDS; ELIGIBILITY OF LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.—All funds awarded to each State under this section shall be allocated to local educational agencies under the following provisions:

''(1) DISTRIBUTION WITHIN LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.—Within local educational agencies, funds allocated under this section shall be distributed to schools on a basis consistent with section 1113, and may only be used to carry out activities under this part.

''(2) ELIGIBILITY FOR GRANT.—A local educational agency in a State is eligible to receive a grant under this section for any fiscal year if—

''(A) the number of children in the local educational agency counted under section 1124(c), before application of the weighted child count described in subsection (d), is at least 10; and

''(B) if the number of children counted for grants under section 1124(c), before application of the weighted child count described in subsection (d), is at least 5 percent of the total number of children aged 5 to 17 years, inclusive, in the school district of the local educational agency.

''(d) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS TO ELIGIBLE LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Funds received by States under this section for a fiscal year shall be allocated within States to eligible local educational agencies on the basis of weighted child counts calculated in accordance with paragraph (2), (3), or (4), as appropriate for each State.

''(2) STATES WITH AN EQUITY FACTOR LESS THAN .10.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In States with an equity factor less than .10, the weighted child counts referred to in paragraph (1) for a fiscal year shall be the larger of the 2 amounts determined under subparagraphs (B) and (C).

''(B) BY PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN.—The amount referred to in subparagraph (A) is determined by adding—

''(i) the number of children determined under section 1124(c) for that local educational agency who constitute not more than 17.27 percent, inclusive, of the agency's total population aged 5 to 17, inclusive, multiplied by 1.0;

''(ii) the number of such children who constitute more than 17.27 percent, but not more than 23.48 percent, of such population, multiplied by 1.75;

''(iii) the number of such children who constitute more than 23.48 percent, but not more than 29.11 percent, of such population, multiplied by 2.5;

''(iv) the number of such children who constitute more than 29.11 percent, but not more than 36.10 percent, of such population, multiplied by 3.25; and

''(v) the number of such children who constitute more than 36.10 percent of such population, multiplied by 4.0.

''(C) BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN.—The amount referred to in subparagraph (A) is determined by adding—

''(i) the number of children determined under section 1124(c) who constitute not more than 834, inclusive, of the agency's total population aged 5 to 17, inclusive, multiplied by 1.0;

''(ii) the number of such children between 835 and 2,629, inclusive, in such population, multiplied by 1.5;

''(iii) the number of such children between 2,630 and 7,668, inclusive, in such population, multiplied by 2.0; and

''(iv)(I) in the case of an agency that is not a high poverty percentage local educational agency, the number of such children in excess of 7,668 in such population, multiplied by 2.0; or

''(II) in the case of a high poverty percentage local educational agency—

''(aa) the number of such children between 7,669 and 26,412, inclusive, in such population, multiplied by 2.5; and

''(bb) the number of such children in excess of 26,412 in such population, multiplied by 3.0.

''(3) STATES WITH AN EQUITY FACTOR GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO .10 AND LESS THAN .20.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In States with an equity factor greater than or equal to .10 and less than .20, the weighted child counts referred to in paragraph (1) for a fiscal year shall be the larger of the 2 amounts determined under subparagraphs (B) and (C).

''(B) BY PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN.—The amount referred to in subparagraph (A) is determined by adding—

''(i) the number of children determined under section 1124(c) for that local educational agency who constitute not more than 17.27 percent, inclusive, of the agency's total population aged 5 to 17, inclusive, multiplied by 1.0;

''(ii) the number of such children who constitute more than 17.27 percent, but not more than 23.48 percent, of such population, multiplied by 1.5;

''(iii) the number of such children who constitute more than 23.48 percent, but not more than 29.11 percent, of such population, multiplied by 3.0;

''(iv) the number of such children who constitute more than 29.11 percent, but not more than 36.10 percent, of such population, multiplied by 4.5; and

''(v) the number of such children who constitute more than 36.10 percent of such population, multiplied by 6.0.

''(C) BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN.—The amount referred to in subparagraph (A) is determined by adding—

''(i) the number of children determined under section 1124(c) who constitute not more than 834, inclusive, of the agency's total population aged 5 to 17, inclusive, multiplied by 1.0;

''(ii) the number of such children between 835 and 2,629, inclusive, in such population, multiplied by 1.5;

''(iii) the number of such children between 2,630 and 7,668, inclusive, in such population, multiplied by 2.25; and

''(iv)(I) in the case of an agency that is not a high poverty percentage local educational agency, the number of such children in excess of 7,668 in such population, multiplied by 2.25; or

''(II) in the case of a high poverty percentage local educational agency—

''(aa) the number of such children between 7,669 and 26,412, inclusive, in such population, multiplied by 3.375; and

''(bb) the number of such children in excess of 26,412 in such population, multiplied by 4.5.

''(4) STATES WITH AN EQUITY FACTOR GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO .20.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In States with an equity factor greater than or equal to .20, the weighted child counts referred to in paragraph (1) for a fiscal year shall be the larger of the 2 amounts determined under subparagraphs (B) and (C).

''(B) BY PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN.—The amount referred to in subparagraph (A) is determined by adding—

''(i) the number of children determined under section 1124(c) for that local educational agency who constitute not more than 17.27 percent, inclusive, of the agency's total population aged 5 to 17, inclusive, multiplied by 1.0;

''(ii) the number of such children who constitute more than 17.27 percent, but not more than 23.48 percent, of such population, multiplied by 2.0;

''(iii) the number of such children who constitute more than 23.48 percent, but not more than 29.11 percent, of such population, multiplied by 4.0;

''(iv) the number of such children who constitute more than 29.11 percent, but not more than 36.10 percent, of such population, multiplied by 6.0; and

''(v) the number of such children who constitute more than 36.10 percent of such population, multiplied by 8.0.

''(C) BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN.—The amount referred to in subparagraph (A) is determined by adding—

''(i) the number of children determined under section 1124(c) who constitute not more than 834, inclusive, of the agency's total population aged 5 to 17, inclusive, multiplied by 1.0;

''(ii) the number of such children between 835 and 2,629, inclusive, in such population, multiplied by 2.0;

''(iii) the number of such children between 2,630 and 7,668, inclusive, in such population, multiplied by 3.0; and

''(iv)(I) in the case of an agency that is not a high poverty percentage local educational agency, the number of such children in excess of 7,668 in such population, multiplied by 3.0; or

''(II) in the case of a high poverty percentage local educational agency—

''(aa) the number of such children between 7,669 and 26,412, inclusive, in such population, multiplied by 4.5; and

''(bb) the number of such children in excess of 26,412 in such population, multiplied by 6.0.

''(e) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A State is entitled to receive its full allotment of funds under this section for any fiscal year if the Secretary finds that the State's fiscal effort per student or the aggregate expenditures of the State with respect to the provision of free public education by the State for the preceding fiscal year was not less than 90 percent of the fiscal effort or aggregate expenditures for the second preceding fiscal year, subject to the requirements of paragraph (2).

''(2) REDUCTION IN CASE OF FAILURE TO MEET.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall reduce the amount of the allotment of funds under this section in any fiscal year in the exact proportion by which a State fails to meet the requirement of paragraph (1) by falling below 90 percent of both the fiscal effort per student and aggregate expenditures (using the measure most favorable to the State), if such State has also failed to meet such requirement (as determined using the measure most favorable to the State) for 1 or more of the 5 immediately preceding fiscal years.

''(B) SPECIAL RULE.—No such lesser amount shall be used for computing the effort required under paragraph (1) for subsequent years.

''(3) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive the requirements of this subsection if the Secretary determines that a waiver would be equitable due to—

''(A) exceptional or uncontrollable circumstances, such as a natural disaster or a change in the organizational structure of the State; or

''(B) a precipitous decline in the financial resources of the State.

''(f) ADJUSTMENTS WHERE NECESSITATED BY APPROPRIATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If the sums available under this section for any fiscal year are insufficient to pay the full amounts that all local educational agencies in States are eligible to receive under this section for such year, the Secretary shall ratably reduce the allocations to such local educational agencies, subject to paragraphs (2) and (3).

''(2) ADDITIONAL FUNDS.—If additional funds become available for making payments under this section for such fiscal year, allocations that were reduced under paragraph (1) shall be increased on the same basis as they were reduced.

''(3) HOLD HARMLESS AMOUNTS.—Beginning with the second fiscal year for which amounts are appropriated to carry out this section, and if sufficient funds are available, the amount made available to each local educational agency under this section for a fiscal year shall be—

''(A) not less than 95 percent of the amount made available for the preceding fiscal year if the number of children counted under section 1124(c) is equal to or more than 30 percent of the total number of children aged 5 to 17 years, inclusive, in the local educational agency;

''(B) not less than 90 percent of the amount made available for the preceding fiscal year if the percentage described in subparagraph (A) is less than 30 percent and equal to or more than 15 percent; and

''(C) not less than 85 percent of the amount made available for the preceding fiscal year if the percentage described in subparagraph (A) is less than 15 percent.

''(4) APPLICABILITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall not take into consideration the hold-harmless provisions of this subsection for any fiscal year for purposes of calculating State or local allocations for the fiscal year under any program administered by the Secretary other than a program authorized under this part.

''(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) HIGH POVERTY PERCENTAGE LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The term 'high poverty percentage local educational agency' means a local educational agency for which the number of children determined under subsection (b) for a fiscal year is 20 percent or more of the total population aged 5 to 17, inclusive, of the local educational agency for such fiscal year.

''(2) STATE.—The term 'State' means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.''.

SEC. 1011A. ADEQUACY OF FUNDING RULE.

Section 1125AA(b) (20 U.S.C. 6336(b)) is amended by striking ''section 1122(a)'' and inserting ''section 1122(a)(1)''.

SEC. 1011B. EDUCATION FINANCE INCENTIVE GRANT PROGRAM.

In section 1125A (20 U.S.C. 6337)—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''under subsection (f)'' and inserting ''under section 1002(a) and made available under section 1122(a)(1)'';

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''pursuant to subsection (f)'' and inserting ''made available for this section under section 1122(a)(1)'';

(3) in subsection (c), by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively;

(4) in subsection (d)(1)(A)(ii), by striking ''clause ''(i)'' and inserting ''clause (i)'';

(5) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

''(e) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A State is entitled to receive its full allotment of funds under this section for any fiscal year if the Secretary finds that the State's fiscal effort per student or the aggregate expenditures of the State with respect to the provision of free public education by the State for the preceding fiscal year was not less than 90 percent of the fiscal effort or aggregate expenditures for the second preceding fiscal year, subject to the requirements of paragraph (2).

''(2) REDUCTION IN CASE OF FAILURE TO MEET.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall reduce the amount of the allotment of funds under this section for any fiscal year in the exact proportion by which a State fails to meet the requirement of paragraph (1) by falling below 90 percent of both the fiscal effort per student and aggregate expenditures (using the measure most favorable to the State), if such State has also failed to meet such requirement (as determined using the measure most favorable to the State) for 1 or more of the 5 immediately preceding fiscal years.

''(B) SPECIAL RULE.—No such lesser amount shall be used for computing the effort required under paragraph (1) for subsequent years.

''(3) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive the requirements of this subsection if the Secretary determines that a waiver would be equitable due to—

''(A) exceptional or uncontrollable circumstances, such as a natural disaster or a change in the organizational structure of the State; or

''(B) a precipitous decline in the financial resources of the State.'';

(6) by striking subsection (f);

(7) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (f); and

(8) in subsection (f), as redesignated by paragraph (7)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''under this section'' and inserting ''to carry out this section''; and

(B) in subsection (f)(3), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''shall be'' and inserting ''shall be—''.

SEC. 1011C. SPECIAL ALLOCATION PROCEDURES.

Section 1126 (20 U.S.C. 6338) is amended by striking ''sections 1124, 1124A, 1125, and 1125A'' each place the term appears and inserting ''sections 1123, 1124, 1124A, 1125, and 1125A''.

AMENDMENT NO. 2186

(Purpose: To establish the Promise Neighborhoods program)

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of July 9, 2015, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

AMENDMENT NO. 2100

(Purpose: To amend title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to establish a full-service community schools grant program)

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of July 7, 2015, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

AMENDMENT NO. 2144

(Purpose: To provide States and local educational agencies with resources on climate theory to promote improved science education)

At the end of part B of title X, add the following:

SEC. 10202. RESOURCES FOR IMPROVED SCIENCE EDUCATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall provide States and local educational agencies with balanced, objective resources on climate theory to promote improved science education for students in kindergarten through grade 12, including materials regarding—

(1) the natural causes and cycles of climate change;

(2) the uncertainties inherent in climate modeling; and

(3) the myriad factors that influence the climate of the Earth.

(b) RESOURCES.—The resources provided under subsection (a) shall be—

(1) in addition to any climate theory resources the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency or the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration are providing to States or local educational agencies on the day before the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) made available to promote open classroom discussion that builds student skills in scientific reasoning, critical thinking, and independent thought.

AMENDMENT NO. 2176

(Purpose: To establish a climate change education program)

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. 5011. CLIMATE CHANGE EDUCATION.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Climate Change Education Act''.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) carbon pollution is accumulating in the atmosphere, causing global temperatures to rise at a rate that poses a significant threat to the economy and security of the United States, to public health and welfare, and to the global environment;

(2) climate change is already impacting the United States with sea level rise, ocean acidification, and more frequent or intense extreme weather events such as heat waves, heavy rainfalls, droughts, floods, and wildfires;

(3) the scientific evidence for human-induced climate change is overwhelming and undeniable as demonstrated by statements from the National Academy of Sciences, the National Climate Assessment, and numerous other science professional organizations in the United States;

(4) the United States has a responsibility to children and future generations of the United States to address the harmful effects of climate change;

(5) providing clear information about climate change, in a variety of forms, can encourage individuals and communities to take action;

(6) the actions of a single nation cannot solve the climate crisis, so solutions that address both mitigation and adaptation must involve developed and developing nations around the world;

(7) investing in the development of innovative clean energy and energy efficiency technologies will—

(A) enhance the global leadership and competitiveness of the United States; and

(B) create and sustain short and long term job growth;

(8) implementation of measures that promote energy efficiency, conservation, and renewable energy will greatly reduce human impact on the environment; and

(9) education about climate change is important to ensure the future generation of leaders is well-informed about the challenges facing our planet in order to make decisions based on science and fact.

(c) AMENDMENT TO ESEA.—Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7201 et seq.), as amended by section 5010, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''PART J—CLIMATE CHANGE EDUCATION

''SEC. 5911. CLIMATE CHANGE EDUCATION PROGRAM.

''(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to—

''(1) broaden the understanding of human induced climate change, possible long and short-term consequences, and potential solutions;

''(2) provide learning opportunities in climate science education for all students through grade 12, including those of diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds;

''(3) emphasize actionable information to help students understand how to utilize new technologies and programs related to energy conservation, clean energy, and carbon pollution reduction; and

''(4) inform the public of impacts to human health and safety as a result of climate change.

''(b) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary, in consultation with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Department of Energy, shall establish a competitive grant program to provide grants to States to—

''(1) develop or improve climate science curriculum and supplementary educational materials for grades kindergarten through grade 12;

''(2) initiate, develop, expand, or implement statewide plans and programs for climate change education, including relevant teacher training and professional development and multidisciplinary studies to ensure that students graduate from high school climate literate; or

''(3) create State green school building standards or policies.

''(c) APPLICATION.—A State desiring to receive a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

''(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report that evaluates the scientific merits, educational effectiveness, and broader impacts of activities under this section.

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section such sums as may be necessary.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 2241

(Purpose: To amend the accountability provisions)

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of July 14, 2015, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

AMENDMENT NO. 2177

(Purpose: To provide for youth jobs, and for other purposes)

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of July 8, 2015, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

AMENDMENT NO. 2242

(Purpose: To establish a Federal-State partnership to provide access to high-quality public prekindergarten programs from low-income and moderate-income families to ensure that they enter kindergarten prepared for success, and for other purposes)

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of July 14, 2015, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

AMENDMENT NO. 2130

(Purpose: To amend title I to support assessments of school facilities)

On page 69, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

''(N) if applicable, whether the State conducts periodic assessments of the condition of elementary school and secondary school facilities in the State, which may include an assessment of the age of the facility and the state of repair of the facility;

AMENDMENT NO. 2215, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To include partnering with current and recently retired STEM professionals and tailoring educational resources to engage students and teachers in STEM)

Beginning on page 373, strike line 22 and all that follows through page 374, line 3, and insert the following:

in the State;

''(C) information on student exposure to and retention in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields, including among low-income and underrepresented groups, which may include results from a pre-existing analysis; and

''(D) an analysis of the quality of pre-service preparation at all public institutions of

higher education (including alternative pathways to teacher licensure or certification) for individuals preparing to teach science, technology, engineering, and mathematics subjects in the State.

On page 381, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

''(vi) partner with current or recently retired science, technology, engineering, and mathematics professionals to engage students and teachers in instruction in such subjects;

''(vii) tailor and integrate educational resources developed by Federal agencies, as appropriate, to improve student achievement in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics;

AMENDMENT NO. 2222

(Purpose: To amend the State plan requirements of section 1111 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to support children facing substance abuse in the home)

On page 69, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

''(N) if applicable, how the State educational agency will provide support to local educational agencies for the education of children facing substance abuse in the home, which may include how such agency will provide professional development, training, and technical assistance to local educational agencies, elementary schools, and secondary schools in communities with high rates of substance abuse; and''.

AMENDMENT NO. 2231

(Purpose: To support professional development to help students prepare for postsecondary education and the workforce)

On page 284, strike lines 4 through 8 and insert the following:

(xix) Supporting the efforts and professional development of teachers, principals, and other school leaders to integrate academic and career and technical education content into instructional practices, which may include—

(I) integrating career and technical education with advanced coursework, such as by allowing the acquisition of postsecondary credits, recognized postsecondary credentials, and industry-based credentials, by students while in high school; or

(II) coordinating activities with employers and entities carrying out initiatives under other workforce development programs to identify State and regional workforce needs, such as through the development of State and local plans under title I of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3111 et seq);

On page 306, strike lines 18 through 23 and insert the following:

(U) providing high-quality professional development for teachers, principals, and other school leaders on effective strategies to integrate rigorous academic content, career and technical education, and work-based learning, if appropriate, which may include providing common planning time, to help prepare students for postsecondary education and the workforce without the need for remediation; and

AMENDMENT NO. 2188

(Purpose: To ensure States will ensure the unique needs of students at all levels of schooling)

On page 69, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

''(M) how the State will ensure the unique needs of students at all levels of schooling are met, particularly students in the middle grades and high school, including how the State will work with local educational agencies to—

''(i) assist in the identification of middle grades and high school students who are at-risk of dropping out, such as through the continuous use of student data related to measures such as attendance, student suspensions, course performance, and, postsecondary credit accumulation that results in actionable steps to inform and differentiate instruction and support;

''(ii) ensure effective student transitions from elementary school to middle grades and middle grades to high school, such as by aligning curriculum and supports or implementing personal academic plans to enable such students to stay on the path to graduation;

''(iii) ensure effective student transitions from high school to postsecondary education, such as through the establishment of partnerships between local educational agencies and institutions of higher education and providing students with choices for pathways to postsecondary education, which may include the integration of rigorous academics, career and technical education, and work-based learning;

''(iv) provide professional development to teachers, principals, other school leaders, and other school personnel in addressing the academic and developmental needs of such students; and

''(v) implement any other evidence-based strategies or activities that the State determines appropriate for addressing the unique needs of such students;

On page 69, line 13, strike ''(M)'' and insert ''(N)''.

On page 69, line 17, strike ''(N)'' and insert ''(O)''.

On page 772, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

''(47) MIDDLE GRADES.—The term middle grades means any of grades 5 through 8.''.

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 1020__. REPORT ON THE REDUCTION OF THE NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS WHO DROP OUT OF SCHOOL.

Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Institute of Education Sciences shall evaluate the impact of section 1111(c)(1)(M) on reducing the number and percentage of students who drop out of school.

AMENDMENT NO. 2156

(Purpose: To amend the State report card under section 1111 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to include the rates of enrollment in postsecondary education, and remediation rates, for high schools)

On page 82, between lines 23 and 24, insert the following:

''(xviii) for each high school in the State, and beginning with the report card released in 2017, the cohort rate (in the aggregate, and disaggregated for each category of students defined in subsection (b)(3)(A), except that such disaggregation shall not be required in a case in which the number of students is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student) at which students who graduate from the high school enroll, for the first academic year that begins after the students' graduation—

''(I) in programs of public postsecondary education in the State; and

''(II) if data are available and to the extent practicable, in programs of private postsecondary education in the State or programs of postsecondary education outside the State;

''(xix) if available and to the extent practicable, for each high school in the State and beginning with the report card released in 2018, the remediation rate (in the aggregate, and disaggregated for each category of students defined in subsection (b)(3)(A), except that such disaggregation shall not be required in a case in which the number of students is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student) for students who graduate from the high school at—

''(I) programs of postsecondary education in the State; and

''(II) programs of postsecondary education outside the State;

AMENDMENT NO. 2232

(Purpose: To allow extended services Project SERV grants under part A of title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to be available for violence prevention activities)

On page 431, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

''(e) PROJECT SERV.—

''(1) ADDITIONAL USE OF FUNDS.—Funds available under subsection (a)(4) for extended services grants under the Project School Emergency Response to Violence program (referred to in this subsection as the 'Project SERV program') may be used by a local educational agency or institution of higher education receiving such grant to initiate or strengthen violence prevention activities, as part of the activities designed to restore the learning environment that was disrupted by the violent or traumatic crisis in response to which the grant was awarded, and as provided in this subsection.

''(2) APPLICATION PROCESS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A local educational agency or institution of higher education desiring to use a portion of extended services grant funds under the Project SERV program to initiate or strengthen a violence prevention activity shall—

''(i) submit, in an application that meets all requirements of the Secretary for the Project SERV program, the information described in subparagraph (B); or

''(ii) in the case of a local educational agency or institution of higher education that has already received an extended services grant under the Project SERV program, submit an addition to the original application that includes the information described in subparagraph (B).

''(B) APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.—The information required under this subparagraph is the following:

''(i) A demonstration that there is a continued disruption or a substantial risk of disruption to the learning environment that would be addressed by such activity.

''(ii) An explanation of the proposed activity designed to restore and preserve the learning environment.

''(iii) A budget and budget narrative for the proposed activity.

''(3) AWARD BASIS.—Any award of funds under the Project SERV program for violence prevention activities under this subsection shall be subject to the discretion of the Secretary and the availability of funds.

''(4) PROHIBITED USE.—No funds provided to a local educational agency or institution of higher education under the Project SERV program for violence prevention activities may be used for construction, renovation, or repair of a facility or for the permanent infrastructure of the local educational agency or institution.

AMENDMENT NO. 2256

(Purpose: To amend the definitions of eligible technology and technology readiness survey and to provide a restriction on funds)

Beginning on page 587, strike line 15 and all that follows through page 588, line 10, and insert the following:

''(2) ELIGIBLE TECHNOLOGY.—The term 'eligible technology' means modern computer, and communication technology software, services, or tools, including computer or mobile devices, whether for use in school or at home, software applications, systems and platforms, digital learning content, and related services, supports, and strategies, which may include strategies to assist eligible children without adequate Internet access at home to complete homework.

''(3) TECHNOLOGY READINESS SURVEY.—The term 'technology readiness survey' means a survey completed by a local educational agency that provides standardized information on the quantity and types of technology infrastructure and access available to the students and in the community served by the local educational agency, including computer devices, access to school libraries, Internet connectivity (including Internet access outside of the school day), operating systems, related network infrastructure, data systems, educator professional learning needs and priorities, and data security.

''(4) UNIVERSAL DESIGN FOR LEARNING.—The term 'universal design for learning' has the meaning given the term in section 103 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1003).

''SEC. 5702A. RESTRICTION.

''Funds awarded under this part shall not be used to address the networking needs of an entity that is eligible to receive support under the E-rate program.

AMENDMENT NO. 2240

(Purpose: To provide resources needed to study and review Native American language medium schools and programs)

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 1020___. REPORT ON NATIVE AMERICAN LANGUAGE MEDIUM EDUCATION.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to authorize a study to evaluate all levels of education being provided primarily through the medium of Native languages and to require a report of the findings, within the context of the findings, purposes, and provisions of the Native American Languages Act (25 U.S.C. 2901), the findings, purposes, and provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.), and other related laws.

(b) STUDY AND REVIEW.—The Secretary of Education shall award grants to eligible entities to study and review Native language medium schools and programs.

(c) ELIGIBLE ENTITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''eligible entity'' means a consortium that—

(1) includes not less than 3 units of an institution of higher education, such as a department, center, or college, that has significant experience—

(A) and expertise in Native American or Alaska Native languages, and Native language medium education; and

(B) in outreach and collaboration with Native communities;

(2) has within its membership at least 10 years of experience—

(A) addressing a range of Native American or Alaska Native languages and indigenous language medium education issues through the lens of Native studies, linguistics, and education; and

(B) working in close association with a variety of schools and programs taught predominantly through the medium of a Native language;

(3) includes for each of American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians, at least 1 unit of an institution of higher education that focuses on schools that serve such populations; and

(4) includes Native American scholars and staff who are fluent in Native American languages.

(d) APPLICATIONS.—An eligible entity that desires to receive a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary of Education that—

(1) identifies 1 unit in the consortium that is the lead unit of the consortium for the study, reporting, and funding purposes;

(2) includes letters of verification of participation from the top internal administrators of each unit in the consortium;

(3) includes a brief description of how the consortium meets the eligibility qualifications under subsection (c);

(4) describes the work proposed to carry out the purpose of this section; and

(5) provides other information as requested by the Secretary of Education.

(e) SCOPE OF STUDY.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section shall use the grant funds to study and review Native American language medium schools and programs and evaluate the components, policies, and practices of successful Native language medium schools and programs and how the students who enroll in them do over the long term, including—

(1) the level of expertise in educational pedagogy, Native language fluency, and experience of the principal, teachers, paraprofessionals, and other educational staff;

(2) how such schools and programs are using Native languages to provide instruction in reading, language arts, mathematics, science, and, as applicable, other core academic subjects;

(3) how such school and programs' curricula incorporates the relevant Native culture of the students;

(4) how such schools and programs assess the academic proficiency of the students, including—

(A) whether the school administers assessments of language arts, mathematics, science, and other academic subjects in the Native language of instruction;

(B) whether the school administers assessments of language arts, mathematics, science, and other academic subjects in English; and

(C) how the standards measured by the assessments in the Native language of instruction and in English compare;

(5) the academic, graduation rate, and other outcomes of students who have completed the highest grade taught primarily through such schools or programs, including, when available, college attendance rates compared with demographically similar students who did not attend a school in which the language of instruction was a Native language; and

(6) other appropriate information consistent with the purpose of this section.

(f) OTHER ENTITIES.—An eligible entity may enter into a contract with another individual, entity, or organization to assist in carrying out research necessary to fulfill the purpose of this section.

(g) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, an eligible entity that receives a grant under this section shall—

(1) develop a detailed statement of findings and conclusions regarding the study completed under subsection (e), including recommendations for such legislative and administrative actions as the eligible entity considers to be appropriate; and

(2) submit a report setting forth the findings and conclusions, including recommendations, described in paragraph (1) to each of the following:

(A) The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate.

(B) The Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives.

(C) The Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate.

(D) The Subcommittee on Indian, Insular, and Alaska Native Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(E) The Secretary of Education.

(F) The Secretary of the Interior.

AMENDMENT NO. 2249

(Purpose: To amend section 1111(c) of the ESEA to require States to provide an assurance regarding cross-tabulation of student data)

On page 73, line 12, strike the period at the end and insert the following: ''; and

''(N) the State educational agency will provide the information described in clauses (ii), (iii), and (iv) of subsection (d)(1)(C) to the public in an easily accessible and user-friendly manner that can be cross-tabulated by, at a minimum, each major racial and ethnic group, gender, English proficiency, and students with or without disabilities, which—

''(i) may be accomplished by including such information on the annual State report card described subsection (d)(1)(C)); and

''(ii) shall be presented in a manner that—

''(I) is first anonymized and does not reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student;

''(II) does not include a number of students in any category of students that is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or that would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student; and

''(III) is consistent with the requirements of section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g, commonly known as the 'Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974').

''(3) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (2)(N) shall be construed to—

''(A) require groups of students obtained by any entity that cross-tabulates the information provided under such paragraph to be considered categories of students under subsection (b)(3)(A) for the purposes of the State accountability system under subsection (b)(3); or

''(B) to prohibit States from publicly reporting data in a cross-tabulated manner, in order to meet the requirements of paragraph (2)(N).

''(4) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Upon request by a State educational agency, the Secretary shall provide technical assistance to such agency in order to meet the requirements of paragraph (2)(N).

On page 189, after line 23, insert the following:

''(5) Designing the report cards and reports under section 1111(d) in an easily accessible, user-friendly manner that cross-tabulates student information by any category the State determines appropriate, as long as such cross-tabulation—

''(A) does not reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student; and

''(B) is derived from existing State and local reporting requirements and data sources.

''(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (5) shall be construed as authorizing, requiring, or allowing any additional reporting requirements, data elements, or information to be reported to the Secretary not otherwise explicitly authorized under this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 2120 WITHDRAWN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Warren amendment No. 2120 is withdrawn.

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, needless to say, yesterday's announcement about our ongoing stature and status with Iran is, in my view, a dangerous step forward in advancing not only the illicit nuclear program that they have had up until now but the clear nuclear weapons capability they would have under this agreement.

I think the agreement confirms that the President was too willing to get a deal with Iran at any price. The concessions made by the administration, based on the starting point of these discussions, I believe to be stunning. All we have to do is go back and review a little bit of recent history to see that today Iran's advancement of instability, terrorism, and violence in the world continues unabated and not hampered by the agreement that has just been announced. Tomorrow, we will see all of those things still continue unabated, and unfortunately they are much better positioned and much better funded than they are right now.

Supported by Iran, Assad in Syria has been massacring his own people, resulting in the deaths of at least 191,000 people in Syria. That is according to the U.N., and those numbers were reported a year ago. Assad, by the way, stepped forward immediately to praise this agreement.

Supported by Iran, Shiite militias are continuing to support Assad and promote division and violence throughout the country of Iraq. Supported by Iran, Houthi rebels have seized key territory in Yemen and continue to work to destabilize that country. Supported by Iran, Hezbollah in Lebanon wages terrorism and calls for the annihilation. Supported by Iran, Palestinian terrorist groups in Gaza continue to lob mortars and rockets into Israel.

Last April, Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps Navy stopped a Marshall Islands-flagged ship as it tried to go into the Strait of Hormuz. This is at a time when Iran is trying to get major countries in the world to negotiate with them.

Iran continues to hold hostages without any reasonable way of defining hostages and without any reasonable charge. They currently have three Americans held as hostages: Pastor Saeed Abedini, former U.S. Marine Amir Hekmati, and Washington Post journalist Jason Rezaian. They also remain totally uncooperative in helping to locate former FBI official Robert Levinson. When the Secretary of State was asked about why these people weren't part of the negotiations, he said: Well, this was a negotiation about nuclear weapons but not about people unlawfully and wrongly detained.

Well, it quickly became a negotiation about not just nuclear weapons but all kinds of other weapons that we have prevented the Iranians from having access to in a worldwide marketplace. That was quickly added to the topic, but we couldn't get three Americans released and find out more about one American than we know now.

The concessions laid out by yesterday's announcement were also, I thought, pretty stunning. Concerning uranium enrichment, the Obama administration said a year and a half ago Iran didn't have the right to enrich.

In November of 2013, the Secretary of State told ABC News:

> We do not recognize the right to enrich. It is clear . . . in the nonproliferation treaty, it's very, very [clear] that there is no right to enrich.

Under the agreement, Iran is allowed to continue to enrich.

As far as inspections, the President said we would have to be able to verify Iran's compliance or Iran's cheating through anywhere, anytime inspections. It is widely understood that any good deal must allow inspections—trust but verify. The President may say that is in there, but it is clearly not in there.

In fact, last April the President's Deputy National Security Advisor proudly proclaimed that ''under this deal'' we ''will have anywhere, anytime 24/7 access'' to Iran's nuclear facilities. As it turns out under this deal, inspectors will be forced to wait up to 24 days for access to suspicious sites once they ask for access to suspicious sites. That is a brand-new definition of ''anywhere, anytime.'' You can possibly have access in 24 days, and obviously lots of things can and would change in 24 days.

Militarily, the President said we would disclose and define the possible military dimensions of the research and where Iran's illegal nuclear program was headed. The President said this information is critical to knowing what Iran's true breakout potential and their true intentions would be. Under this agreement, however, the option of examining the possible military dimensions of Iran's nuclear program is off the table.

As far as sanctions, the administration said that removing all sanctions was a nonstarter until Iran demonstrated that it is complying with the agreement. A little over a year ago, in March of 2014, Secretary Kerry said: ''Iran is not open for business until Iran is closed for nuclear bombs.'' However, we know now that Iran will, in fact, be open for business much sooner than that. This deal will not only allow them to be open for business, but they will be rewarded with hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of sanctions relief and return of assets that didn't have to be returned. And under this agreement all sanctions, even those related to arms, missiles, and proliferation, will be removed—not suspended. These will be removed. We have some of the most aggressive arms suppliers in the world, and Iran is now being given access to all kinds of arms that they couldn't get legally or easily up until now.

All economic and banking sections, as well as those imposed on transport, insurance, petrochemical industries, and valuable materials will be removed.

As far as dismantling, the President said Iran would have to dismantle its illegal nuclear program. In December of 2013, the chief negotiator, Wendy Sherman, told PBS that a final agreement should include ''a lot of dismantling of their infrastructure.'' Yet under this deal we are seeing that Iran's program will, in fact, almost all be preserved, not dismantled.

The length of the agreement—the P5+1 initially stipulated that Iran must accept restrictions on its nuclear program for 20 years plus another 25 years, and then later they said 20 years plus another 10 years, and finally their last offer was just 20 years, which in the end was reduced to 10 years. I think over the next 60 days, as people read the fine print of the agreement, they might find out that it is even less than 10 years, but they certainly know now it is not 20 years plus 25 years.

This is a bad deal for the United States and one that will embolden our enemies, jeopardize the security of our allies, and further lead our friends to not believe they can trust us and our enemies not to be afraid of us. In a dangerous world, what worse place could we be in than that.

The stated goal of the negotiations was to ensure that Iran never developed the capability of producing a nuclear weapon. Yet the President agreed to a deal that does just the opposite. By allowing Iran to become nuclear weapons capable and failing to provide for anytime, anywhere inspections, this deal gives Iran a free pass to cheat at its military sites with no access to U.S. inspectors.

Meanwhile, just last week Iran continued its calls for the destruction of Israel. These are the people we are allowing, through this process, to have access to more weapons and to become nuclear weapons capable. Just last week, Iran called, as it has for decades, for the destruction of Israel and ''death to America.'' In fact, Iran's Supreme Leader stood by, calling for the need to fight the United States even if there is an agreement. I don't know that we have ever before entered into an agreement with another country that, while we are in the agreement, says: And by the way, no matter if there is an agreement or not, we want to continue to see the United States as an enemy we need to fight.

This deal undermines the security of our friends and allies. It legitimizes Iran's unapologetic sponsorship of terrorism throughout the Middle East.

It is interesting what could be included, by the way, and what couldn't be included.

Iran has repeatedly refused to abide by international agreements that require inspection of nuclear facilities, details of facility designs, acquisition and production of nuclear materials. What makes us think Iran is going to change that behavior now? The negotiations themselves should lead us to believe the new Iran is still the old Iran.

This is a bad deal. It is a deal that just hopes that in the next 8 or 10 years

the Iranian Government totally changes, the Iranian attitude totally changes, our relationship with them totally changes, and it just hopes that in the interim—during the time we have that hoped-for change—the Iranians don't cheat. This is a hope, not a strategy, and it is a hope, not a strategy, wherein we would let the world become much more destabilized as a result.

After months of negotiations, Iran hasn't released a single American prisoner, nor have they announced any intentions to do so.

The Iranians, the Russians, the Chinese, the Syrians—or at least the Syrians who are still controlled by Assad—may like this deal, but this is a bad deal for the United States of America, it is a bad deal for world stability, and it is a bad deal for our friends.

Frankly, I think the law that Congress passed that now gives the Congress of the United States 60 days to look at it will turn out to be 60 days that the President himself is about to find out what is in the deal he and the administration signed.

This is a serious matter for every Member of the Senate.

I was asked earlier today: Are you going to lobby Members of the Senate as to how they should vote on this agreement when it comes up?

I said: I am going to do everything I can to talk about the real shortcomings of this agreement, the destabilizing effects of this agreement, but every Member of the Senate is going to have to answer for this agreement and this vote for a long time.

Members of the Senate on their own are going to have to decide what side of this to wind up on. I predict that a majority—and maybe a substantial majority—of the Senate will wind up understanding that this is a bad deal for America and a bad deal for the future of the world's security.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2241

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, as we wait for colleagues to arrive to the floor, I thought I would take a few minutes to speak a little bit about accountability in this bill.

As we know, the No Child Left Behind legislation and now this new version of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act require annual tests. They are not popular.

I believe we are overtesting kids in this country. It is not the Federal requirement that is causing that; it is the relationship of the Federal requirement to State and local tests that are administered, so that by the time we get to the classroom inhabited by one of my three daughters who go to Denver's public schools, for example, kids end up spending too much time being tested. Part of that is because we haven't done a good job, I don't think, of distinguishing between tests that are used for accountability purposes—how is the school doing growing kids—and tests that are used for teaching and learning purposes, which are assessments that have to happen all the time during the school year. When I was in school, we called those quizzes, and we dreaded them, just as people dread them today. That was the way teachers were able to keep an eye on how students were doing in their classroom throughout the year so they could course correct, so they could make changes based on the individual needs of the kids in their classroom.

Teaching and learning and accountability aren't the same things, and I think we put too much freight on some of these assessments. I hope what we are going to see as we come out of this new reauthorization is an understanding about the importance of the accountability—why we have it—and better implementation of tests at the State and local level.

There is no reason for the Federal Government to be involved in education, really—only 9 percent of what we spend is Federal money, and the rest of it is State and local money—except for one reason. The civil rights imperative in this bill and that is at the heart of this bill has said to us that we just can't look the other way when it comes to kids of color and kids living in poverty in this country, which we did for decades—for decades—without knowing where we were headed.

The one great benefit of No Child Left Behind is that it required that data about kids living in poverty, kids of color, kids with special needs, and English language learners as well be published so we could see the huge gaps that exist all across this country in educational attainment. We can't go backward on that. I agree that allowing States to have more flexibility in the design of these systems is important. It is an important step forward in this bill.

As I mentioned yesterday, when I was the superintendent of the Denver Public Schools—the best job I ever had; I had that honor—I used to wonder all the time why people in Washington were so mean to our teachers and to our kids. I got here and I realized they weren't mean, they just have absolutely no idea what is going on in our schools and our classrooms. Where the Presiding Officer is right now, right here, in this place—and I mean this literally—is as far away as one can get from a school or a classroom in this country and still be in this universe. We are very distant. We may think we know what is going on there, but we don't know. This institution doesn't know.

While I, as that superintendent, have developed a very strong view that I didn't want to be told how we should do things by Washington, and I didn't want Washington telling my teachers how to do things, our principals how to do things, kids and families how to do things, I think it is important and imperative that we have a national expectation for what kids ought to be able to do at certain grade levels and that we have a national imperative around the achievement gap in this country.

We also have a national imperative—people may not like to know this—to figure out how we are going to replace the 1.5 million teachers we are going to require in this country over the next several years.

Those are all issues of national concern, but our federalist system tells us there are certain responsibilities assumed by the States and certain responsibilities assumed by the Federal Government, and we have gotten that twisted up when it comes to education. So I think that is an important step forward, that we are not going to be telling people how to do it, but we need to remind people that they need to do it.

It is not OK that we live in a country where if you are unlucky enough to be born poor, your chances of getting a college degree or its equivalent are roughly 9 in 100. That is not OK. That is a matter of national concern. That is why the accountability provisions in this bill are so important. To be honest, that is why the annual testing is so important, if it is done wisely and well and if the data is used in a thoughtful way to measure student growth.

No Child Left Behind not only was a huge overreach by the Federal Government, it also asked and answered the profoundly wrong question. It asked: How did this year's group of fourth graders do compared to last year's fourth graders? That is how we evaluated schools, on that basis. That is crazy. They are not the same kids. The question we should be asking and the question we are asking now in many States and in many communities across the country is this: How did this group of sixth graders do compared to how they did as fifth graders compared to how they did as fourth graders and then compared to all the kids in the State—this is the way we do it in Colorado—who had a statistically similar test history. That reveals a lot of information.

For No Child Left Behind, we used to have a matrix in Denver, and it was four squares, and in the upper right-hand corner was—well, there are two measures; one is growth and one is status. How much did you grow this year? It would be like saying, how much weight did you gain or lose this year, versus status, which is, how much did you weigh? What is your achievement level? Those are two different ideas.

In those four boxes I mentioned earlier, in the upper right we had high growth, high status schools, and in this corner we had high status but low growth schools. Those are schools we

called excellent schools under No Child Left Behind. Those were blue ribbon schools even though kids were losing ground in those schools. They arguably shouldn't have been because those schools didn't have the struggles schools have with kids living in poverty. Those were blue ribbon schools. Those are schools where we were telling moms and dads and kids that everything is fine, even though kids were losing ground when they showed up at the schoolhouse door.

The reverse was also true. The reverse was also true because we were saying to schools that were below the threshold of high status—low status schools—that they were failing schools even though they might have been schools where what we were seeing was 2 years of growth for kids who had started out way behind because they had come to kindergarten with that stubborn word gap, that 30 million word gap that kids have who are living in poverty and are showing up in kindergarten. By the way, we are not doing anything, almost, as a country to deal with that problem.

As I mentioned yesterday, we are having a debate in Washington about income redistribution sometimes. We have a discussion about what the Tax Code should be, and there are people here who believe that it shouldn't do anything. That is a principled position, but if that is a person's position, they better be working day and night to make sure every single kid in America has access to high-quality early childhood education. We better make sure every kid in America has access and a choice to go to a high-performing K–12 school. And we better make sure we are doing everything we can to make it easier, not harder, to go to college to get a higher education degree because this unforgiving international economy is not going to change its mind about whether a high school degree is enough or dropping out of high school is enough.

We need to be focused on education in this country. It is the single most important public good we provide domestically. If a person asks me as a parent what I would take a risk on for my kids, the No. 1 thing I wouldn't take a risk on is their education. That is how we ought to be feeling about all of the kids in the United States of America. We should stop treating America's children as though they are someone else's kids. They are not someone else's kids; they are our kids. And if we extrapolate the academic outcomes that we are seeing in this country, the college graduation rates we are seeing, the high school graduation rates—if we extrapolate those against the changing demographics in the United States, we are not going to recognize ourselves in the 21st century.

When we constrain a child, a human being, an American citizen to the margin of this economy or the margin of the democracy simply because they are born into poverty and we can't do the work to provide a high-quality education, that is all the evidence we need that we are treating people as though they are someone else's kids. That is why, by the way, there is more we need to do on accountability.

I feel as though we have made good progress with a lot of this bill, and I am extremely grateful for the leadership of Chairman ALEXANDER from Tennessee and the ranking member of the committee, Senator PATTY MURRAY, and I am pleased to see that the bill passed out of committee unanimously. Remember, ESEA is fundamentally a civil rights law. We should measure growth. We should identify the bottom 5 percent of schools in this country. We need to ensure that subgroups and high-performing schools are not left behind. And that is the power of the data that is collected, and that is the power of what is called the disaggregation of that data so that we can see outcomes.

I see my colleague from New Jersey is here. Through the Chair, I would ask if he wishes to speak, and if so, I will stop. I was filling time. I do want to talk about the comparability loophole, but I will come back to that and yield to my colleague from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I am grateful to Senator BENNET. Senator BENNET and I met around education issues. Senator BENNET led the largest public school system in the State of Colorado. Senator BENNET has been in the weeds of education for years, if not decades.

I am grateful that Senator BENNET began his remarks by saying all of the things that have been wrong with No Child Left Behind. That was a bad piece of legislation. We saw the aspects of it that were causing problems and that have created a bipartisan push to fix them.

I want to give credit to Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER and Senator PATTY MURRAY for joining together and doing the things necessary to improve the bill. The culture of education has shifted in this country, from high-stakes testing to looking at measures that made no sense to creating artificial deadlines that could not be met or even doing things that undermined the very goals and aspirations that we have for our country, which is to lead the globe in educational excellence.

So, I am encouraged by Senator BENNET and myself and the majority of this body who agree that this legislation needs to be changed. It is a left-right coalition that is encouraging to me.

But I want to echo Senator BENNET's concerns about a problem that is not being addressed—that as the pendulum swings away from the problems of No Child Left Behind, we not create new ones that cut against the very ideals with which this legislation was put in place by Lyndon Johnson. Lyndon Johnson said clearly that this was a bill to bridge the gap in this country between help and the helpless, for those children who are suffering on the educational margins of our society, drowning in the eddies of educational lack of opportunity, caught in the quicksand of poverty and race, and with challenges that undermine and contribute to the dysfunction and inequality in our Nation. This was to be the bridge. It is why this body acted under President Johnson.

So now, Senator BENNET, I have a distressed heart, because what this amendment we are trying to put forward does is to allow us to get to a point where we are now not even putting a spotlight on where we are failing to live up to our values. This amendment calls for us to at least acknowledge that there are children in our country who are stuck in so-called dropout factories, children who are perpetually underachieving, and schools that are failing the genius of our children. What this amendment was seeking to do was to say that we cannot ignore our children, we cannot turn our backs on these children, we cannot turn over and say it doesn't exist, because we do have a problem in our Nation. What anguishes me about this problem is that the children we are turning our backs on and not focusing on are children that are poor and children that are disproportionately minority.

To paraphrase Martin Luther King, he said that what we will have to repent for in this day and age is not the vitriolic words and actions of the bad people but the appalling silence and inaction of the good people.

I hear time and again that we love our children in America. Well, if we love them, we should do something about the challenges that are afflicting a small percentage of our kids who do not get the educational environment they deserve. This is a peculiar form of American insanity—insanity being defined as doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results. We are not going to change this problem of perpetual failure in too many of our schools that affect poor and minorities by not having some attention to that problem.

Let's be clear. We have learned lessons. This amendment No. 2241, the ESEA accountability amendment, does not do the things that this body in its majority thinks should no longer be done by the Federal Government.

Let me be clear. This amendment does not reinstate any type of adequate yearly progress, or AYP. In fact, the underlying bill is repealed. AYP is repealed. It does not establish artificial deadlines such as No Child Left Behind did, saying that all children will be proficient by 2014. It does not establish Federal goals for our students. States will have the prerogative to set their own. It does not impose test-based accountability on States. States must include a range of factors in their State-designed accountability systems. It

does not require schools to implement a one-size-fits-all intervention. Local districts will design the intervention for underperforming schools.

This legislation is not prescriptive. This legislation is not Washington telling local districts what to do. This amendment does not design programs. It simply says that there must be a commitment made when there are these dropout factories and when there are these populations that are not being served to ensure that States identify certain low-performing schools so that students in these schools receive the support they need.

It would require locally designed, evidence-based interventions to schools identified in the following categories: the lowest performing 5 percent of our schools; high schools where less than two-thirds of students graduate; and schools where subgroups, including low-income students, students of color, students with disabilities, and English learners miss State-established goals on multiple measures for 2 consecutive years. This amendment says that we cannot ignore those children whom we are failing to serve, and that we can't turn our back on these kids.

We salute this flag and say ''liberty and justice for all.'' Well, every issue that I hear discussed in this august body cannot be dealt with unless we deal with all children. The achievement gap in America will not be addressed unless we focus on all children. The poverty gap in America will not be addressed unless we focus on all children. The opportunity gap in America will not be addressed unless we deal with all children. Issues that I am passionate about such as mass incarceration will not be addressed unless we focus on all children. And the competitive economy—the productivity of our Nation—will not reach its full strength unless we focus on all children.

So I am distressed today that this body will put into place a piece of educational legislation that ignores the very children to whom this original legislation was dedicated to serving years ago. We cannot be a great nation if we have parts of our country—be they neighborhoods or schools—that fail to experience what should be the bedrock of our country: equal opportunity, a great education, and the opportunity to succeed through one's grit, sweat, and hard work. We don't have that now.

If we in this body create legislation that pours millions of dollars into the States and then say that if States choose to ignore these kids, if States choose to turn their backs on the children who need them most, if States don't even want to put forward an idea of how to address this persistent problem, and we are OK, then to me we belie the oath we took, the pledge we gave to bring justice to all children.

We speak of accountability in this country. Well, we should be accountable to the government dollars that we spend for America. We should be accountable for the ideals of this Nation.

So I hope I can get my colleagues to support this bill that Senator MURPHY and Senator BENNET are leading so well. I hope we can stand up in a chorus of conviction in this body, saying that every single child—no matter what station in life, no matter how poor your parents are, no matter what your background, color, creed or religion—can have hope and opportunity in our public schools.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I thank Senator BOOKER.

I see the Senator from Pennsylvania is here. The Senator from Connecticut is here, and I want to thank him for his leadership and how he has stuck with it week after week after week.

I want to say to my friend from New Jersey, through the Chair, how much I appreciate his words and his aspirations for our country, because we are falling down on the job.

We have issue after issue after issue that comes here to the Senate floor—sometimes resolved, sometimes not. Education almost never is in front of us.

I sometimes hear people say this, and it rattles me when I hear them say it. Sometimes people say: MICHAEL, don't you know that not everybody is going to go to college? Don't you know that not everybody is going to go to college?

That is OK with me as long as it is their decision that they are making and that they are an educated 12th grader but they are deciding not going to go to college. That is the decision they are making.

But the reality is that it is not that we are sort of, kind of getting it right when it comes to kids in this country. Let's do the math. If you are born poor in the United States, because of the way our K–12 system works in access to higher education, you stand a 9-in-100 chance of getting a college degree—not an 80 percent chance, not a 75 percent chance, but 9 in 100.

If we were poor kids in this place instead of Senators, it would be those desks in the front row, the desks in the row behind them, and three desks in the next row. The entire rest of this Senate would be a sea of people without a college degree. That is the condition for poor kids living in the United States of America. That is the circumstance they face. We have to start believing there are kids—they are not someone else's kids. We learned for the first time a month ago—this is not a measure of poverty in the same sense that I was just using the word, but for the first time in this country's history, over half our public school children are poor enough that they qualify for free and reduced lunch.

We did not change the standard for free and reduced lunch. That is the effect of 20 years of an economy that is not driving middle-class wages up and the worst recession since the Great Depression. So at every level from the schoolhouse door to the floor of the Senate, this ought to be our No. 1 priority. Because as the Senator from New Jersey said, all the other stuff that we want to fix—he mentioned what we need to do with sentencing reform.

Eighty-five percent of the people in our prisons are high school dropouts. That tells you something about what you might do to cure that problem. This ought to be our No. 1 issue. It ought to be our No. 1 here, and it ought to be our No. 1 issue at home.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Before our leader on this amendment speaks, Senator MURPHY, I do want to echo what Senator BENNET said. He has been leading this charge in a bipartisan manner, pulling people together trying to get this across. I just want to echo that last point that Senator BENNET made. We as a nation have this ideal that America is the best country if you are poor to be born into; that you can make it here. This is the country—Statue of Liberty, give us your tired, your hungry, the wretched refuse of your teeming shores. This is the country you can make it in.

Well, unfortunately, in social mobility, which is a measurable index—the ability for somebody to make it out of poverty into the middle class—we have fallen. We have fallen on that list compared to our peers from other nations. If you just have the simple goal of making it out of poverty, America is no longer the No. 1 country to do that.

The principle reason for this is that the tried and true pathway to the middle class must be the schoolhouse door. That path must lead through educational systems. If our children don't have that access or if we leave some children behind, we shut those doors to quality education. Then it is an affront to the very ideal of the American dream, and we are failing the purpose, the greatness, the glory that is America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

AMENDMENT NO. 2247, AS MODIFIED

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak on an amendment that is offered by the senior Senator from North Carolina. It is an amendment that would change the formula for how title I funds are allocated among the States. So first by way of background, title I is the largest category of Federal financial assistance for K-through-12 education. So we are talking about a large pot of money. This is the biggest single source of Federal funding for primary and secondary education.

Under current law, the formula for how that money is allocated to the school districts is based on two things. It is based on the number of children who live in poverty in these respective districts, but it is also related to the average amount that the various States spend on education. So let me

be very clear. It is not a single, uniform amount per student. It was never meant to be. It still is not.

There is a reason for that. The reason is it is meant—this correlation to not only the number of kids in poverty but also the amount of money States spend on education is designed that way in order to reflect the fact that there are different costs of living in different States. Nobody would dispute that, I don't think. In some States, the real estate on which you build the school is more expensive. Some States have a higher general wage level, so teachers get paid more. States just have different expenses.

In addition, there is an incentive element. The incentive is, for States that are willing to commit more resources—that means taxing their residents more to fund education—then there is that little bit more that comes from the Federal Government. So this is a finite amount of money. What this amendment goes to is the question of how does this get allocated? The amendment originally offered by the senior Senator from North Carolina was very troubling to me because it would profoundly change the formula effective immediately. This is a zero-sum game. So some States would win a lot, other States would lose a lot. Pennsylvania stood to lose a lot of funding under the formulation that was originally constructed for this amendment—the gist of it being to convert the funding to an almost uniform amount per student.

I can assure you, I was hearing loudly and clearly from the folks who run especially the large school districts in Pennsylvania about how concerned they were because it was a multi-million-dollar-per-year hit that they were going to take. I spoke with Dr. Hite, who is the superintendent of Philadelphia schools, and Dr. Lane from Pittsburgh school district, as they would have been hit the hardest in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

In total, had the original amendment become law, it would have cost Pennsylvania over $120 million per year. Every one of Pennsylvania's 500 school districts, except one, would have lost money. So 499 school districts would have had to do with less and one would have had a little more. Many of them would have lost huge amounts of their funding.

I first want to say I appreciate the fact that the Senator from North Carolina and other Senators worked with my office and other offices across the aisle to take a different approach. So the original amendment is no longer under consideration. My understanding is the unanimous consent agreement which was struck earlier abandons that approach, but it does still have an element of that direction that does concern me.

I want to touch on that. So here is my understanding: Under the form that the amendment now takes, and which we will be voting on maybe later today, the current levels of funding will continue under the current formula. In fact, that funding level, as it naturally tends to grow each year because the Federal Government increases funding in this—for a while, that growth will also occur according to the current formulation. But at some point in the not-too-distant future, the total spending on title I funding will reach about $17 billion—now it is about 14.5. When it gets to $17 billion, from that point forward, prospectively, the increments each year will then be allocated according to the new formula, which is, by the design, the same design as the original amendment, which is nearly uniform spending per child, disregarding, in my view, the important consideration of the different costs of living in the various States.

So this is a huge improvement, from my point of view, over what we were looking at before. Pennsylvania will not have a dime cut from its spending. The formula does not change next year or the year after. I am not sure exactly when we will reach that $17 billion figure. But at some point, if this amendment passes, this reformulated amendment from the senior Senator from North Carolina, if it does pass, then at some point we start to move incremental funding into this sort of uniform formulation, rather than the current formulation where we take into account the varying costs of education. So while this is a huge improvement over the original version of this amendment, it is still something that I think is very problematic and so I will be voting no on this.

I would just summarize by saying that I think the amendment is mistaken in two respects: One, it fundamentally fails to recognize the varying costs of living in varying States. That is a very big difference. Secondly, it penalizes those States that are willing to ask their citizens to invest more in education by eliminating the current mechanism. So I would urge my colleagues to vote no on that amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I thank my great friends Senator BOOKER and Senator BENNET for their passionate and moving remarks about the task ahead of us, to make sure that as we reauthorize No Child Left Behind, as we reorder our priorities, that we remember that this law is an education reform law, but it has to be a civil rights law as well. It has to make sure that in the best traditions of this country, we are requiring that every single child gets a quality education.

I want to talk about my amendment that is cosponsored by Senators BOOKER and WARREN, COONS, DURBIN, MIKULSKI, and others. I want to start by telling a story that is, unfortunately, not unfamiliar in probably every corner of this country. I am going to talk about a 16-year-old African-American boy, an eighth grader in an urban middle school in Connecticut. I will call him James for today's purposes.

James had a habit of walking out of class in the middle of instruction. He walked out of class and he would wander the hallways until he would eventually run into a teacher, an administrator, a school resource officer, who would haul him down to the principal's office. His grandmother, who was his primary care giver, would get a phone call. She would come pick him up and then the suspension proceedings would start.

James would get suspended for a few days. He would come back, and the whole cycle would play out again, such that by the middle of his first semester of his eighth grade year, he had been out of school—suspended—more days than he had been in school. One day he was so frustrated when an assistant principal stopped him, once again, as he was wandering the halls that he had an argument. He was a big kid for his age, but he was a total teddy bear. He never hurt anybody. But that day when he talked back to that assistant principal, they called the police and James got arrested. Now he has a criminal record. But the reason he was walking out of class day after day, week after week, was pretty simple: James was an eighth grader who could not read—he could not read. He could barely read. So he had this toxic mixture of frustration and embarrassment every day that he sat in class such that it had no relevance to him and he walked out.

The worst of it is that the school knew he could not read because he had an identified learning disability. It was not a mystery. Yet James got promoted year after year because it was easier to pass him along, easier to push him out, as the suspensions and eventual arrest were on their way to doing, rather than actually give James an education. Now, I only know this story because my wife, who was then a legal aid lawyer in Connecticut, represented James. His grandmother, who just wanted James to get a decent education, would call my wife in tears every time James was found in the hallway and suspended again and again.

My wife actually got the services James needed. But James' story is not unique. Most kids do not have legal aid lawyers fighting on their behalf. Most kids in James' situation have the deck stacked against them: disabled kids who are hard to teach, poor kids who are warehoused in failing schools, Black and Hispanic kids struggling to overcome generations of discrimination.

They do not all have lawyers. They have us in the Congress. This place, Washington, DC, has had its finest moments when it stands up for educational civil rights: the idea that a child in this country should get a quality education no matter their race or their address or their disability. Whether we like it or not, there are these political pressures in America that cause minority kids and disabled kids and poor kids to get an education

that is not equal to that of their White or nondisabled or more affluent peers.

The facts are just very stubborn. I can't say them any better than Senator BENNET did earlier today. Today, half of African-American and Latino fourth grade students score below the basic level of reading that we expect of our students. Just one out of every seven African-American eighth grade students scores at a basic proficiency level in math. Nationally, 70 percent of students who attend high school with low graduation rates come from low-income families. These statistics, they represent a stain on the conscience of our Nation.

If this body wants to stay true to its history of standing up for educational civil rights, then we have to make a stand this week to make sure this Every Child Achieves Act ensures that minority and poor and disabled kids get a fair shot at a good education.

Now, right now this bill does not meet this test. That is why the Nation's leading civil rights organizations, from the NAACP to La Raza, to the Urban League oppose this bill in its current form. It is why they have joined together with business groups who want to make sure our educational system stays competitive for everyone, to propose a fairly simple solution to a problem that is also fairly simple.

So this bill requires that schools continue to assess student performance while getting rid of those annual high-stakes tests that were unquestionably bad for schools and for students. No Child Left Behind was a bad bill for my State and for the Nation. So I am glad Senators MURRAY and ALEXANDER have come together to create something better for our kids.

The bill requires that States track results by what we call subgroups: minority students, disabled students, poor students, and non-English-speaking students. But the problem is that when the schools are failing or when minority or disabled students are falling way behind their peers, the bill doesn't require or even ask States or school districts to do anything to fix it—nothing. As a civil rights matter, that is unacceptable.

No Child Left Behind said a lot on this issue, and most of it wasn't helpful or productive. NCLB made the measurement of schools and subgroups a test and only a test. NCLB prescribed in a detailed way what schools had to do to turn around student outcomes, and NCLB punished schools that didn't turn around those outcomes quickly enough.

We have learned a lot from that backwards approach, from this ''Washington knows best'' attitude. That is why the amendment we are offering today takes a very different approach to accountability for vulnerable kids. Under our amendment, States are required to identify the bottom 5 percent of performing schools according to their measurement of performance; they have to identify the dropout factories—the high schools where fewer than two-thirds of the students are graduating; and then they have to identify, again according to their own measurement, schools where subgroups of students—low-income students, students of color, students with disabilities, English learners—aren't meeting their own set of criteria.

This amendment ensures that schools are identified based on a measurement that is set by the State, not by Washington, and it has to include multiple measures, not just test scores alone. Let me say that again. The measurement is determined by the State, and it cannot be based on test scores alone.

Then the amendment says that once you have identified those schools or those student groups who are in need of improvement according to your own measurements, then the State needs to come up with a plan to improve outcomes. Period. Stop. Identify your achievement gaps according to your own comprehensive measurements and come up with a plan to fix the gaps. There is no federally dictated measurement, no federally set intervention, no Federal penalty if you don't succeed. Just identify your problems and come up with a plan to make the problems better. The accountability will then happen naturally, as students and parents and community members have input into that plan and the ability to watch to see if it is working—local solutions, local oversight, local accountability.

In 2006, as a candidate for Congress, I excoriated No Child Left Behind wherever I went. I come from a family of teachers, and I married a former teacher. Now I have two kids, one in the public school system and one on his way there. And I watched firsthand as NCLB failed teachers, parents, and students.

But about a month or so after I was sworn in to the House of Representatives in 2007, I received a visit from the Children's Defense Fund. They had heard how vocal I was in my criticism of the law, and they just wanted me to know that not every State was like Connecticut. They told me stories of places where prior to NCLB kids with disabilities were sent for half a day of ''vocational training'' with the janitor. Nothing was expected of those kids, and more often than not those kids lived up to the low expectations that were set for them.

So maybe the only redeeming quality of No Child Left Behind was that it did expose these inexcusable gaps in performance between disabled and nondisabled kids. It forced States to talk about why Black students year after year were 30 percent behind their White peer students in achievement tests. It caused embarrassment for school systems with schools where the majority of kids got so little out of school that they dropped out before graduation. And it put pressure on all of us to do better.

This is an education bill, but it is not a worthwhile bill unless it is also a civil rights bill. Every single child, no matter their race or their geography, their income or their disability, deserves a first-rate education.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this vital amendment that continues our march away from the stringent, inflexible requirements of No Child Left Behind, while ensuring that all of our students receive the support they need to be successful.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT). The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about a couple aspects of the legislation. I will do it in summary form. I will submit a longer statement for the RECORD.

First, I wish to say how much I appreciate the work that has been done not only this week but over many weeks and months that led up to today. We were working a number of months ago on the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee to get a bill out of the committee. After it was completed, of course it looked easy, but I know how hard Senator ALEXANDER, the chairman of the committee, and Senator MURRAY, the ranking member, worked to reach this point. The vote that day was 22 to 0, and now we are considering the bill on the floor. So that is significant and noteworthy, especially in these times in the Senate.

I just wanted to talk about a couple of aspects of this legislation.

For far too long, States have had to deal with the uncertainty of Federal waivers. One aspect of the legislation we are focused on is that we need one law that provides States and districts with more flexibility.

We hear all across the country—I certainly heard it in Pennsylvania—that among the concerns people had was a lack of flexibility, sometimes a one-size-fits-all regimen that came from Washington. So that flexibility is important. We also want to make sure we are recapturing the original intent of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—to protect our most vulnerable students.

The bill acknowledges the anxiety students, parents, and teachers often feel about testing, but it also realizes and contemplates that we must at the same time have a way to determine what students are learning each year. So I am pleased to see that the legislation strikes the balance by maintaining annual testing while taking significant steps to reduce the high-stakes nature of the testing.

So while there is more work to be done to ensure that all our children have access to high-quality early childhood education, I am encouraged that the bill builds on decades of research on early learning by requiring that States align their early learning guidelines with their kindergarten through 12th grade standards. So this change will help educators from Head Start, childcare, and other early childhood

education programs in elementary schools work together so young children have a successful continuity of learning over time that sets a strong foundation throughout the kindergarten through 12th grade years and beyond. That is something I pushed for over many years in the so-called Continuum of Learning Act, and I am pleased it has been included in the bill.

Mr. President, I wish to move to two other topics. I know we may have limited time. The first is on the question of bullying, which we have begun to address in the debates we have had leading up to this legislation. We had a vote yesterday on Senator FRANKEN's Student Non-Discrimination Act. I supported that, and I commend him for his work, but even with that vote, we have a long way to go on this issue.

Bullying, of course, is not what my generation understood it to be. It is a much worse problem today. It is more severe, it is more damaging, and it is destroying lives all across the country.

More students than ever are not in school every day for one reason—bullying, because of the impact bullying has on their lives. If a child is gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender, they are often and disproportionately the victims of bullying. If a student has a disability, he or she is often the victim of bullying, and again it is disproportionate. So students are more likely to be bullied if they are disabled, if they have a disability, or if they are gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender. That is an abomination. That is an insult to our country. Unless we begin to do something about this, we will still see those numbers soaring.

Bullying, of course, is the ultimate betrayal. It is a betrayal by adults with regard to children, and it is a betrayal of everything we claim to stand for in America because we say to our children, ''If you go to school every day and study hard and go to class and do your homework and study hard for tests and quizzes, you will succeed,'' but, of course, often children are betrayed because in between there, they are bullied. When they go home, they are bullied. When dinner is over at night, they are bullied. All throughout the night they are bullied often because of technology and because of vicious students who go after one student and use social media or other tools to harass and bully that person. We have to do something about this. We have to do more than just debate it and talk about it. We need to do something.

I am hoping that some of the efforts I have undertaken in my legislation will be the subject of not just more debate but more action, progress, and results when we get through the conference committee because I think this overall legislation should reach the point of getting to conference.

I am going to conclude because I see our chairman, who wants some time before we start.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I am fine.

Mr. CASEY. Thank you.

I wish to give one example of a particular individual—a real-life example of what bullying means, and I will have some comments as well about prekindergarten education.

This is a real-life story. Brandon Bitner, 14 years old, of Mount Pleasant Mills, PA, walked 13 miles from his home on an early Friday morning in November of 2010 to a busy intersection and threw himself in front of an oncoming tractor trailer after leaving a suicide note at his home. That is what happened to a 14-year-old Pennsylvanian. I cannot even imagine the horror of that, what led to that action he took when he took his own life. It is, unfortunately, not an isolated example. There are too many of these today. There would be too many if there were one, but unfortunately there are many more than one.

So there seems to be little doubt in our minds and certainly in the minds of those who knew Brandon why he did what he did on that day in November of 2010. I am going to quote a friend, Takara Jo Folk. Here is what Takara said: ''It was because of bullying.'' That was written in a letter to the Daily Item, a newspaper in central Pennsylvania.

Quoting again from that letter:

> ''It was not about race or gender, but they bullied him for his sexual preferences and the way he dressed. Which,'' she said, ''they wrongly accused him of.''

Brandon's suicide note reportedly explained that he was constantly bullied at Midwest High School in Middleburg, where he was a freshman. Bullies at that school allegedly called Brandon names—names which I will not repeat on the floor of the Senate. He stated in the note that a humiliating event in school this past week was the ''straw that broke the camel's back.''

Brandon was an accomplished violinist, having been a member of the Susquehanna Youth Orchestra in 2009, the year before he took his own life.

That story, unfortunately and tragically, is emblematic of the problem. We read these stories all the time. They may not be every single day and in every single newspaper, but not more than a week can go by in the United States of America where you don't read something like that.

I have others I could read as well, but I think folks within the sound of my voice know this. We all know this. So what are we going to do about it? Well, we all have a role to play. Parents have to do a lot more. Parents haven't done enough. Public officials haven't done enough. Schools haven't done enough. You could go down the list. At a minimum—and that is why I introduced legislation that we want to get back to; we want to be able to reach consensus—at a minimum, we should say to school districts: Look, if you are getting Federal money and you don't have a policy in place that deals with bullying and harassment and you don't specifically define or list or enumerate what is unlawful conduct, what is prohibited, then there should be a consequence for that. You should have to prescribe what is wrong by way of a set of rules, a code of conduct. You should enforce it. And you should keep data. If we take those kinds of steps, at least we can say that in a school or a school district, there is a heightened consciousness about this problem and that it is everybody's problem. This isn't just the problem of the person being bullied and the person engaging in bullying; it is the problem of all of us, whether we are parents, taxpayers, public officials, or whatever. We all have an obligation.

So I hope we can get back to this, in addition to continuing the good work Senator FRANKEN and others have started, because this is a betrayal. It is a betrayal of our children. And we are all diminished by our allowing this problem to persist.

The only good news here—and it is significant—is that in a lot of places we have parents who are taking responsibility, teachers, school administrators, school board directors, and of course students themselves taking on the responsibility of making sure in their school there will be zero tolerance for bullying, the best that they can implement that kind of a policy. So we have students who are working with other students to resolve disputes, to help someone who might be a victim before something goes wrong and someone becomes a tragedy after being a victim of bullying. So we have a ways to go on this issue, and we have more to do.

AMENDMENT NO. 2242

Let me conclude with some thoughts about what we will likely be voting on tomorrow, which is prekindergarten education. It is a very rare vote on the floor of the Senate where the entire Senate will cast a vote on a very basic program—a program to make sure that if a State wants to join together in partnership with the Federal Government to build upon, expand, enlarge, or even start from scratch an early learning, prekindergarten program for 4-year-olds, this legislation will give them that opportunity. This is paid for. We have an offset for the cost of it.

This is the right thing to do for 3 million American children, meaning that if this prekindergarten education program were enacted and if every State took advantage and implemented this program, 3 million children in the country would have prekindergarten education, 93,930 in Pennsylvania alone. The State of Texas, for example, upon passage of this kind of a program into law, will have the opportunity to have 300,000 children get the benefit of early learning.

Let me say finally that this is not just any program; we want high-quality early learning. All the experts know, have known for years, and have told us for years what works. If there is a high-quality program, a child will learn more now and he or she will earn

more later. It is not just a rhyme, it is the truth. We have 50 years of data making that direct linkage between learning and earning, and all we need to do is give States the opportunity to work with us to develop a nationwide strategy so that the United States can say we are preparing not just our children for that bright future we hope they have but that we are preparing our workforce and our economy. When you make that linkage between learning and earning, you are literally not just improving the life of that child, but you are improving our economic prosperity as well. I think our economic destiny is tied to these kinds of strategies.

So we have a long way to go to get there, but tomorrow we should have a vote, and I am looking forward to that.

I also again commend Senators ALEXANDER and MURRAY for their work on the legislation overall.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. SANDERS. Of course.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, for Senators' information, I will be talking to Senator MURRAY in the next few minutes, and there is a good possibility we will have votes beginning at about 3 o'clock. But I will have more to report, hopefully, after the Senator from Vermont makes his remarks.

I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 2177

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, one of the amendments that will be offered is an amendment I have submitted regarding a major crisis in this country that we don't talk about enough, and that is the frighteningly high rate of youth unemployment in America.

I am delighted that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is on the floor for debate today, and I thank Senator ALEXANDER and Senator MURRAY for their hard and constructive work on this important piece of legislation. In my State of Vermont, we have held town meetings on No Child Left Behind, and the people of Vermont want to leave No Child Left Behind very far behind. They want to get rid of it. They feel it has not been productive for our kids, and I think that sentiment exists all over the country. If we go forward on this legislation, I think we will be taking a very important step forward for the children of America.

When we talk about the needs of our young people, it is not just a dysfunctional child care system we talk about and the need to make sure working families all over this country have good-quality, affordable childcare; it is not simply that college is increasingly unaffordable for millions of working-class families; it is not just that the United States, tragically and embarrassingly, has the highest rate by far of childhood poverty of any major industrialized country on Earth. We talk about the future. We talk about family values. But the truth is that we have significantly ignored the needs of our children, and that is not what a great nation does—not a nation that looks forward to the future.

This country has to come to grips with the reality that we have not just a high rate of youth unemployment but a tragically high rate of youth unemployment in this country. This is an issue we don't discuss. It is literally swept under the rug. We have to bring it out in the open, we have to discuss it, and we have to address this issue.

Last month, the Economic Policy Institute released a new study about the level of youth unemployment in this country. This study took a close look at census data on unemployment among young people between 17 and 20 who are jobless, those who are working part time when they need a full-time job, and those who have given up looking for work altogether. The results of this study should concern everybody in our country and every Member of the Congress.

By the way, I have mentioned these facts in the past. PolitiFact, which seems to check every statement I make, checked it out, and they said these facts are basically accurate.

Here is what the Economic Policy Institute found. From April of 2014 to March of 2015, the average real unemployment rate for young White high school graduates between the ages of 17 and 20 was 33.8 percent. High school graduates, high school dropouts, White, 17 to 20—33.8 percent. The jobless figures for Hispanic kids in the same age group was 36.1 percent. And incredibly, the average real unemployment rate for African-American high school graduates was 51.3 percent. High school graduates or dropouts between the ages of 17 and 20, African American, over 50 percent unemployed or underemployed.

Today in America, over 5.5 million young people have either dropped out of high school or have graduated high school and do not have jobs. It is no great secret—not to any parent, not to any Member of the Senate—that when kids are not in school, when kids have no jobs, that is when kids get into trouble, when they get into drugs, when they get into self-destructive activity.

The result of kids not being in school and kids not having jobs is that tragically, today, we in this country have more people in jail than any other country on Earth, including China—a Communist authoritarian country with a population four times our size. We have more people in jail than China does. Incredibly, over 3 percent of our country's population is under some form of correctional control.

According to the NAACP, from 1980 to 2012, the number of people incarcerated in America quadrupled—quadrupled—from roughly 500,000 to 2.2 million people.

A January 2014 study published in the journal Crime & Delinquency found that almost half of Black males in the United States are arrested by the age of 23. That is an unbelievable statistic and a tragic statistic. If this current trend continues, one in four Black males born today can expect to spend time in prison during his lifetime. What a tragedy this is. We cannot ignore it. We have to deal with this reality.

But this crisis is not just a destruction of human life and of potential, it is also very costly to the taxpayers of our country. In America, we now spend nearly $200 billion on public safety, including $70 billion on correctional facilities each and every year.

It is beyond comprehension that we as a nation have not focused attention on the fact that millions of young people are unable to find work and begin their careers in a productive economy. That is what young people want to do. They want to get out, they want to get a job, they want to earn some money, they want to become independent from their parents, and they want to begin a career ladder, but for millions of these young people, that is not taking place today.

Let me be as clear as I can be. It makes a lot more sense for us to invest in jobs and education rather than in more and more incarceration and more and more jails. The time is long overdue for us to start investing in our young people, to help them get the jobs they need, to help them get the education they need.

This is not only saving human life; it is saving dollars. It is a very expensive proposition to put people into jail. Many people who go to jail come out of jail and go back to jail. They don't get jobs, and they don't pay taxes. Their lives are destroyed. Their families' lives are destroyed. It is high time we understood that. We have to invest in jobs, and we have to invest in education—not more jails, not more incarceration.

I have offered an amendment that will be voted upon, either today or tomorrow, that is pretty simple and pretty straight forward. It says to us that now is the time to keep kids out of jail, to get them jobs, and to get them an education. This amendment would simply provide $5.5 billion in immediate funding to States and cities throughout the country to create 1 million jobs for young Americans between the ages of 16 and 24. This amendment would also provide job opportunities for hundreds of thousands of young adults.

Frankly, this amendment doesn't go far enough, but it is an important start in trying to save the lives of countless numbers of young people who, if we do not address their needs, are going to end up in jail or with destroyed lives.

Specifically, under this amendment the U.S. Department of Labor would provide $4 billion in grants to States and local governments to provide summer and year-round employment opportunities for economically disadvantaged youth, with direct links to academic and occupational learning. This

amendment would also make sure that young Americans have access to transportation and childcare services they may need in order to participate in job opportunities all over this country. This amendment would also provide $1.5 billion in competitive grants to local areas to provide work-based job training to low- and moderate-income youth and disadvantaged young adults.

I hope very much we can have bipartisan support for this amendment, because what we are talking about is not just saving countless numbers of lives and not just saving taxpayers a substantial sum of money. It is much more cost effective to invest in kids so they have productive lives rather than seeing them go into jail and into jail and into jail and see their families being destroyed. It is high time we addressed this issue. This amendment is an important first step. I look forward to seeing bipartisan support for it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, yesterday President Obama announced a deal with Iran, one that will send billions of dollars to a regime with a long history of violently opposing the United States and its allies.

I come to the floor to express again my deep skepticism about how the Obama administration has approached these talks and my great concerns about what has been revealed about the deal so far—recognizing that we should all, perhaps, reserve our judgment for the process that will unfold over the next couple of months, by which we will actually be able to read the text of the deal and then to show to the American people what it contains and express our concerns publicly and debate those. That is going to unfold over the next couple of months.

But I think we can all agree that bringing Iran to the negotiating table and securing an agreement that prohibits 100 percent of their ability to gain the capacity to create a nuclear weapon would be a tremendous legacy for any President to accomplish.

Preventing Iran from becoming a nuclear power would have been a legacy item for President Obama or any President. But these negotiations have been particularly concerning because, in spite of the fact that the Iranian regime has given us no reason to trust it, the President has been operating under the assumption that any deal is better than no deal.

I am afraid the President has demonstrated the old adage that if you want a deal bad enough, that is exactly what you are going to get—a bad deal.

In so doing, the President has abandoned longstanding U.S. policy. Our policy has always been to prevent Iran from getting nuclear weapons. Instead, the administration has said: Well, it is OK. We will allow you a plan forward, and—in the words of Prime Minister Netanyahu—pave the way toward your acquisition of nuclear weapons.

This is an outcome that is irresponsible, unacceptable, and exceedingly dangerous.

I found it interesting that during his announcement the President said U.S. engagement in Iran was built upon ''mutual interests and mutual respect.'' The theocratic Iranian regime is a government that just last week encouraged its citizens to shout slogans often heard on the streets of Tehran. ''Death to America,'' they say. ''Death to Israel.'' I don't see how the President can consider such actions a sign of ''mutual respect.'' It is just the opposite.

But I should be fair to the President. He is of course not the only person who supports this deal. We hear that Russia's President Vladimir Putin has endorsed it. So has Syria's President Bashar al-Assad, who called the agreement a ''major turning point.'' Our enemies think this is a great deal, and they strongly support it.

But I hope the administration is aware that the optimism they have surrounding Iran and this deal is not universal. Our staunchest ally in the Middle East, the nation of Israel, has stated its clear opposition yesterday.

President Netanyahu, as he did in a joint session of Congress just a few short months ago, said in crystal clear language that this agreement represents a ''historic mistake'' for the world. That is likely because the Iranian regime has regularly—even throughout the ongoing negotiations—called for the destruction of Israel.

So while our enemies such as Bashar al-Assad of Syria called the deal a major turning point, our greatest ally called it a ''historic mistake.'' That should give all of us pause. What other warning signs do we need? Can a deal that is wholeheartedly endorsed by our adversaries and simultaneously disdained by one of our closest allies possibly be in the best interest of the United States of America? I am interested in hearing the answer to that question during the course of our review and debates because that is the question we will have the chance to answer for ourselves at the end of this next 60-day period of time.

Although I have seen several headlines talking about Republican opposition to the agreement, I would like to point out that there are a number of Democratic colleagues who have been quick to voice their concerns as well. This should not, and I pray will not, become a partisan disagreement. What we ought to be doing, in the best interest of the United States of America and our national security and those of our allies, is getting to the bottom of this agreement, raising concerns, and asking questions. Perhaps the President would like for this to become a partisan debate because then he wins, and in so doing America and our allies lose.

Yesterday, the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee said that ''there is no trust when it comes to Iran.'' That statement was made by the distinguished Senator from Maryland, Mr. CARDIN. Similarly, another Democratic colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey and former chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, said that ''the deal doesn't end Iran's nuclear program,'' but instead it ''preserves it.''

This deal cements many of the longstanding concerns that I and many of my colleagues have had. Instead of ridding the world of an Iranian nuclear weapon once and for all, this simply kicks the deal down the road—when, by the way, President Obama will no longer be in office—but it completely preserves the nuclear infrastructure required to create a nuclear weapon in as little as 1 year. We can't afford to sit back, cross our fingers, and wait for the regime to resurrect its nuclear program after their main obligations under the deal have expired.

Let me just be clear. The American people are not so desperate to cut this deal with the Iranian regime, and I think they will be even less supportive than they have been so far once the details of this deal gets vetted.

I wholeheartedly reject the suggestion the President has made on numerous occasions that there are two alternatives: There is this deal or there is war. That is ridiculous. That is a false choice. What it should be is a choice between this deal and something better—something that actually denies Iran nuclear weapons and doesn't unleash billions of dollars for them to fight their proxy war against the United States and our allies.

Again, the No. 1 state sponsor of international terrorism is Iran, and we are going to unleash the sanctions on the oil that they will now be able to sell in global markets and reap windfall profits perhaps, along with released funds that have been sequestered in American banks and other institutions, so they can now prop up their economy and again pay for the war they are fighting against Israel and the United States and other allies.

The bipartisan sanctions regime that Congress has put in place over decades should not and cannot be undone through an Executive agreement between President Obama and the head of the world's leader in state-sponsored terrorism. As elected representatives of the American people, we, all of us, in addition to the President, are committed to securing a good deal for the people who sent us here, and that means making sure Iran will never have the ability to build a nuclear

weapon, protecting our interests and our allies against a threatening regional power and, first and foremost, ensuring that the American people are safer tomorrow than they were yesterday.

Now that the White House has submitted the first 109 pages of this deal to Congress, we are in the process of reviewing it, but there is more to come—classified annexes and all. I look forward to reading this agreement word-for-word, understanding it better, and asking many of the similar-type questions which I posed here today, which need good and solid and reliability answers. We can't base this on a policy of hope or even trust in the rogue regime in Tehran. We need answers to these questions and, even more importantly, so do the American people.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2241

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, our Nation has always held the ideal of providing education for all, but a half century ago we put that ideal into action with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act or ESEA. That law aimed to close education gaps between rich and poor, Black and White, kids from rural areas, and kids from big cities.

Today, we are debating an amendment to strengthen accountability in our bill to reauthorize ESEA to do even more by making sure schools are delivering on the promise of quality and equality to every student in America.

Across the country, too many schools today have failed too many of our children for too long, and that has to change. Now our bipartisan bill removes the unrealistic goals and one-size-fits-all mandates of No Child Left Behind. But we can still have strong accountability without going back to those requirements.

Senator MURPHY's amendment, which we will be voting on shortly, will shine a light on the persistent inequality and achievement gap that still exists and do something about it, and it would ensure that we make sure children from low-income backgrounds, the kids of color, the students who are still learning English, and students with disabilities have access to a high-quality education.

Under his amendment, States would identify the bottom 5 percent of schools, States would identify the high schools that are failing to graduate one-third or more of their students, and States would identify schools that have failed to help subgroups of students make progress.

Now, of course, accountability is about more than just identifying the schools and districts that need help. We have to make sure those schools get the resources they need. The Every Child Achieves Act allows districts to design interventions tailored to the individual needs of low-performing schools. This amendment doesn't change that, but this amendment would give parents, teachers, and communities important measures to hold schools accountable for delivering a quality education to every child.

I will also note that in our bipartisan bill, we have done a lot to help the adults in this school get the support they need from professional development to easing the burden on school administrators. I was very proud to work on all of those provisions. But this amendment isn't about the adults. It is about the children in our schools. So I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the Murphy amendment so we can do even more to make sure all of our students learn, no matter where they live or how they learn or how much money their parents make.

Let's fix No Child Left Behind. Let's continue to improve this bill by strengthening accountability, and let's reaffirm our Nation's commitment to providing a quality education to every student in America.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the Every Child Achieves Act, S. 1177, which replaces the education law better known as No Child Left Behind. I wish to thank the HELP Committee Chairman ALEXANDER and ranking member PATTY MURRAY for their hard work on today's bipartisan compromise bill.

Today's Every Child Achieves Act isn't perfect, but it makes good progress. For years, I have heard from Hawaii's teachers, parents, and administrators that No Child Left Behind, or NCLB, is broken. It is time to leave NCLB behind.

I have been working to fix this broken law, first as a member of the House of Representatives' Education and Labor Committee in 2007 and now as a Senator. I also began to work on education reform when I was Lieutenant Governor of the State of Hawaii.

I will start with one of the biggest problems with NCLB, which is the testing requirements. I heard from teachers in Hawaii loud and clear that NCLB brought us too much testing. Teachers and students in some schools spent so much time on testing and test prep that they didn't have enough time for teaching and learning.

Today's bill includes Senator BALDWIN's SMART Act legislation, which I cosponsored, to cut redundant State and local tests, and it also includes Senator BENNET's amendment that sets a cap on the percent of time spent on testing.

I also strongly support the early education parts of this program as negotiated by Senator MURRAY, herself a former preschool teacher. I urge my colleagues to expand on this work by also supporting the Strong Start for America's Children amendment led by Senators CASEY, MURRAY, myself, and others.

The Strong Start amendment would invest significant resources in high-quality preschool grant programs, which would serve some 16,000 Hawaii children in my State alone. It would expand early Head Start childcare partnerships, such as Hawaii's Parents And Children Together and Kama'aina Kids, and would strengthen the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program, supporting programs like the Hawaii Home Visiting Network.

Quality early education helps kids enter kindergarten ready to learn, a recipe for success in school and in life. Studies show that by age 3, there is a 30-million word gap, basically a 2-to-1 gap, between low-income children and their wealthier peers with regard to their language skills. Quality early education can help close this gap early. Kids then are more likely to succeed in school, avoid crime or teen pregnancy, graduate from high school and college, earn more income, pay more taxes, and need fewer public services. Why?

First, they have the knowledge and skills necessary to succeed in a changing economy. Business and financial leaders in Hawaii—Hawaii's Business Roundtable executive director Gary Kai is a huge supporter of quality early education, and former Federal Reserve Chair Ben Bernanke also agrees that early childhood education is a key investment in U.S. competitiveness.

Second, military leaders have also stressed the importance of quality early education as a national security issue. The Department of Defense has estimated that 75 percent of Americans age 17 to 24 are ineligible for military service due to poor education, physical unfitness or criminal records. Hundreds of retired admirals and generals know that quality early learning can reverse this trend.

Third, early education investments make financial sense for taxpayers. A study by the University of Hawaii and Good Beginnings Alliance estimated a return of more than $4 for every $1 invested in early education. National studies are even higher. Some show a return as high as $17 for every $1 invested in quality early education. That depends, of course, on the quality of the program and particularly if we target the highest need students.

Finally, parents themselves are demanding quality, affordable preschool for their children. In April of this year, I visited Kauai Community College

whose Early Childhood Development Center reopened after a few years of renovations.

This center trains early childhood educators while providing high-quality early learning services to children of faculty, staff, and the community. Their lead teacher and coordinator, Gina Medrano, said, ''So far, no one has cried since we opened. They only cry when it is time to go home.'' That is evidence of how important early education is to our kids themselves.

Currently, the KCC Center can only serve 20 children. There are wait-lists for this program and for quality early learning programs in Kauai, all across Hawaii, and nationwide. We can and should do much better.

The Strong Start for America's children amendment would help make early learning the national priority it deserves to be. The amendment would provide quality preschool to over 3 million children nationwide. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this amendment when it comes to the floor.

So many of us recognize that education is a continuum which starts early and continues throughout life; therefore, coordination of effort is important. So I am pleased that this bill before us includes provisions to foster coordination between existing early childhood programs and their local elementary school. In 2011, Senator CASEY and I introduced the Continuum of Learning Act, and today's bill on the floor includes many pieces from that legislation.

On balance, the Every Child Achieves Act before us means good progress for our keiki—our children—and I hope we can continue moving forward and pass the bill before us in a bipartisan way.

Our country is at its best when all students have access to high-quality education from birth to college and career. Improving our education system through evidence-based reforms will help every child achieve so that our next generation can compete and lead in the 21st-century global economy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator MURRAY from Washington and myself, I ask unanimous consent that at 3:15 p.m. today, the Senate vote on the following amendments in the order listed: Markey amendment No. 2176, 60-vote threshold; Heitkamp amendment No. 2171, 60-vote threshold; Kirk amendment No. 2161, 60-vote threshold; and Murphy amendment No. 2241, 60-vote threshold.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2144 WITHDRAWN

Mr. ALEXANDER. I further ask unanimous consent that the Wicker amendment No. 2144 be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, amendment No. 2144 is withdrawn.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2176

Mr. MARKEY. I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 2 minutes on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, my amendment is very simple. It would create a competitive grant program to support the development and improvement of educational materials and teacher training on climate change science and solutions.

The scientific evidence of climate change is longstanding and wide-ranging. The National Academy of Sciences and numerous science professional organizations all recognize the reality of climate change and the influence of human activities upon it. The children of our country deserve the best scientific education they can get on this topic. They are the future leaders of our country and the world. They must be equipped for this generational challenge.

This is without question one of the overarching issues of our 21st century. We must ensure that we provide the best science training available for this next generation—the green generation. They are going to have to confront this problem. They should have the best scientific evidence available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, we will have a vote on the Markey amendment. I would urge a ''no'' vote for the following reasons: If you love Washington getting involved in Common Core, you will love this amendment, because it gets the Federal Government involved in creating a curriculum for climate change in your local high schools and other schools.

Based upon what we know about the U.S. Department of Education, as soon as we authorize this, it will begin to write regulations defining what we mean by climate change, and we would have to change textbooks in 100,000 public schools every time we have a Presidential election. Just imagine what the curriculum on climate change would be if we shifted from President Obama to President Cruz and then back to President Sanders and then to President Trump. There would be a lot of wasted paper, writing and rewriting textbooks.

The Every Child Achieves Act prohibits officials of the Federal Government from getting involved with the instructional material in classrooms. If we want to have better climate science, the appeal should not be to a national school board that gets Washington involved in climate change. It should be to the local school board or the State school board. I say that as a Republican who believes that climate change is a problem and that human activity is a major contributor to that problem. But I do not want the Federal Government involved in local high school and elementary school curricula for climate science or anything else.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 238 Leg.]

YEAS—44

Ayotte	Franken	Murray
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reid
Booker	Kaine	Sanders
Boxer	King	Schatz
Brown	Kirk	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Stabenow
Carper	Markey	Udall
Casey	McCaskill	Warner
Coons	Menendez	Warren
Donnelly	Merkley	Whitehouse
Durbin	Mikulski	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	

NAYS—53

Alexander	Flake	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hatch	Roberts
Burr	Heitkamp	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Cassidy	Hoeven	Sasse
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Sessions
Collins	Johnson	Shelby
Corker	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lee	Tester
Cotton	Manchin	Thune
Crapo	McCain	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Toomey
Enzi	Moran	Vitter
Ernst	Murkowski	Wicker
Fischer	Paul	

NOT VOTING—3

Cruz	Graham	Nelson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 2171

Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to Heitkamp amendment No. 2171.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I rise to urge my colleagues to support my amendment. As you have been talking to your school districts and as you have been talking to the school personnel, if they don't mention the challenges they have dealing with children in their schools who need services beyond education services, who come unready to learn because of behavior and mental health problems, we have a program that has existed for a number of years. I understand it has been underutilized. But if there has ever been a time, as we talk about the behavior and mental health challenges that we have in our communities and in our schools, and if there has ever been a challenge for a grant program that develops best practices, it is today.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and integrate these behavior and mental health programs into the schools and into the education system so that we can better address the concerns, so that we can, in fact, begin to challenge our society to deal with these issues at the school level. Schools should not be in this alone. We need to integrate the behavioral health and mental health systems into our schools.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I urge a ''no'' vote. Of course, we should help and care about the mental health of children, but the Federal Government already funds at least 16 programs related to mental health.

A new program isn't needed, and the Department of Education is not the best suited agency to administer it. It ought to be in the Department of Health and Human Services.

It is unnecessary. The district may use funds already under the education bill and other health programs for this purpose.

One of the problems we have as a Congress is we have a good idea and we appropriate and create a new program without realizing there are already 16 other programs there. We should stop that and focus our efforts on existing programs and giving States more flexibility to use that money.

I urge a ''no'' vote.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, do I have any time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 239 Leg.]

YEAS—58

Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murray
Baldwin	Heinrich	Peters
Bennet	Heitkamp	Portman
Blumenthal	Heller	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Hoeven	Sanders
Brown	Kaine	Schatz
Cantwell	King	Schumer
Cardin	Kirk	Shaheen
Carper	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Sullivan
Cassidy	Manchin	Tester
Collins	Markey	Thune
Coons	McCaskill	Udall
Daines	Menendez	Warner
Donnelly	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Ernst	Moran	Wyden
Feinstein	Murkowski	
Franken	Murphy	

NAYS—39

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Flake	Risch
Blunt	Gardner	Roberts
Boozman	Grassley	Rounds
Burr	Hatch	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Coats	Isakson	Scott
Cochran	Johnson	Sessions
Corker	Lankford	Shelby
Cornyn	Lee	Tillis
Cotton	McCain	Toomey
Crapo	McConnell	Vitter
Enzi	Paul	Wicker

NOT VOTING—3

Cruz	Graham	Nelson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 2161

Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to Kirk amendment No. 2161.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I urge all my colleagues to vote yes on the Kirk-Reed-Baldwin-Brown amendment.

Essentially, in this legislation—and I commend the chairman and the ranking member for all the work they have done—they have established lofty goals, but without adequate resources, all of our students cannot succeed. This amendment encourages the States to develop and report on measures of access to critical education resources; identify disparities in districts' access to those resources; develop plans with school districts to address these disparities; and include the Opportunity Dashboard of Core Resources on the State report card.

Again, it is a very simple concept. Lofty goals without adequate resources will not give opportunities to American students. We hope this will help provide equitable access to critical resources.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I urge a ''no'' vote. This bipartisan bill on the floor is about reversing the trend toward a national school board. This amendment is about making the national school board bigger and more powerful. It would result in the Federal Government deciding for States which educational resources are critical. That would have the Federal Government deciding about licensing teachers, teachers' salaries, library books, wellness programs, school facilities, and it would produce new lawsuits.

We need to go in the other direction. We need to keep the measurements of how children are doing but restore to States and local school boards the responsibility for making these decisions.

I urge a ''no'' vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 2161.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) would have voted ''yea.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 240 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Baldwin	Heinrich	Peters
Bennet	Heitkamp	Portman
Booker	Heller	Reed
Boxer	Hirono	Reid
Brown	Kaine	Sanders
Cantwell	Kirk	Schatz
Cardin	Klobuchar	Schumer
Carper	Leahy	Shaheen
Casey	Markey	Stabenow
Coons	McCaskill	Udall
Donnelly	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Franken	Murkowski	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murphy	
Hatch	Murray	

NAYS—50

Alexander	Ernst	Perdue
Ayotte	Fischer	Risch
Barrasso	Flake	Roberts
Blunt	Gardner	Rounds
Boozman	Grassley	Rubio
Burr	Hoeven	Sasse
Capito	Inhofe	Scott
Cassidy	Isakson	Sessions
Coats	Johnson	Shelby
Cochran	King	Sullivan
Collins	Lankford	Tester
Corker	Lee	Thune
Cornyn	Manchin	Tillis
Cotton	McCain	Toomey
Crapo	McConnell	Vitter
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Paul	

NOT VOTING—4

Blumenthal	Graham	Nelson
Cruz		

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 2241

Under the previous order, there is 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on Murphy amendment No. 2241.

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, arguably the only good thing that the existing education law did was expose these unconscionable gaps in this country between the performance of minority kids and nonminority kids, between disabled kids and nondisabled kids.

Frankly, this body is at its best when it says that, no matter your race, geography, disability or income, you deserve access to a quality education. If we can't guarantee that, then the question is this: What good is a Federal education law in the first place?

So this amendment learns from the mistakes of No Child Left Behind, and it simply says two things. States have to identify when they have these unjustifiable yawning gaps between the performance of disabled kids or minority kids and the rest of the school, and then they have to come up with a plan through a community conversation as to how to fix that—period, stop. Identify your problem, your achievements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, let me quickly say that this vote will be the last vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. All this amendment says is that just simply on a State by State basis, identify your achievement gap and then come up with a plan to fix it—no Federal intervention, no Federal prescription of how you fix the problem.

It is a big, big problem in this country that has a very simple solution in this amendment, and it deserves our support.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Montana, Mr. TESTER, came on the floor and said he supported this bill because it got rid of adequate yearly progress. This is adequate yearly progress through the back door. Instead of fixing No Child Left Behind, it keeps the worst parts of it and restores those kinds of parts with new mandates.

If you don't believe me, here is a letter dated yesterday from the National Educational Association on behalf of its 3 million members:

After 13 years of witnessing firsthand the negative consequences [of] No Child Left Behind's one-size-fits-all approach to accountability . . . our members strongly oppose more of the same. . . . we believe the Murphy amendment would continue the narrow and punitive focus of NCLB.

Our members are deeply concerned the amendment would mark an entire school for intervention if a single subgroup misses goals for two consecutive years—precisely the approach that misidentified schools under the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) provision of [No Child Left Behind].

We are reversing the trend toward a national school board, not establishing more of a school board. Governors, teachers, school board members, and superintendents agree with that.

I urge a ''no'' vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 241 Leg.]

YEAS—43

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Portman
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cantwell	Leahy	Schumer
Cardin	Manchin	Stabenow
Carper	Markey	Udall
Casey	McCaskill	Warner
Coons	Menendez	Warren
Donnelly	Merkley	Whitehouse
Durbin	Mikulski	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	
Franken	Murray	

NAYS—54

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Ayotte	Flake	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Risch
Blunt	Grassley	Roberts
Boozman	Hatch	Rounds
Burr	Heller	Rubio
Capito	Hoeven	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott
Coats	Isakson	Sessions
Cochran	Johnson	Shaheen
Collins	King	Shelby
Corker	Kirk	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Tester
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Crapo	McCain	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Toomey
Enzi	Moran	Vitter
Ernst	Murkowski	Wicker

NOT VOTING—3

Cruz	Graham	Nelson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

The Senator from Ohio.

AMENDMENT NO. 2247, AS MODIFIED

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise to speak regarding the Burr amendment, which has been offered to the underlying education bill. This is an amendment that I understand has been modified recently, but it still has some of the flaws it has had all along; that is, it tells States that if they invest in their kids, they are penalized, which I think is the wrong message. I hope this amendment can be defeated on that basis alone.

It also happens to be bad for some States because, for instance, in my home State of Ohio, we would lose an estimated $70 million because we do invest in our children who are poor, who are vulnerable. Therefore, because of formula changes, we get less money in Ohio.

I hope States that are affected one way or another, though, will look at this from a policy perspective and understand that certainly in this Federal K–12 education bill, we ought not to be telling the States, such as my home State of Ohio, that because they invest more in their kids, somehow they are penalized.

I know the Burr amendment was changed to reach a different level before this formula change would occur. I think it is $17 billion; right now it is $14.4 billion. This means that this change will not occur for a few years, as I understand it, but the same problem remains.

We hope this authorization will last through that period and we will not be back revisiting this on the floor of the Senate. Therefore, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—and I know there is opposition on both sides of the aisle to this amendment—to stand tall and to say let's not tell the States that if they invest in kids who come from some of the lowest income school jurisdictions in our country, that somehow they are going to be penalized under a new formula.

This amendment is a mistake because it fails to take into account that the cost of education in different parts of the country differs, and again it penalizes States that invest more in education.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on the Burr amendment.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 3 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING DR. ELSON FLOYD

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, every once in a while you meet an individual who thinks bigger than themselves, rises above challenges with grace, is driven by a passion to better the world

around them and, most importantly, is a truly wonderful human being. I have come across many advocates and community leaders in my career, but Dr. Elson Floyd was exceptional. He was a giant in Washington State's higher education community. He inspired countless students and teachers and many across the State as Washington State University's president. I can only imagine what else he would have accomplished had his life not been cut painfully short.

For 8 years, I have had the privilege to work with Dr. Floyd in his role as the beloved president of my alma mater, Washington State University. He was one of our Nation's most successful advocates for affordable and accessible higher education. I always admired his dedication to his students, his passion for education, and his desire to make a great university even better.

The last time I spoke with Dr. Floyd a few months ago, he spoke of the bright future of Washington State University and the innovative steps the institution was taking to provide high-quality education to its students.

As we look back now on the life and legacy of Dr. Elson Floyd, we will remember how he led WSU through a trying economic recession by tirelessly advocating for investments in higher education as a path to the middle class and how he doubled the enrollment of students of color. We will remember how he skillfully convinced our State legislature to allow the university to begin building the State's second medical school at Washington State University-Spokane. And, most importantly, we will remember how, through a warm handshake to visiting alumni or a comforting hug to a student, he always had a way of making those around him feel welcome.

I hope to honor Dr. Floyd's memory by striving every day to better our higher education system with the enthusiasm and the warmth he emanated as a tireless advocate for Washington State students.

There is so much we can all learn from his work, and I know his legacy will continue to live on in Washington State and across the higher education community.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for such time as I shall consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, the junior Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. LANKFORD, be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DRIVE ACT

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, right now probably the most significant thing we will be facing as soon as we get through with the education bill that Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER has done such a great job on is the transportation reauthorization bill. I found out the House just passed a few minutes ago a 5-month extension to the highway reauthorization bill.

I would suggest to the people who may think there is some type of adversarial relationship between our bill in the Senate and the House bill that there isn't. We are working together and we both want to accomplish a long-term bill, and I anticipate that we will actually have passed in the next few days a long-term—maybe a 6-year—highway reauthorization bill, at which time we will go to conference with the House and it will be business as usual. I want to make sure, in case there is a fire looming out there, that we put it out early.

Passing the long-term transportation bill has been my top priority since I returned as chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee. Ironically, the ranking member of that committee, Senator BOXER of California, feels just as strongly that it is her top priority also. So I consider this to be the second most significant bill of the year, the first one being of course the Defense reauthorization, which we have already addressed here. But we felt strongly enough about this being a top priority that we had our first full committee hearing on the need to reauthorize what at that time was MAP–21. We had Anthony Foxx, the Secretary of Transportation, as well as a lot of government leaders so they could share the importance of an ongoing Federal and State partnership in building and maintaining a modern surface infrastructure system.

Since that hearing, my committee has put forward a bold bipartisan solution called the DRIVE Act that will put our Nation on the path to having a world-class transportation system. I have often said there is no such thing as a Republican or a Democratic road or bridge. This is something that is bipartisan. By the way, I have to say when the DRIVE Act passed through my committee, it passed unanimously—every Democrat and every Republican voted for the bill.

The Transcontinental Railroad, I am proud to say, the Republicans have historically been leading the way in transportation going all the way back to the Lincoln days. We passed the Transcontinental Railroad. The Panama Canal was done by Teddy Roosevelt.

Of course, the Interstate Highway System was done by Eisenhower. Eisenhower said the transportation system is a dynamic element in the very name we bear, United States. Without it, we would be a mere alliance of many separate parts. What he also said—let's remember that Eisenhower was a President. He was a star. He was concerned, and he started the first highway bill by addressing the problems of defense. The fact is that if you don't have a highway system within the United States, you can't adequately supply the necessary means to fight and win wars. So that was the very first motivation for it. In laying out the full interstate system, Eisenhower envisioned it to be the physical backbone of the economy, fueling the growth of our GDP, our cities, and the competitiveness of our exports.

Now, this vision and certainty maximized the economic and mobility benefits of the system. Businesses and individuals knew that if they could locate somewhere on a future interstate system, they would be connected not just with the Nation but with the world.

I am afraid this legacy system, which was built with a 50-year design life, is now more than 50 years old. So we are out of warranty now, and we need to address that. That is the sense of urgency that we have. We are in serious danger of eroding a half century of investments without proper maintenance, modernization, and reconstruction. We are on borrowed time with a system that is in full need of restoration.

Our national interstate system currently has a maintenance backlog of $185 billion. Now that national interstate system is actually 47,000 miles in length, and just to bring back the system to the original 1956 design, it would be that expensive.

Maintaining Eisenhower's vision of economic opportunity and strength in defense requires a continued partnership between the Federal Government and the States, which is the hallmark of the DRIVE Act. Yet due to 33 short-term passages since 2005, the highway construction now consists of maintenance patchwork.

This is what happened. We had a transportation reauthorization bill that was a 5-year bill. This was in 2005. I am very familiar with it. I was the author of the bill at that time. In 2005, we passed this long-term bill. Since that time, we have been unable to pass a long-term reauthorization bill. So we have been operating on extensions—short-term extensions.

It is interesting that we are now looking at something that has both a liberal and a conservative perspective. The conservative position is a long-term bill because the only alternative is short-term extensions. Short-term extensions—I don't think anyone has ever challenged this—costs about 30 percent more because you can't get big projects, which we are talking about in a minute. So we are now to the point where we are going to be able to do something with a long-term bill.

Passing a long-term bill is crucial in many aspects of day-to-day life in America. More than 250 million vehicles and 18 billion tons valued at $17 trillion in goods traverse across the country every year. Yet every day 2,000 miles of our highways slow below the posted speed limits because of the stop-and-go conditions of overcongestion.

The National Highway System—this is kind of interesting. Not many people

are aware of this. Our whole National Highway System is 5.5 percent of the total Nation's roads, but it carries 55 percent of all vehicles traveling and 97 percent of the truck-borne freight. So 5.5 percent of the Nation's roads account for the transportation of 97 percent of the freight crossing this country. This type of congestion has a huge negative impact on our businesses throughout America.

Congress just passed a 2-month extension, and we now have a responsibility to pass a long-term solution. As I mentioned, they did pass something over in the House that we are in agreement that will get them to conference with us, and I think most of them are going to be—from the ones I talked to over there—very excited about the fact that we are going to have funding for a 6-year bill.

The highway trust fund needs $15 billion a year to maintain current spending. What we are saying there is, if you take proceeds of the gas tax that is out there in order to do what we are currently doing, it takes an additional $15 billion each year just to do that, but we need to do more than just maintain the system. We need to improve it for the future of America's growing economy. Fortunately, my committee just passed this bill unanimously with what we call the DRIVE Act.

The DRIVE Act will put America back on the map as the best place to do business. The DRIVE Act has several key components to position America's transportation system to support our growing economy.

First of all, it prioritizes funding for core transportation formula programs to provide States and local governments with strong Federal partners. In other words, the States have needs. They articulate those needs to the Federal Government. The Federal Government goes in and makes sure that is going to be a reality. Let's keep in mind, there are some States—suggesting Wyoming as an example—it would take three times as much money actually to take care of the roads in Wyoming than could be produced by the sparse population of that State. So that is one of the major initial reasons for the program.

Secondly, it prioritizes the interstate system, the National Highway System, and the bridges at risk system. Well, as I said, the interstate system is 47,000 miles, but the National Highway System is 220,000 miles, which does encompass the 47,000 miles of the interstate system.

Thirdly, it creates a new multibillion-dollar-per-year freight program to help the States deliver projects that promote the safe, efficient, and reliable transportation of consumer goods and products across the United States.

The fourth thing is—and this is something a lot of people are not aware of—a lot of people think that we in Washington have this infinite wisdom that we know what is best for the States. We don't believe that. We believe the States should set their own priorities. In my State of Oklahoma, I don't even get involved in what projects are going to be there. We have a State system, where the State does evaluate, and certainly they know more about our needs in Oklahoma than the Federal Government does. Don't you agree? That is right. Well, that is where we are on that. We let the States determine what projects we are going to be doing.

The fifth thing is to provide greater efficiency in the project delivery process through reforms that put DOT in the driver's seat during the NEPA process by requiring other agents to bring in their issues. Here is what happens. We have a lot of good rules in the NEPA Program, in the environmental programs, but there are some things where we feel that should not slow down the construction of roads, highways, and bridges, both new bridges and repairs. To do that, we have to write that into the law, so that streamlines the system. If you have nothing but short-term extensions, that doesn't happen. They don't get streamlined.

Let me compliment my partner in this, the ranking member Senator BOXER from California. It is interesting. I am among one of the most conservative Members of the U.S. Senate. She is a very proud liberal. Yet we both agree on what our priorities should be, and that makes this process more important. She has been willing to do things she didn't really want to do because it does short-circuit some of the NEPA requirements, and as a general rule she would not want to do that. But this has been a give-and-take, and that is why we have a bill that passed our committee unanimously.

The sixth or seventh thing is eliminating duplicative reviews and expanding categorical exclusions. To give an example of that, we have bridge projects that are given special considerations with new exemptions from section 4(f), the historic property reviews. Now, to be a historic property, it has to be over 50 years old. For them to continue to be able to do it, it takes these exemptions from what other historic things have to go through because we are in the business of building bridges.

Secondly, we have the Migratory Bird Treaty Act on the books, and it allows us to go ahead and start working on projects even though swallows nests—I know it sounds kind of insignificant, but it is not, because swallows go in there, and while they are not protected or listed as an endangered species, they still are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and they have caused us to stop construction on many of the bridges around the country.

This is kind of a brief overview of the bill. As the DRIVE Act progresses on the floor, I intend to address the significance of each program in a lot more detail. Most importantly, the DRIVE Act sets up funding levels for the next 6 years. This is at the very best what the Federal Government should provide so States and local officials in the construction industry can gear up for large projects—the $500 million to $2 billion projects. These are things you can't do with extensions, but you can do with a bill such as the bill we have successfully passed.

We have thousands of projects around the Nation that are currently in jeopardy, and construction will come to a halt unless this legislation becomes a reality.

As shown in this picture I have in the Chamber, this is the Brent Spence Bridge. This goes from Kentucky to Ohio. Right now it is in dire need. One can see actually the problems with this antiquated bridge. There are chunks of it dropping off into the river below and it has become very dangerous.

We saw not long ago in another adjoining State what can happen if a bridge goes down. Here in DC we had the Memorial Bridge. It is literally crumbling. You can go right down and you can see the pieces of the bridge dropping into the Potomac River. It was built in 1932. It has only received patchwork ever since that time. It is estimated that nearly $250 million will be required to keep the bridge operational. That is not a new bridge. That is to make that into an operational bridge.

You recognize this. You drive by it, many of you, every day. But you don't see—you have to get down there and you can see concrete dropping into the Potomac. We have many more like this. What else do we have here? The Mobile River Bridge. This is in Alabama. This is what it will look like later. That is not a current picture. This is what it is right now.

These are the types of projects that we can do now which we could not do with just extensions, as we have been doing since 2009. I believe more than just a small part of the economic success enjoyed by the United States over the past 50 years has been the interstate system started by President Eisenhower. But today we literally sit in a situation where we would have to do something to carry this forward.

That is why Senator BOXER and I are bringing the DRIVE Act to the Senate floor. It will ensure that States have the tools and certainty to make the necessary new investments to rebuild Eisenhower's vision, fight growing congestion and maintain the mobility of goods and services across our country. So we are going to have this up. I think this will be on the floor, probably the next thing after we finish with the education bill.

Again, no one can argue that this is the second most significant bill that we address each year. We have not addressed this one in the right way since 2005. So it is very significant. We are looking forward it to. Anyway, we are going to be coming forth with this, I'm going to be coming to the floor and

talking about it in a lot more detail. We have got to get the roads and the bridges taken care of. We intend to do it. The product to do that is the DRIVE Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, in the 1960s the Johnson administration led Congress to start allotting a small amount of money—of Federal funding from the Federal taxpayers to target schools and reach out to the poorest of the poor in America and try to help beat back poverty. Five decades later, we have an education policy in America that reaches out to every single school district in America—millions of kids—that continues to fail them, to fail their parents, and that still has not solved the poverty issue.

What we have is an ever-increasing Federal bureaucracy that has reached well beyond what it was designed for in the 1960s and, I would assure you, reaches well beyond what it was originally designed for—something that would help the poorest of the poor or take care of kids on military bases and those on Indian tribal lands.

No Child Left Behind passed in 2001, authorizing education policy that was even more expansive. The goal was good—make sure that every child in America has the opportunity for success, that every teacher has teaching qualifications, and that every school has accountability. It was approved through 2008, and it still continues today.

Math, reading, and science are now measured in adequate yearly progress for each school, and it has become the slow-rolling disaster. The problem was the source and the goal. Parents, local districts, and States should set education policy—I would think that is something we should agree on—not a massive, centralized, controlled bureaucracy—the bureaucracy that is here, made up of a lot of nice folks who do care about kids; it is just that most of the folks who are here in this bureaucracy dealing with education have never been to Oklahoma, and the folks in Oklahoma don't know their names and don't know why they are managing their district.

The goal should be progress for each student, not each school, but the annual yearly progress demanded by No Child Left Behind really managed the progress of the school, not the child. I can assure you that the parents at home are not trying to figure out if the school is better; they are trying to figure out if their child is better in a particular subject.

Annual yearly progress and the Federal mandates have put my State in the untenable position of playing ''Mother, may I'' with the Federal Government and asking for a waiver every single year and having the national education board determine what our schools in Oklahoma can and cannot do. That has to change.

We want our students in Oklahoma to be college- and career-ready. We want accountability to the parents and the community. We want less burden on the educators who give their lives and their time to the task of helping parents and their children. We want that. As surprising as it may be to some in Washington, DC, we actually do care about our kids. We want the best for them. So we ask a simple thing. Allow Oklahomans to manage education for Oklahomans and just take this assumption: We do love our kids. We are going to work hard to make sure they are taken well care of.

My mom was an educator for decades. She started teaching elementary school and then went into a library and was an elementary school librarian and then a high school librarian and then moved into the black hole of education that is the administration building downtown, where she worked in a burnt-out position in school administration for a district for years. She is passionate about kids. She passed that on to me.

I started out my first year in college as a business major. I thoroughly enjoyed it for probably a week and then shifted the next year to secondary education—the thing that I fought against because my mom was in education, so surely I should not do the same thing, but I loved being with students. I spent 22 years of my life serving students after college. It is a passion in my family. There are multiple educators in my family, both at the college level and in the schools. We believe in education.

I will never forget the student teaching time that I had in college, interacting with those kids for the first time, stepping out of a college setting of being the student to now suddenly being the student teacher and having a classroom and understanding for the first time that it is my responsibility to help those parents educate their children; that I am not now the parent for this child—this child has a parent, and that parent has the responsibility to be able to raise their child well, but I have a responsibility to come alongside that parent and help. Allow us to have that.

This is what I want. I want greater flexibility for States. I want greater authority and responsibility to be placed on parents in education. The people in Oklahoma want the freedom to be able to make decisions about their own children, their own families. That is why I voted for the A PLUS Act. I tried to add that as an amendment to this bill. STEVE DAINES from Montana and I and multiple others supported the ability for States to have even more control if they choose to, to have both the responsibility and the authority for all areas of all parts of education. We did not win that amendment, but it was a blanket ''We want everything to go back to the States if they choose to have it.'' We will continue to have that fight in the days ahead.

LAMAR ALEXANDER brought out an amendment that would have been great to have. It allowed parents to choose their school regardless of whether it is public or private.

Education union leaders had kittens about that, saying: The public schools are getting better, and so we don't want to take funds away from those public schools; we want to keep all of the funds in the public schools.

The parents are saying: I understand that school is going to get better someday, but my child is there right now.

Certain leaders in schools will say: We cannot have Federal funds moved to follow the child.

I would say: Would you allow the parent to help that child have the one shot they are going to get to get an education and allow them to choose where they want to go?

That is why I am also a supporter of things such as the DC opportunity scholarships that will allow children in Washington, DC, to be able to choose the school they attend. The President has fought adamantly against that. So have the education unions. Quite frankly, the parents here in DC want to have the option to send their child anywhere they choose to send them.

I would like to see more reductions in duplication of education programs. There is real reduction in that in this particular bill, but I would like to see even more. We have education programs in the Departments of Defense and Ag and Health and Human Services and multiple other places scattered around the bureaucracy. We need to be able to shrink all of those different programs and to be able to make sure that we are not feeding the bureaucracy but that we are actually helping kids.

I would actually like to see more in this bill dealing with options for those who are homeless. This bill helps us get a better count and better insight on the educational quality and the graduation rate for homeless and foster children. But I would like to have greater flexibility built into this bill, which I did not get. I would like the parents and the people in the local district to be able to have better decision-making capability.

What did I get? There are some things we won in this bill. There are no common core mandates. I can assure you, in my State of Oklahoma, most every person in my State stands and cheers when they find out one thing: that there are no common core mandates in this. There are no Federal tests at all. States—my State in particular—will have absolute control over standardized testing and the results of those tests and how they apply the information gained from those tests. The leaders in my State will manage that, control that, and make sure that is accurate for us.

There are no Federal education standards. There is no Federal curriculum. There are reductions in some of the education programs. I am glad to

see that, although, as I have already mentioned, I would like to see more of that.

It breaks down some of the funding silos. Do you realize right now that if there is money available in one silo dealing with kitchens, for instance, and nutrition for school, they may allot Federal dollars and say, ''You can have those Federal dollars if you want to buy a new oven.'' But if a district says, ''We don't need more money for ovens; we need money for special education,'' the Federal Government currently says, ''No, you can't do that. You have to buy a new oven.'' That is dumb. Why don't we allow the districts to make that decision? This bill begins to break down some of those funding silos, and it gives them the opportunity to be able to make decisions on that.

What I would like to see and what I did get was more local control of education, dramatically increased local control, in fact, local authority and additional local responsibility. That is the way it should be. INHOFE and I even had a bill on local school board flexibility. We got good downpayment on that bill. There is more to go on that. We need to get a chance to see additional things, but those are things we were able to win.

Can I tell you the one big thing we really won? It is that my State, after this bill passes—if we can get this bill done, my State will no longer have to crawl back to Washington, DC, every year and beg for a waiver in education to maintain the education funding—which, by the way, came out of our State. Literally, the Federal taxpayers pay in with their tax dollars, and the State of Oklahoma has to come crawling to Washington, DC, saying: Can I please have those dollars back to our State? Right now, we have to do that every year.

My State actually lost Federal control because we chose not to do common core. The Department of Education said: If you don't do this, then you are going to lose your funding. For months we lost control of that funding, but that was our choice because we were setting our own standards. We have now won that waiver back. In fact, just a few weeks ago, that waiver was renewed again.

I am already sick to death of our State having to come beg for the Federal dollars that we put into the system and to get permission from someone in DC. This bill finally fixes that. Does it go as far as I want to go? No. I have been pretty clear about that. But it is the first step taking in our long journey towards taking us back in the direction where we need to be—our schools, our parents making decisions for our kids.

Again, I remind you, Oklahoma parents do love their kids, and Oklahoma legislators are doing a great job of trying to turn some things around in a very hard situation. Let's give them the ability to be able to do that. I encourage this body to pass this education bill, and let's get going again towards educating our students and doing the right thing.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 20 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, as folks around here know by now, I come to the floor once a week to say as clearly as I can that it is time to wake up to the mounting hazard of climate change. Today is the 106th consecutive time.

Why do I do it? Why do I care so much? Because I know the harm we are causing through carbon pollution spells trouble for my home State of Rhode Island. I see it already. We are the Ocean State.

Here is a recent headline from the Washington Post: ''Human impact on the oceans is growing—and climate change is the biggest culprit.''

But I don't have to read the Washington Post to know that. With the changes from carbon pollution, our Rhode Island fishermen see strange catches coming up in their nets. Our homeowners and business owners along the coast see rising sea levels, worsening erosion, and extreme weather. It is no longer rare for extreme weather to claw people's homes into the sea. Sandy took several.

Rhode Islanders get all of this. But unless and until the men and women in this Chamber decide to heed the warnings of all of our best scientists—not to mention America's insurance companies, faith leaders, our military leaders, virtually every big American company not associated with the fossil fuel industry, and, of course, the American public—Rhode Island and all States will continue to risk even worse effects.

For the fossil fuel industry, we are the best Congress money can buy. For everyone else, we are a disaster.

Last year I went to New Hampshire to talk with people about the changes they see there. I met climate scientist Dr. Cameron Wake of the University of New Hampshire. He showed me a detailed analysis on climate change in New Hampshire—what scientists have already measured and what projections indicate the future may hold. We had a good talk and after my visit he ran for me a similar analysis of climate change in Rhode Island.

This is what he found. This chart shows measurements of the average annual maximum temperature for three weather-monitoring stations in Rhode Island. Block Island is in blue, Kingston is in red, and Providence is in orange. It measures the highest daily temperature for each day, averaged over the whole year from 1895 to 2012. Let me remind everyone that these are measurements. This is not theory. These are measurements. This is climate change on the march in Rhode Island. What does it show? Warming. The trend is indisputable.

Dr. Wake's analysis shows that the average annual maximum temperature has increased at a rate of 3.6 Fahrenheit per century in Block Island, 2.8 degrees per century in Kingston, and 3.1 degrees per century in Providence.

Dr. Wake then looked to the future of Rhode Island. This chart shows the same thing we were looking at on the last chart—the average annual maximum temperature. But while that one just looks backward, this one looks forward. It shows two scenarios: business as usual in red or reduced carbon emissions in blue. It shows us, in effect, the difference that cutting back on carbon pollution could make for future generations of Rhode Islanders.

If we do nothing to curb our carbon pollution here, the annual average goes up toward 68 degrees, some years close to 70 degrees Fahrenheit by year's end.

Remember the last chart, which ended around here in 2010? The historical record there ended at around 60 degrees. Carry on this flood of carbon pollution and here is where you end, around 8 degrees warmer on average.

Between 1980 and 2010, the average annual maximum temperature of Washington, DC, was 68 degrees. That is the 8-degree difference. The difference that this flood of carbon pollution portends is Providence feeling like steamy, sweltering, Washington, DC. But if we take action to dial back our pollution, the warming is about half as much and less severe.

This is not the only measure of what carbon pollution will bring to Rhode Island. Winter temperatures going up mean fewer snow-covered days. Extreme precipitation will likely increase, and as the average annual maximum temperature increases, there will also be more very hot days in the summer.

This chart shows the increase in the number of days with a maximum temperature above 90 degrees Fahrenheit. Hot days such as that are common here in sweltering Washington, but historically Rhode Island might see maybe three 90-degree days a year. People come from all over to our cool, beautiful shores to swim in our cool, beautiful Atlantic.

This chart shows that even in the best case, Rhode Island can expect to see 18 such sweltering 90-degree days per year and, in the worst case, that number could rise to over 50 90-degree days every year, with the mercury soaring over 95 degrees Fahrenheit for 16 of those days.

Well, if you want to sit inside watching TV, cranking up your air conditioner, that may be fine, but Rhode Islanders like to go outside. We enjoy the beach, and we enjoy the bay. We are not looking forward to what these temperature consequences mean for our health.

Earlier this year, the Rhode Island Department of Health produced an in-depth report on heat and health in Rhode Island, concluding this: ''The destabilizing effects of climate change on our environment are among the most significant potential health threats faced by individuals and Rhode Island communities today.''

That is the official word of the Rhode Island Health Department. So don't expect me to ignore this issue here because it is uncomfortable for someone. Rising temperatures and extreme heat cause serious human health effects, such as dehydration, heat exhaustion. Hospitalizations result and even death. The department of health projected that the calculated temperature increases in Rhode Island will result in almost 400 additional emergency room visits in the year 2022 alone and nearly 1,400 more in 2084.

Researchers at the Harvard School of Public Health just published a study showing that death rates among seniors in New England increased when summer temperatures rose significantly. The risk, they believe, comes not only from the hotter temperatures but also from variability in temperatures as climate change makes the weather weirder and more unpredictable.

There is a documentary series, ''Years of Living Dangerously,'' which looked at how this works, as has the Rhode Island Department of Health, working with Brown University. Both found that a pronounced increase in emergency room visits and deaths as temperatures rise was statistically related to heat.

In many cases, it was not specifically indicated in the chart as related to heat. This suggests that heat-related deaths and illness may be underdiagnosed if you just look at medical charts. So this is a significant health issue that we face.

Then there are the storms. Climate change will increase the frequency and intensity of extreme weather events in Rhode Island, such as Hurricane Sandy, to the tune of $2 billion to $6 billion in Rhode Island, according to one report. In a State of 1 million people, that is a lot of damage. The heavy rains that brought on our floods in 2010 will become more frequent as well.

This is what our health director wrote: ''In Rhode Island, where our economy, culture, and identity are all so closely tied to the ocean and to Narragansett Bay, the effects of climate change will be particularly acute.'' Again, that is the official word of our health department.

Climate change threatens our water systems as temperatures increase and as we see more intense rain events. Stormwater and sewer overflows can contaminate Rhode Island coastal waters. Warmer waters can foster bacterial growth that can be harmful. Swimming in or consuming polluted water obviously can cause illness.

Then there is vibrio. The world-renowned shellfish of Narragansett Bay are becoming susceptible to a group of marine bacteria known as vibrio. If vibrio gets into seafood, it can be very unpleasant. Symptoms can be especially severe in people with compromised immune systems. Rhode Island health officials now have to work with the State's shellfish industry, with the University of Rhode Island, and others to monitor water quality and shellfish growing and harvesting conditions to protect this important resource.

These are just a few of the health threats laid out in the report. The department of health is just one of many agencies and organizations in our State that have had to put climate action and clean energy at the heart of their work as we in Congress pretend this problem does not exist.

Dozens of the most dedicated and innovative minds in our State recently came to Washington for my sixth annual Rhode Island Energy and Environmental Leaders Day. Our attendees represent some of the best work being done in Rhode Island to stave off the devastating effects of climate change.

Janet Coit, our director of environmental management chairs the Executive Climate Change Coordinating Council, created by our Governor to coordinate State agencies to address threats from climate change, threats to the State's environment, the State's economy, and the State's people.

The council was established by the Resilient Rhode Island Act, passed by our general assembly in 2014. That law also set specific greenhouse gas reduction targets and incorporates consideration of climate change effects into the powers and duties of all State agencies. The bill's author, Representative Art Handy, also came down and joined us for the Rhode Island Energy and Environmental Leaders Day, along with his colleague Representative Carlos Tobon, a member of the Rhode Island House Committee on the Environment and Natural Resources.

Dennis Nixon was there. He heads Rhode Island Sea Grant at the University of Rhode Island School of Oceanography. Sea Grant works with the Rhode Island government agencies and coastal communities to support climate resiliency and to protect vibrant waterfronts.

Marion Gold, our commissioner of the office of energy resources, was there. She has advanced incentives for large and small renewable energy development in our State, and she has helped Rhode Island become the third most energy-efficient State in the Nation.

Recently, we saw this report: ''Study shows Northeast states benefit from carbon cap program.'' We are a part of RGGI. Marion Gold helps supervise that. It has created jobs, it has saved money. It is proving that solving the carbon pollution problem is not actually a burden on the economy. It is a boost to the economy.

One of the special breakout sessions at the Energy and Environmental Leaders Day focused on corporate sustainability efforts to spur innovation, save money, and reduce emissions.

Representatives from Microsoft, Mars—the company—FedEx, and Schneider Electric shared their sustainability success stories. For these companies, efforts to improve energy efficiency and reduce carbon emissions are more than good intentions; they are good business.

Another breakout session looked at faith perspectives on environmental stewardship. Rev. Anita Schell of Rhode Island Interfaith Power & Light came. She works with local faith-based institutions to raise awareness about climate change and about safeguarding the poor of the world, who are least responsible for and most vulnerable to climate change. As Pope Francis gives his voice to this moral calling, these faith perspectives were especially welcome.

Dozens of other smart, hard-working Rhode Islanders attended—too many to mention them all. But I am always proud of the important work going on in Rhode Island to combat climate change. It is my inspiration to continue fighting for responsible action in Washington.

As our senior Senator JACK REED told the group, ''Rhode Island is one of the leaders in the country in smart policies . . . and it's is the result of the culmination of lots of individual activities.''

Rhode Island gets it, and we are pulling together in one direction. Our homes, our shores, and our way of life are at stake. We need every State in the Nation to join us to take this issue seriously, and we need every Senator to pay attention. It is truly time to wake up.

I ask my colleagues here today, if this were you, if something this threatening were happening to your State, would you really expect me to stand down because it was uncomfortable for big powerful industries and big aggressive donors? You would not. You would go to war to protect Utah and to protect Iowa from a threat such as this.

So forgive me if I am impatient, but this is serious in our Ocean State. If your department of health projected these kinds of threats for your home State people, you would be up in arms. So forgive me for being a little bit up in arms.

I will close with this. Look at this picture. Do you know what that is? That is a picture of Pluto. That is a picture of the dwarf planet Pluto. Do you know how we got that? We got that off of NASA's New Horizons spacecraft. It made it to Pluto after crossing the solar system for 9½ years. It traveled 3 billion miles from Earth and came within 8,000 miles of the surface of Pluto. It was traveling at more than 31,000 miles per hour, and it took 3 minutes to cross the face of Pluto, where it took innumerable images and samples for our scientists.

Let me quote one of the lead scientists, whose name is Bowman, who

managed 1 hour of sleep in her office Monday night. She said:

I have to pinch myself. Look what we accomplished. It's truly amazing humankind can go out and explore these worlds, and see Pluto revealed just before our eyes. It's just fantastic.

And it really is. These are American scientists who are able to run an American craft 3 billion miles to cross within 8,000 miles of Pluto traveling 31,000 miles an hour. When those scientists from NASA tell us that climate change is real, what do we have to say to them? We say that they are part of a hoax.

Really? Is that going to be the position of Members in this body—that the people driving a rover around on the surface of Mars and the people who flew this New Horizons craft by Pluto don't know what they are talking about when they say that climate change is real?

We have people trying to unfund their satellites so that we don't have the information to prove what is happening on climate change. Is that responsible with respect to NASA?

A day of reckoning is going to come on this, and we had better start getting this right.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, in 1965, Congress passed the original Elementary and Secondary Education Act as part of President Lyndon Johnson's War on Poverty. The centerpiece of that law, then as now, is title I funding provided as a block grant to local school districts to serve children in poverty.

The assumption in 1965 was that simply providing an infusion of Federal cash to schools with more disadvantaged children would correct educational inequities compared to more affluent schools. As it turned out, simply providing more money didn't result in improved educational outcomes for disadvantaged children.

So every time this law came back up for reauthorization, Congress added more stipulations on the use of the funds and additional programs that well-meaning Members of Congress hoped would help students.

Meanwhile, Congress kept raising the level of funding. Over time, there began to be a bipartisan realization that all this funding and all these programs were not resulting in improved student achievement, so something needed to change.

In this context, President Bush proposed what became the No Child Left Behind Act. His original proposal promised to fundamentally change the old Washington-knows-best approach to improving teaching and learning.

The theory was that we would cut the Federal strings that tied the hands of local administrators and teachers, allowing them to focus on teaching kids. In return, the law would require greater accountability in terms of student achievement outcomes.

However, the final compromise that passed Congress included a very detailed one-size-fits-all assessment and accountability system, but not the degree of local freedom that many had hoped for.

In retrospect, I think most people believe the focus on achievement for all students was positive. But like with many Federal laws, how it worked in practice didn't live up to the good intentions.

The reality is that the new federally mandated accountability system included required interventions that were cooked up in Washington and designed for big city failing school districts. These were not a good fit for communities in Iowa and many other States. Moreover, they set a new precedent for Federal intervention into how local schools are run.

Secretary Duncan took this a step further through the Race to the Top program and his abuse of the Federal waiver authority by adding conditions found nowhere in law. He used these tools to coerce States into adopting his preferred policies. These included new, even more heavy-handed mandates regarding reorganizing local schools, specific methods for schools to evaluate their teachers, and most infamously, pushing States to adopt the common core standards.

I believe these actions go well beyond any authority Congress gave the Secretary of Education, and I told him so in a letter when he denied Iowa's waiver. This should be a warning to Congress that if you give an inch, Federal officials might just take a mile.

The high-stakes system in No Child Left Behind also created negative incentives for schools to focus on getting passing test scores rather than meeting the individual learning needs of each student.

For instance, I have had a concern for a long time in how Federal education policy affects gifted and talented students. The exclusive focus on bringing struggling students up to some minimum level means that we are setting our sights on mediocrity.

Left out of this equation are gifted students, including those from disadvantaged backgrounds, who have enormous potential but need to be challenged to reach that potential.

At the end of the day, the goal of making sure all students are receiving a quality education is a good one, but the record of Washington's intervention in this issue has not been a success. It is time for Congress to take a step back and have a little humility. We don't know what's best for every child in every school. We can't design a single national education system that can meet the individual needs of children we will never meet.

Our Founding Fathers designed a federal system of government for a reason. The principle of federalism is that decisions should be made at the level of government as close as practicable to the people those decisions impact.

When it comes to education, no one has a greater stake in educational decisions, or knows better what is right for a specific child, then that child's parents. As a result, parents should have maximum control over their child's education. When governments make decisions that impact education, it should be at a level of government as close as possible to the parents and children who are affected.

The Every Child Achieves Act is a step in that direction. It eliminates the very specific mandates on States requiring that they evaluate schools based on test scores and apply federally designed interventions. States will be free to design their own assessment and accountability systems.

The bill retains the requirement that States test annually in grades 3–8, which I understand was necessary to get a bipartisan agreement. However, States will have wide discretion in how they design their assessments. And, the elimination of the federally mandated school interventions that raise the stakes on the test results will reduce teaching to the test.

This bill also consolidates Federal funding in a way that provides more latitude to local school districts to better meet their individual needs, although less so than in the House-passed bill. By contrast, the Obama administration's blueprint for reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act called for replacing the current set of Federal mandates with a new set of Federal mandates. What the President proposes would include even more intrusive, mandatory Federal interventions for certain schools.

It also proposed a series of new Federal competitive grants with broad purposes, which puts smaller rural schools at a disadvantage and gives the Secretary of Education an inappropriate degree of control over which schools get funding for which purposes. Moreover, the President's blueprint proposes tying Federal education funds to the adoption of State content standards that are ''college and career ready,'' which is code for common core.

In short, the Obama blueprint would have essentially ratified this administration's heavy-handed intrusions into how and what students are taught and enabled further Federal overreach.

The Every Child Achieves Act represents a rejection of that approach and an admission that the model of Federal control of local schools has not worked. As a result, President Obama has said he cannot support the bill as it stands unless it adds back more power for the Secretary. That position flies in the face of what I hear from Iowa educators and parents.

In fact, this bill quite intentionally tightens up some of the language in current law to prevent future overreach by the Secretary of Education. For instance, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has always required States to develop a State plan to show how it will comply with the law in order to get Federal funding.

Under current law, the Secretary of Education is charged with approving the plan unless it does not meet the requirements of the law. That should be sufficient to tell the Secretary that he must approve a plan so long as it complies with the law.

However, given the current Secretary's track record, the language in this bill is more explicit. It requires the Secretary to deem a State plan approved within 90 days of its submission unless he can provide a detailed description of the specific requirements in law that the State did not comply with. It then lists three pages of explicit limitations on the Secretary's authority describing what he cannot consider in evaluating a State plan. That is then followed by a rule reemphasizing that the Secretary cannot require anything at all from States beyond what is in the law.

This bill also voids any conditions attached to waivers already granted by the Secretary of Education and prohibits the attaching of any new ones in the future.

I am also glad that this bill includes very comprehensive language I worked on with Senator ROBERTS to explicitly shut off all the avenues this administration has used to coerce States to adopt the common core standards. This will free States to adopt whatever content standards they choose based on the input from their citizens without Federal coercion or fear of Federal repercussions.

Too often, Congress passes vague laws that delegate excessive discretion to Federal agencies to fill in the blanks. This bill is an improvement over the standard practice. It makes congressional intent more clear and fills in many gaps to ensure that the Department implements the law as intended rather than based on the whims of the Secretary.

Some bipartisan compromise is necessary for any bill to pass the Senate, and like any compromise, most people can find some things they don't like in this bill. Some Senators feel this bill goes too far in reducing the Federal role in education and some Senators feel it doesn't go far enough. I am one of those Senators who would prefer to see a maximum degree of State and local control and I voted for amendments to that effect.

However, the Every Child Achieves Act is a step in the direction of reducing Federal control on local schools so teachers can teach and parents know who to hold accountable for decisions that affect their children. Given the current mess with an unworkable law on the books, many States ceding control over major policies to Washington in return for a waiver, and an unprecedented degree of Federal intervention into what happens in neighborhood schools, it is overdue for Congress to act. Local schools can do more when Washington does less. Let's give them that chance.

I yield the floor.

EDUCATION

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I wish to talk about our education system—why it is not working and what we can do to fix it.

Ensuring every child in this country gets a high-quality education is critical to our country's future. Education remains the primary tool to obtaining a good-paying job and building a middle-class life. But too many children are not getting the education they need to succeed in the 21st century workforce.

Nearly 20 percent of students don't graduate from high school. For Hispanic and African-American students, the dropout rate is nearly 25 and 30 percent, respectively.

Hundreds of thousands of high-skilled jobs remain unfilled, and too many Americans find themselves stuck in low-wage jobs that can't support their families. Simply put, our education system is failing our children.

There are a number of reasons for this. Our education system is one-size-fits-all. Teachers are forced to teach to the test and our schools are not equipped with support services to address the many issues that prevent children from learning.

In my view, the main reason we are falling short is that our education system is one-size-fits-all, which doesn't work in education. Students learn differently. Some flourish in large settings and others in small settings with more teacher attention.

Students have varied needs based on where they live. Do they live in a rural area, suburb or city? What is their economic status? Is their family living in poverty? How is their home life? Are they raised in a single parent household? What are their individual interests? Do they like art and music? Or are they more interested in science and technology?

A child who comes from an affluent home in the suburbs learns differently from a child living in poverty in a city. Both children can learn—if the right approach for each child is taken. We need to give States and local school districts more flexibility to do what is right for their students.

Teaching to the test is another problem that plagues our education system. When the emphasis is placed on memorization rather than comprehension, or answering essay questions with a formula rather than reasoning and critical thinking, students are not actively engaged in learning.

Students fail to gain the comprehension and critical thinking skills needed in college and to be successful in the workplace. That is a big reason why up to 60 percent of students who enroll in college need to take remedial English and math classes. Schools need to be places where children learn, not where children memorize.

A child's life outside of school has a tremendous effect on his or her ability to succeed in school. Does a child get enough to eat at home? Are a child's parents working multiple jobs to pay the bills? Is there violence in the home? Is a child homeless?

Our schools are not equipped with the support services they need, such as mental health professionals and basic health care services that help to address the issues that prevent children from learning.

The good news is that we have solutions to these problems. They are in place, and they need to be implemented on a larger scale.

During the 2013–2014 school year, California implemented its local control funding formula, which targets State funding for poor students, students of color, students with disabilities, foster youth, and English learners.

Under this new formula, local districts can use that funding to teach these students in the way that best works for them. It has made a difference. For example, San Diego Unified School District plans to reduce class sizes from a 25-to-1 to a 22-to-1 student teacher ratio in 29 of the most disadvantaged schools.

The district also plans to look at resource equity and provide expanded access to counseling services and additional services for English learners and students with disabilities.

We also need to expand charter schools and provide continued support to existing, high-quality charter schools. Charter schools tailor instruction to each student and are not bound by traditional school district requirements.

Every child deserves a quality education, and many children who struggle in underperforming schools go on to flourish in charter schools. Here are just a couple of examples from California:

Nolan from East Los Angeles was reading below grade level when he enrolled in a charter school. Within 6 months, he had advanced two grade levels.

Trina, a seventh grader in the Bay area, stated:

> I think KIPP teachers are extremely important because they teach us everything we need to know to reach our goal of climbing the mountain to college. I can remember back to my very first day as a KIPPster. We learned that we would need to ''work hard'' and ''be nice.'' Working hard meant that in our English classes we would be reading and writing every day. When I came to KIPP, I found out that I was at a second grade reading level in the fifth grade! I was shocked, so I worked hard and got to the sixth grade reading level by the end of the year.

Parents desperately want opportunities for their children, and unfortunately the demand for charter schools remains much higher than the supply. Currently in California, approximately 150,000 students are on waiting lists. We need to continue to invest in the expansion and development of charter schools so more children receive the education they deserve now.

Providing support services to at-risk students has also proven to be successful. If students are less worried about

meeting their basic needs and everything that goes on in their lives outside of school, they can learn.

The Monarch School for homeless students in San Diego is a great example of this. It provides food, clothing, counseling, health care, and transportation to its students. And more than 90 percent of graduates go to college or pursue vocational training. We need to fund these kinds of support services in schools where children need them the most. We know that they work.

Education remains the great equalizer in this country, but we have failed in giving all of our children access to the quality education they deserve. By directing extra resources where they are needed most and giving schools the ability to do what is right for their students, we can turn things around—for our children and our country.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 10:45 a.m. tomorrow, Thursday, July 16, the Senate vote on the following amendments in the order listed: Cruz amendment No. 2180; Sanders amendment No. 2177; Coons amendment No. 2243; Burr amendment No. 2247, as modified; Brown amendment No. 2100; Casey amendment No. 2242; Hatch amendment No. 2082; Warren amendment No. 2106; Schatz amendment No. 2130; Murphy amendment No. 2186; Nelson amendment No. 2215, as modified; Manchin amendment No. 2222; Boozman amendment No. 2231; Baldwin amendment No. 2188; Capito amendment No. 2156; Thune amendment No. 2232; King amendment No. 2256; Schatz amendment No. 2240; and Warren amendment No. 2249.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

REMEMBERING JIM GASTON

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, today I recognize the life and legacy of Arkansas outdoorsman, tourism advocate, and business owner Jim Gaston.

Jim spent his life as a champion of the Arkansas outdoors—sharing his passion of Mother Nature's landscape, wildlife and recreation, and helped paved the path for the Arkansas tourism industry.

Jim inherited the family business, Gaston's White River Resort, in his early 20s when his dad passed away. He saved the property from foreclosure and turned the six cottages and six boats into the premier destination for anglers and tourists that it is known as today. Under Jim's leadership, the resort grew into a 400-acre property with 79 cottages along 2 miles of river frontage in addition to a restaurant, conference center and other amenities.

As a regular fixture on the White River for more than seven decades, he saw a lot of improvements, often because of his own contributions. His advocacy of minimum flow helped provide a steady stream of water in the river and create the habitat trout need to survive—boosting Arkansas's trout fishing and tourism industry.

Jim was a strong voice for Arkansas tourism locally, regionally, and statewide. He was a lifetime member of the Arkansas Department of Parks and Tourism Commission. He served in numerous leadership positions to promote tourism throughout the State including president of the Arkansas Tourism Development Foundation and Arkansas Hospitality Association. In 2010, Jim Gaston was named the Arkansas Business Executive of the Year and will be awarded the Legacy Award at this year's Arkansas Game & Fish Foundation Outdoor Hall of Fame Awards.

Jim truly transformed Arkansas. His contribution is commemorated in the James A. Gaston Visitor Center, a multi-million dollar facility that teaches about the rivers he loved his entire life.

My thoughts and prayers go out to Jim's wife Jill and the entire Gaston family. I humbly offer my appreciation and gratitude for his contributions to the State of Arkansas, his friendship, and many great memories that I will cherish forever.•

RECOGNIZING ARKANSAS FARM BUREAU FARM FAMILIES

• Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I would like to recognize six Arkansas families who recently were named finalists for the Arkansas Farm Bureau Farm Family of the Year. Their hard work, dedication, and passion have been instrumental not only in the success of their individual farms but our State's agriculture industry as a whole, the largest industry in Arkansas.

The Arkansas Farm Family of the Year program is the longest running program of its kind in the country. Each year a panel of judges selects families who demonstrate outstanding efforts in production, conservation of energy and resources, and leadership in agricultural and family affairs. This year's finalists are John and Mikki Hamilton of Searcy, Allen and Melissa Glidewell of St. Joe, the Wildy Family Farms in Manila, Brent and Ronda Butler of Siloam Springs, the Fueller family of Poplar Grove, Phil and Lesia Hamaker of Junction City, Billy and Charlotte Wilchman of Cleveland, and Roy and Carolyn Ham of Arkadelphia.

These eight families farm a wide variety of crops, including cotton, corn, soybeans, tomatoes, strawberries, peanuts, rice, poultry, and cattle. Growing up on our family farm in Dardanelle, I learned it takes the whole family to make a farm successful. I want to thank not only these couples but also their children for the sacrifices they have made and the importance they place on the agriculture industry in the community and State. Congratulations on this well-deserved recognition.•

REMEMBERING DARYLE HOLLOWAY

• Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I wish to honor the memory of Officer Daryle Holloway, a 22-year veteran of the New Orleans Police Department who was killed in the line of duty Saturday, June 20, 2015.

In 1992, Officer Holloway joined the New Orleans Police Department after graduating from St. Augustine High School. Throughout his career, he asked to remain a patrol officer in order to better interact with the residents of district 5 of New Orleans. Known for his sunny disposition, sincerity, and good nature, Officer Holloway truly cared about the neighborhoods he protected.

Following the levee breaches after Hurricane Katrina, Officer Holloway remained in the city providing security at Charity Hospital. Later he performed water rescue missions, bravely rescuing numerous people trapped in their homes or on their rooftops.

Besides his duty as a police officer, Officer Holloway remained an ardent supporter of his high school alma mater, St. Augustine, where he volunteered as a mentor to troubled students and continued to be a valuable part of the all-boys Catholic high school.

For the past 22 years, Officer Holloway served the citizens of New Orleans, LA, with his professionalism, skill, enthusiasm, and leadership. He selflessly served his community as a guardian, mentor, and father of three children, Kalia, Cydni, and Dillion. It is with a heavy heart that I honor the esteemed life and career of Officer Daryle Holloway. I thank him for his years of service to our State and country and pray for his family and friends.•

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting nominations which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:28 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 251. An act to transfer the position of Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs in the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Office of the Secretary, and for other purposes.

H.R. 432. An act to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to prevent duplicative regulation of advisers of small business investment companies.

H.R. 1047. An act to authorize private nonprofit organizations to administer permanent housing rental assistance provided through the Continuum of Care Program under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1334. An act to amend the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 to make the shareholder threshold for registration of savings and loan holding companies the same as for bank holding companies.

H.R. 1408. An act to require certain Federal banking agencies to conduct a study of the appropriate capital requirements for mortgage servicing assets for banking institutions, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1723. An act to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise Form S–1 so as to permit smaller reporting companies to use forward incorporation by reference for such form.

H.R. 1847. An act to amend the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 and the Commodity Exchange Act to repeal the indemnification requirements for regulatory authorities to obtain access to swap data required to be provided by swaps entities under such Acts.

H.R. 2064. An act to amend certain provisions of the securities laws relating to the treatment of emerging growth companies.

H.R. 2482. An act to amend the Low-Income Housing Preservation and Resident Homeownership Act of 1990.

H.R. 2997. An act to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to carry out a demonstration program to enter into budget-neutral, performance-based contracts for energy and water conservation improvements for multifamily residential units.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 251. An act to transfer the position of Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs in the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Office of the Secretary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 432. An act to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to prevent duplicative regulation of advisers of small business investment companies; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 1047. An act to authorize private nonprofit organizations to administer permanent housing rental assistance provided through the Continuum of Care Program under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 1334. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to make the shareholder threshold for registration of savings and loan holding companies the same as for bank holding companies; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 1408. An act to require certain Federal banking agencies to conduct a study of the appropriate capital requirements for mortgage servicing assets for banking institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 1723. An act to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise Form S–1 so as to permit smaller reporting companies to use forward incorporation by reference for such form; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 1847. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the Commodity Exchange Act to repeal the indemnification requirements for regulatory authorities to obtain access to swap data required to be provided by swaps entities under such Acts; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

H.R. 2064. An act to amend certain provisions of the securities laws relating to the treatment of emerging growth companies; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 2482. An act to amend the Low-Income Housing Preservation and Resident Homeownership Act of 1990; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 2997. An act to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to carry out a demonstration program to enter into budget-neutral, performance-based contracts for energy and water conservation improvements for multifamily residential units; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–2251. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Viruses, Serums, Toxins, and Analogous Products; Single Label Claim for Veterinary Biological Products'' ((RIN0579–AD64) (Docket No. APHIS–2011–0049)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2252. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of 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.

EC–2253. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2254. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of twenty-two (22) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2255. A communication from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Notification to Congress on the Permanent Reduction of Sizable Numbers of Members of the Armed Forces''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2256. A communication from the Secretary, Office of FOIA Services, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Freedom of Information Act Regulations: Fee Schedule, Addition of Appeals Time Frame, and Miscellaneous Administrative Changes'' (RIN3235–AL58) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2257. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Change of Listing Status for Certain Substitutes under the Significant New Alternatives Policy Program'' ((RIN2060–AS18) (FRL No. 9926–55–OAR)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2258. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Determinations of Attainment of the 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter Standard for the Libby, Montana Nonattainment Area'' (FRL No. 9930–47–Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2259. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Lead Rule Revisions'' (FRL No. 9930–41–Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2260. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to the New Source Review State Implementation Plan; Flexible Permit Program'' (FRL No. 9930–44–Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2261. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Quality Planning Purposes; Tennessee; Redesignation of the Knoxville 2008 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attainment'' (FRL No. 9930–49–Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2262. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''2014 Actuarial Report on the Financial Outlook for Medicaid''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2263. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a financial report for fiscal

year 2014 relative to the Biosimilar User Fee Act of 2012; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2264. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Coverage of Certain Preventive Services Under the Affordable Care Act'' (RIN1210–AB67) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2265. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Permanent Discontinuance or Interruption in Manufacturing of Certain Drug or Biological Products'' ((RIN0910–AG88) (Docket No. FDA–2011–N–0898)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2266. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''National Plan to Address Alzheimer's Disease: 2015 Update''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2267. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Annual Report to Congress on the Prevention and Reduction of Underage Drinking''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2268. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21–97, ''Heat Wave Safety Temporary Amendment Act of 2015''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2269. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21–98, ''TOPA Bona Fide Offer of Sale Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2015''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2270. A communication from the Director, Planning and Policy Analysis, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Employees Health Benefits Program: FEHB Plan Performance Assessment System'' (RIN3206–AN13) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2271. A communication from the Director, Retirement Services, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Employees' Retirement System; Present Value Conversion Factors for Spouses of Deceased Separated Employees'' (RIN3206–AN16) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2272. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the implementation of the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission for the period from October 1, 2014, through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–2273. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on the Department's activities during calendar year 2013 relative to prison rape abatement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–2274. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class D Airspace; Baltimore, Martin State Airport, MD'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2015–0793)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2275. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Cloverdale, CA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0457)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2276. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Highmore, SD'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0723)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2277. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH (Previously Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH) (Airbus Helicopters)'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0577)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2278. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0426)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2279. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0492)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2280. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell International Inc. Turboprop Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2006–23706)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2281. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Pratt and Whitney Division Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–0266)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2282. A communication from the Regulatory Ombudsman, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Incorporation by Reference; North American Standard Out-of-Service Criteria; Hazardous Materials Safety Permits'' (RIN2126–AB78) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2283. A communication from the Division Chief of Regulatory Development, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Rulemaking Procedures—Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations; Treatment of Confidential Business Information'' (RIN2126–AB79) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2284. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Assessment and Collection of Regulatory Fees for Fiscal Years 2014 and 2015; and Amendment of Part 1 of the Commission's Rules'' ((MD Docket No. 15–121; MD Docket No. 14–92) (FCC 15–59)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2285. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Oil Exploration Staging Area in Dutch Harbor, AK'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2015–0246)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2286. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zones; Marine Events held in the Sector Long Island Sound Captain of the Port Zone'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2015–0438)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2287. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; 520 Bridge Construction, Lake Washington; Seattle, WA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2015–0570)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2288. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Underwater Vessel Testing, San Francisco Bay, San Francisco, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2015–0422)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2289. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department

of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulations for Marine Events, Manasquan River, Seaside Park, New Jersey'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2015–0328)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2290. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulation; L'HERMIONE Parade, Upper New York Bay and Lower Hudson River, New York, NY'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2015–0457)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2291. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Erie Boom on the Bay Fireworks Display; Presque Isle Bay, Erie, PA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2015–0506)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2292. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Bay Village Independence Day Celebration Fireworks Display; Lake Erie, Bay Village, OH'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2015–0500)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2293. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Independence Day Celebration Fireworks Display; Lake Ontario, Oswego, NY'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2015–0503)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2294. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Alexandria Bay Chamber of Commerce Fireworks Display; Saint Lawrence River, Heart Island, Alexandria Bay, NY'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2015–0504)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2295. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Three Rivers Regatta/Three River Regatta and Fireworks, Ohio River, mile 0.5 to mile 0.5 on the Allegheny River and mile 0.5 on the Monongahela River; Pittsburgh, PA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2015–0436)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2296. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Chesapeake Bay; Cape Charles, VA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2015–0048)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2297. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zones; Fourth of July Fireworks Displays, Murrells Inlet and North Myrtle Beach, SC'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2015–0529)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2298. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Ohio River between mile 618.5 and mile 619.5; Louisville, KY'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2015–0198)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2299. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone, Fourth of July fireworks, Lake Winnebago; Menasha, Wisconsin'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2015–0532)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2300. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Ohio River between mile 603.4 and 605.4; Louisville, KY'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2015–0505)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2301. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Black River Kayak-a-thon; Black River, Lorain, OH'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2015–0496)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2302. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone for Fireworks Display, Chesapeake Bay, Prospect Bay; Queen Anne's County, MD'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2015–0279)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2303. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zones, St. Petersburg Captain of the Port Zone'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0764)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2304. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Fireworks Display, Columbia River, Cathlamet, WA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2015–0358)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2305. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Niantic River, Niantic, CT'' ((RIN1625–AA09) (Docket No. USCG–2015–0218)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2306. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Grand River, Grand Haven, MI'' ((RIN1625–AA09) (Docket No. USCG–2015–0373)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2307. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone, Indian River Bay; Millsboro, Delaware'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2015–0317)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2308. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone for Fireworks Display, Patapsco River, Inner Harbor; Baltimore, MD'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2015–0315)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2309. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Salvage and Recovery of CSS Georgia and Recovery and Transit of Unexploded Ordnance, Savannah River, Savannah, GA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2015–0434)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2310. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulations; Grand National Drag Boat Races, Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway; Bucksport, SC'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2015–0340)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2311. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulations for Marine Events, Atlantic Ocean; Atlantic City, New Jersey'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2015–0329)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2312. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Bridgefest Regatta Fireworks, Portage Canal, Hancock, MI'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2015–0531)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. INHOFE, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with amendments:

S. 1647. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114–80).

By Mr. COCHRAN, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Special Report entitled ''Further Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals from the Concurrent Resolution for Fiscal Year 2016'' (Rept. No. 114–81).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. PETERS, Mr. UDALL, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BENNET, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1766. 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. ISAKSON (for himself, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 1767. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to combination products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Mr. MORAN):

S. 1768. A bill to authorize States to enforce safety requirements related to wellbores at interstate storage facilities; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. 1769. A bill to amend the African Elephant Conservation Act to conserve elephants while appropriately regulating ivory in the United States; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. VITTER):

S. 1770. A bill to provide for evidence-based and promising practices related to juvenile delinquency and criminal street gang activity prevention and intervention to help build individual, family, and community strength and resiliency to ensure that youth lead productive, safe, healthy, gang-free, and law-abiding lives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1771. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt Indian tribal governments and other tribal entities from the employer health coverage mandate; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1772. 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 Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1773. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to require creditors to inform consumer reporting agencies that certain debts have been discharged in bankruptcy cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. REID, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. HEINRICH, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1774. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to treat Puerto Rico as a State for purposes of chapter 9 of such title relating to the adjustment of debts of municipalities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1775. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to accept additional documentation when considering the application for veterans status of an individual who performed service as a coastwise merchant seaman during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1776. A bill to enhance tribal road safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1777. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to maintain or replace certain facilities and structures for commercial recreation services at Smith Gulch in Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mrs. ERNST):

S. 1778. 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 Finance.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. SCHATZ, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1779. 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 Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. FLAKE):

S. 1780. A bill to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to promote watershed health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1781. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to modify a provision relating to the obligation and release of funds; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1782. A bill to permit a State transportation department to approve a justification report for a project to build or modify a freeway-to-crossroad interchange on the Interstate Highway System within a transportation management area in such State; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1783. A bill to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to clarify a provision relating to the designation of a northern transportation route in Washington County, Utah; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. COTTON):

S.J. Res. 19. A joint resolution to express the disfavor of Congress regarding the proposed agreement for cooperation between the United States and the People's Republic of China transmitted to the Congress by the President on April 21, 2015, pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 192

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 192, a bill to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 210

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 210, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for amounts paid by a spouse of a member of the Armed Forces for a new State license or certification required by reason of a permanent change in the duty station of such member to another State.

S. 314

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 574

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 574, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit against income tax for employees who participate in qualified apprenticeship programs.

S. 586

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 586, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to foster more effective implementation and coordination of clinical care for people with pre-diabetes, diabetes, and the chronic diseases and conditions that result from diabetes.

S. 621

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey

(Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 621, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety and effectiveness of medically important antimicrobials approved for use in the prevention and control of animal diseases, in order to minimize the development of antibiotic-resistant bacteria.

S. 637

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 637, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 804

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 804, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to specify coverage of continuous glucose monitoring devices, and for other purposes.

S. 849

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 849, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for systematic data collection and analysis and epidemiological research regarding Multiple Sclerosis (MS), Parkinson's disease, and other neurological diseases.

S. 928

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 928, a bill to reauthorize the World Trade Center Health Program and the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001, and for other purposes.

S. 1004

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1004, a bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to encourage the nationwide observance of two minutes of silence each Veterans Day.

S. 1020

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1020, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure the continued access of Medicare beneficiaries to diagnostic imaging services, and for other purposes.

S. 1135

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1135, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for fairness in hospital payments under the Medicare program.

S. 1205

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1205, a bill to designate the same individual serving as the Chief Nurse Officer of the Public Health Service as the National Nurse for Public Health.

S. 1246

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1246, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to revise the definition of municipal solid waste for purposes of the renewable electricity production credit.

S. 1383

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1383, a bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to subject the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to the regular appropriations process, and for other purposes.

S. 1390

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1390, a bill to help provide relief to State education budgets during a recovering economy, to help fulfill the Federal mandate to provide higher educational opportunities for Native American Indians, and for other purposes.

S. 1458

At the request of Mr. COATS, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1458, a bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to ensure scientific transparency in the development of environmental regulations and for other purposes.

S. 1584

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1584, a bill to repeal the renewable fuel standard.

S. 1617

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1617, a bill to prevent Hizballah and associated entities from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 1651

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1651, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 1676

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1676, a bill to increase the number of graduate medical education positions treating veterans, to improve the compensation of health care providers, medical directors, and directors of Veterans Integrated Service Networks of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1691

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1691, a bill to expedite and prioritize forest management activities to achieve ecosystem restoration objectives, and for other purposes.

S. 1762

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1762, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to increase the penalties applicable to aliens who unlawfully reenter the United States after being removed.

S. RES. 222

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 222, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Federation Internationale de Football Association should immediately eliminate gender pay inequity and treat all athletes with the same respect and dignity.

AMENDMENT NO. 2188

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2188 proposed to S. 1177, an original bill to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that every child achieves.

AMENDMENT NO. 2215

At the request of Mr. PETERS, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2215 proposed to S. 1177, an original bill to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that every child achieves.

AMENDMENT NO. 2240

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2240 proposed to S. 1177, an original bill to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that every child achieves.

AMENDMENT NO. 2241

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2241 proposed to S. 1177, an original bill to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that every child achieves.

AMENDMENT NO. 2243

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from New York

(Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2243 proposed to S. 1177, an original bill to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that every child achieves.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1776. A bill to enhance tribal road safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about legislation I introduced that will improve safety on roads across Indian Country. Roads and bridges in Indian Country are in desperate need of improvement.

According to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, only 17 percent of the roads are considered to be in acceptable condition. The remainder are considered to be in poor and unacceptable condition and many are simply unpaved. According to the National Congress of American Indians, ''These roads are among the most underdeveloped and unsafe road networks in the Nation, even though they are the primary means of access'' throughout these tribal communities. The Centers for Disease Control lists motor vehicle crashes as the leading cause of death for Native American children. Meanwhile, Indian infants, under the age of 1 year old, are eight times more likely to die in a vehicle-related crash than other children.

That is why I am introducing the Tribal Infrastructure and Roads Enhancement and Safety Act, or TIRES Act for short. The TIRES Act supports increasing the safety of roads throughout Indian Country by: streamlining the process to start and complete safety projects, increasing available funding for tribal road programs, and reinstating the tribal facility bridge program. This legislation will reduce the administrative fees that the Bureau of Indian Affairs charges tribes for road work and will speed up the time such projects take to get approved.

The TIRES Act also commissions two important road safety studies. In one study, the Department of Interior, in consultation with the Department of Transportation and other relevant Federal agencies, will examine the quality of transportation safety data collected. Such a study can benefit tribes by finding ways to prevent future car crashes and recover damages caused by motorists on roads on Indian reservations. The second study will examine and identify ways to improve safety on all public roads on Indian reservations.

The number of lives lost on roads in Indian Country is far too high. Something needs to be done and this bill is a good first step towards improving safety on the roads in tribal communities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2256. Mr. KING (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2089 submitted by Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) to the bill S. 1177, to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that every child achieves.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2256. Mr. KING (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2089 submitted by Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) to the bill S. 1177, to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that every child achieves; as follows:

Beginning on page 587, strike line 15 and all that follows through page 588, line 10, and insert the following:

''(2) ELIGIBLE TECHNOLOGY.—The term 'eligible technology' means modern computer, and communication technology software, services, or tools, including computer or mobile devices, whether for use in school or at home, software applications, systems and platforms, digital learning content, and related services, supports, and strategies, which may include strategies to assist eligible children without adequate Internet access at home to complete homework.

''(3) TECHNOLOGY READINESS SURVEY.—The term 'technology readiness survey' means a survey completed by a local educational agency that provides standardized information on the quantity and types of technology infrastructure and access available to the students and in the community served by the local educational agency, including computer devices, access to school libraries, Internet connectivity (including Internet access outside of the school day), operating systems, related network infrastructure, data systems, educator professional learning needs and priorities, and data security.

''(4) UNIVERSAL DESIGN FOR LEARNING.—The term 'universal design for learning' has the meaning given the term in section 103 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1003).

''SEC. 5702A. RESTRICTION.

''Funds awarded under this part shall not be used to address the networking needs of an entity that is eligible to receive support under the E-rate program.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 15 at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's Semi-Annual Report to Congress.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 15, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a Subcommittee hearing entitled ''Examining the Governance and Integrity of International Soccer.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 15, 2015, at 4:45 p.m., in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 15, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD–406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Nomination hearing for Kristen Kulinowski to be a Member of the Chemical Safety Board and Greg Nadeau to be Administrator of the Federal Highways Administration.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 15, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Overview of U.S. Policy Towards Haiti Prior to the Elections.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 15, 2015, at 3:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Nominations.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 15, 2015, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''Securing the Border: Understanding Threats and Strategies for the Maritime Border.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 15, 2015, in room SD–628 of

the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Juvenile Justice in Indian Country: Challenges and Promising Strategies.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 15, 2015, at 2:15 p.m., in room SDG–50 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Diabetes Research: Improving Lives on the Path to a Cure.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Russell Armstrong, a fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the rest of the month.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a member of my staff, Joseph Hill, be granted floor access for the remainder of the debate on the Every Child Achieves Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 16, 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow, Thursday, July 16; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S. 1177; finally, that all time during the adjournment of the Senate count postcloture on the substitute amendment No. 2089.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:22 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, July 16, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. CARLTON D. EVERHART II

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. ALLAN L. SWARTZMILLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE CHIEF OF CHAPLAINS, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 8039:

To be major general

COL. DONDI E. COSTIN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. STEPHEN R. LYONS

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. MATTHEW T. QUINN

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. JOHN C. AQUILINO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. ROBERT L. THOMAS, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) DAVID F. STEINDL

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS COMMANDANT OF THE MARINE CORPS AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 5043:

To be general

LT. GEN. ROBERT B. NELLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. LAWRENCE D. NICHOLSON

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

JOSE M. GOYOS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be colonel

ALLEN KIPP ALBRIGHT
ANNMARIE K. ANTHONY
RUSTY LYNN BALLARD
MICHAEL H. BARTEN
BRIAN THOMAS BELL
JOSEPH ELLIOTT BENSON, JR.
KEVIN JAY BLASER
PETER M. BOONE
ALLAN R. CECIL
WESLEY JAMES CLARE
EVA MARIE LUHM CLEET
JOHN D. CONAWAY
SCOTT A. CONIGLIO
TRAVIS J. CRAWMER
JAMES H. CULP
BUEL JAY DICKSON
MARK PATRICK DONAHUE
MICHAEL T. DOTSON
DAVID L. EADDY
GLENN H. EVENSON
CRAIG J. FERY
BRIAN SCOTT FILLER
SHAWN P. FITZGERALD
LEE T. FURCHES
RUSSELL BENTLEY GABY
CHRISTOPHER LAWRENCE GNAGI
JOHN C. GREENAN
MICHAEL S. GRIESBAUM
DARREN J. GUTTMANN
JOHN FRANCIS HALL
MARTIN LEE HARTLEY, JR.
JEFFREY LEWIS HEDGES
JOSHUA LANGSTON HENDRIX
KENNETH R. HEUTMAKER
BRADLEY W. HILBERT
SCOTT A. HOWARD
CHRISTOPHER WILLIAM HURLEY
CHRIS JAMES IODER
THOMAS PATRICK JACKSON
TOMMY FORREST JAMES, JR.
DAVID B. JOHNSON
GREGORY ALLAN JOHNSON
GARY D. JONES
DAVID WILLIAM KAISER
ANDREW J. LEE
CONSTANTINE ANDREW LEON
DARRIN BLANE LETSINGER
MAKI T. LIVESAY
MARTIN D. LOUIE
MARK LAWRENCE MANOR
TIMOTHY DOUGLAS MARTENSON
MICHAEL PATRICK MCDERMOTT
DAVID C. MCPHETRES
DANIEL S. MCSEVENEY
MARK L. MILLER
ROBERT K. MITCHELL
MARK W. MITCHUM
STEPHEN A. MIZAK
GARY S. MONROE
GERALD S. NALL
ORLANDO E. NEGRON
KYLE J. NOEL
JENIFER E. PARDY
MICHAEL CHRISTOPHER PARRINELLO
JONI MARIE PENTIFALLO
MATTHEW J. PETERSON
DANIEL J. POTAS
TROY E. POU
MACK H. PRAYTOR
ALVIN LYNN PUNT
JOHN V. C. RAMOS
MICHAEL LEWIS REICHARD
ADAM THOMAS RICE
JOHN W. ROGERS
RAUL ROSARIO
VINCENT VITUS SANTANGELO
CHARLES A. SCHAAN
ERIC A. SCHADLER
KEVIN E. SCHNELL
EILEEN E. SCUTT
GARY DEAN SMITH
THOMAS CHRISTIAN SODEMAN
JON DOUGLAS STONE
TIMOTHY DAVID STUMBAUGH
DANIEL M. SUTCH
JONATHAN RONALD THORPE
JONATHAN LEVIN VINSON
BRADLEY DAVID WATERS
MICHAEL GARY WATSON
WILLIAM LEE WHEELER
BRADLEY DUNCAN WHITE

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS PERMANENT PROFESSOR AT THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 4333(B) AND 4336(A):

To be colonel

MARK R. READ

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

21ST CENTURY CURES ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 2015

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6) to accelerate the discovery, development, and delivery of 21st century cures, and for other purposes:

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Chair, today, I stand in strong support of the 21st Century Cures Act. This bipartisan bill gives our nation's best and brightest the tools they need to understand—and eventually defeat disease—and reauthorizes both the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA).

The 21st Century Cures Act has the potential to accelerate the discovery of drugs for life-threatening illnesses; repurpose drugs found ineffective for one condition and test them on another; promote an interoperable health system; enhance telehealth practices; and advance the development of more targeted, personalized treatments.

My district, the 7th Congressional District of Alabama, is home to the University of Alabama at Birmingham, the Southern Research Institute, and the University of Alabama. NIH funding is critical to the continuing vitality of these three leading institutions, as well as to the region.

The prospect of this act alone provides hope. Hope that cures can be discovered, hope that one day no diagnoses indicate inevitable ailment or death, and hope that one day treatments will yield more reward than risk.

Despite the potential of this bill, there are two amendments that threaten that hope and essentially aim to inhibit the health of several Americans. First, the Hyde Amendment has reared its ugly head yet again. It is a harmful and discriminatory bill that prevents women from making their own healthcare decisions. Further, it serves as a stark contradiction to efforts geared toward providing health positive resources for all.

Second, the Brat amendment aims to convert the federal funding of the NIH and the FDA from mandatory to discretionary. Such a transaction would stifle the progress both federal agencies have already made and will continue to make. It will singlehandedly reverse the trajectory of medical progress and halt further research efforts.

I am particularly supportive of the 21st Century Cures Act because of its inclusion of provisions for the pediatric and rare disease community. This bill will allow Children's of Alabama, ranked among the nation's best children's hospitals for six years in a row, to finally be able to participate in a national pediatric research network and therefore, save more lives.

With only 5 percent of rare diseases having an FDA-approved treatment, it would be a gross understatement to say our medical systems have failed to keep pace. Gabe Griffin from Birmingham and Houston Sides from Montgomery are two young Alabama boys who asked me to support the 21st Century Cures Act because it modernizes the FDA and spurs development of pediatric and rare disease treatments. Gabe and Houston have a rare and deadly muscle-wasting disorder called Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy. This disease takes the lives of children as young as 9 or 10. Very few children with this disease will ever reach the age of 25. But the 21st Century Cures Act provides hope for these families. It promotes 'precision medicine,' modernizes the clinical trial system, and expands access to investigational drugs.

Viruses and diseases will not wait for us to catch up; they will mutate, grow ever more virulent, and continue to impact our public health. We need to leverage our investments to make potentially game-changing strides in treatment. We need 21st century solutions for 21st century threats.

An investment in health affects more than our physical well-being, and the 21st Century Cares Act reflects this. H.R. 6 is not only a health bill; it is a jobs bill. Our country has been the leader in both the medical device and biopharmaceutical industry for decades, helping us become the core of global medical innovation. This puts a target on our backs, as China and other countries have attempted to attempt to claim this role and thus, our jobs. U.S. medical device-related employment totals over 2 million jobs, and the U.S. biopharmaceutical industry is responsible for over 4 million U.S. jobs. NIH funding currently supports over 400,000 jobs at research institutions across the country, including jobs for young and upcoming scientists. Without this funding, our jobs are out there for the taking. Without this funding, the thousands of jobs in my district provided by the University of Alabama at Birmingham, the Southern Research Institute, and the University of Alabama are not safe. The policies in this legislation will help us fight off foreign competitors and allow us to continue innovating, so we can all protect medical jobs in our districts and add more.

We must get serious about addressing the unmet medical needs of the American people. I urge my colleagues not to deprive the American people of the cures they deserve. Vote against these poison pill amendments because when it comes to the health of our constituents, there is no place or time for partisan politics. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Brat amendment, support the Lee amendment and I urge them to support H.R. 6.

RECOGNIZING COL. RICHARD J. MURASKI, JR.'S SERVICE TO FORT WORTH AND AMERICA

HON. KAY GRANGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 2015

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Deputy Commander of the Southwestern Division of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Colonel Richard J. Muraski, Jr.

Colonel Muraski is retiring after a long and impressive career in the Army. In Fort Worth we are particularly grateful for his work on the Trinity River Vision, which is a vital part of Fort Worth's future.

He played a critical role in the implementation of the highest standard of Flood Risk Management. His programmatic approach and respect for others fostered excellent communication and solutions.

Colonel Muraski led the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Fort Worth District Staff in the planning, engineering and design of the existing Fort Worth floodway and the new Central City Project.

Colonel Muraski is a native of Kansas City, MO, and earned a Bachelor's degree in Geology from St. Mary's University in San Antonio and a Master of Science degree in Geodetic Sciences from Purdue University.

During his career he has served in a variety of operational, command and staff assignments in the United States and overseas. He deployed with a National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency support team to Afghanistan and Kuwait in support of Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Colonel Muraski assumed command of the 588th Engineer Battalion in June 2004. Under the Army's modular reorganization, he transformed the 588th into the Special Troops Battalion, 2nd Brigade. The battalion deployed to Operation Iraqi Freedom in November 2005 and was responsible for the majority of Babil Province, conducting combat operations along with training Iraqi security forces.

The City of Fort Worth and our country owe Colonel Muraski a debt of gratitude for his work.

HONORING SERGEANT JAMES R. STEPHENSON

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 2015

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Sergeant James R. Stephenson as he prepares to retire from the Petaluma Police Department on July 31, 2015. With over twenty-five years of exemplary service as a police officer, twenty-one of these have been with the City of Petaluma where Sergeant Stephenson has been instrumental in building

positive relationships with local residents and ensuring the overall safety of the Petaluma community.

Sergeant Stephenson joined the Petaluma Police Department on August 9, 1994 and quickly distinguished himself as an outstanding street officer, often detecting criminal activity from subtle clues. In 1999, he was named as the Sonoma County Law Enforcement Officer of the Year in recognition of his exceptional work. One noteworthy example was Sergeant Stephenson's skillful arrest of an armed, drug induced and mentally unstable man. Rather than resorting to stronger measures, he physically restrained the man, ultimately protecting both the individual and the broader community from more serious consequences after an arsenal of firearms and thousands of rounds of ammunition were discovered in the citizen's home.

Throughout his career, there have been many other instances when Sergeant Stephenson's calm demeanor and sharp instincts have helped to prevent crime. In his most recent assignment as Supervisor of the Traffic Safety Unit, his leadership has been important in helping officers to develop efficient action plans for responding to and investigating many serious accidents.

Sergeant Stephenson's legacy is one of dedicated service to the people of Petaluma. Please join me in congratulating Sergeant James Stephenson and expressing deep appreciation for his long and exceptional career and outstanding contributions to the City of Petaluma.

CONGRATULATING TONY IOVINELLI ON HIS 40TH ANNIVERSARY AT TURANO BAKERY

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 2015

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Tony Iovinelli on his recent 40th anniversary at Turano Baking Company, a nationwide leader in baked products.

Tony started his career at Turano at the ripe old age of 16, in an ominous-sounding set of circumstances. You see, Mr. Speaker, Tony was dating the owner's daughter-in-law, and a job he had lined up at a printing company fell through. But contrary to the stories fathers tell the boyfriends of their daughters, this is not a story that has a bad ending. It is a story that has a good ending. Over many years, Tony and the Turano family have worked together and supported each other and ultimately achieved a remarkable thing, and that is the growth of a small-time family business into a leading national brand.

For Tony, it all started during high school, when he began working after class cleaning the bakery. In the summers, he would work full-time, cleaning and helping out in the packaging department. After graduating high school, he went on to attend a local college, where he was able to continue working at the bakery in the evenings. As his years at the bakery piled up, Tony took on more senior roles. He became shipping supervisor. After expressing an interest in learning the production side of the business, and through a lot of hard work and dedication, Tony was eventually promoted to plant manager, supervising the day-to-day operations of Turano's Berwyn, Illinois production facility. For 40 years, Tony has worked in many roles at the bakery. As he wistfully recalls, "I came for the summer and never left."

In Tony's 40 years of service, Turano has grown tremendously. Long gone are the days of the original 1,000 square foot facility. Turano has established new product lines, expanded into new plants in Bolingbrook, IL, Villa Rica, GA, and Orlando, FL. They now offer delivery across the United States. In today's economy, it is easy to overlook the significance of a successful, 40 year long career with one employer. But I want the House to pause for a moment and reflect on the incredible loyalty and commitment Tony's journey shows. And by the way, after 40 years, he's still going strong.

Mr. Speaker and Distinguished Colleagues, please join me in congratulating Tony Iovinelli on his remarkable 40 years of service at Turano Baking Company and wishing him every success for the years to come.

RECOGNIZING MR. CARLOS ALEMANY

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 2015

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to recognize one of my constituents, Mr. Carlos Alemany of Windermere, Florida, for his acceptance to the People to People World Leadership Forum in Washington, D.C. Mr. Alemany was selected for his academic excellence, leadership potential and exemplary citizenship.

The mission of People to People Leadership Ambassador Programs is to bridge cultural and political borders through education and exchange. To this end, People to People offers domestic and international educational programs that promote cooperation, cross-cultural understanding and leadership. It is my hope that Mr. Alemany benefitted greatly from his participation in the World Leadership Forum, and I wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF KIWANIS INTERNATIONAL

HON. MIKE KELLY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 2015

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of Kiwanis International.

Founded on January 21, 1915, in Detroit, Michigan, Kiwanis International has become a global organization with dedicated, hard-working volunteers from 96 different countries who work tirelessly to improve our communities and better the lives of children.

Guided by six permanent "Objects of Kiwanis," Kiwanis Club members acquire personal and professional connections while having fun, making friends, and helping others. Kiwanis initiatives put an emphasis on children, including pediatric trauma, child safety, child care, early development, and infant and child health nutrition. Kiwanis has continued to support impressive service leadership programs such as K–Kids, the Aktion Club, the Key Club International, Circle K, and the Builders Club.

In my home state of Pennsylvania, the Pennsylvania District of Kiwanis International consists of more than 200 Kiwanis Clubs and 400 members throughout the commonwealth who have developed a partnership with the Pennsylvania Early Learning Investment Commission to foster early educational opportunities for our kids.

For all of these reasons, I am incredibly pleased that the Keystone State has officially declared this August to be "Kiwanis Month."

I commend and thank all Kiwanis for their long participation in the honorable work of improving our communities. It is with tremendous pride and appreciation that I extend my heartfelt congratulations to Kiwanis International for their 100th anniversary. God bless them for all that they do.

RECOGNIZING DONNA CHAMBERS ON THE OCCASION OF HER RETIREMENT

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 2015

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Donna Chambers, executive director of the Humboldt County Resource Conservation District, on her retirement.

Donna's service to Humboldt County and her efforts on behalf of the Salt River Ecosystem Restoration Project have been exemplary. Since she began working with the Resource Conservation District, Donna has overseen vital agreements, funding and permitting, and construction of one of the most significant estuary restoration and agricultural improvement projects in California. Located at the mouth of the Eel River, the Salt River project is crucial to salmon and steelhead, wildlife, and agricultural production.

After graduating from Humboldt State University in 1996 with a bachelor's degree in social work and a minor in business management, Donna worked for the Humboldt Access Project, the Humboldt Community Access and Resource Center, and the Area 1 Agency on Aging. When she joined the Resource Conservation District in 2008, Donna became known as a champion for agricultural producers. Donna helped develop nutrient management plans, projects to handle dairy waste, and helped producers upgrade facilities like roof and gutter structures and concrete slabs and ramps to improve efficiency and protect water quality. She also helped dairy and beef ranchers reduce the impacts of Aleutian cackling geese on private lands. Donna helped bring more than $20 million in funding to the Resource Conservation District and the local community since she began working with the district.

Mr. Speaker, Donna Chamber's commitment to agriculture and environmental protection is commendable and worthy of recognition. I urge my colleagues to join me in extending our congratulations to her.

RECOGNIZING THE DEDICATED SERVICE OF PENSACOLA CHIEF OF POLICE CHIP W. SIMMONS

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 2015

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Pensacola Chief of Police Chip W. Simmons on the occasion of his retirement after nearly 30 years on the force serving the people of Florida's Gulf Coast.

Shortly after his graduation from Pine Forest High School, in Pensacola, Chief Simmons started his career in law enforcement at the Escambia County Sheriff's Department as a Corrections Officer. Upon his graduation from the Pensacola Police Academy, Chief Simmons joined the Pensacola Police Department in October 1986. Like so many other dedicated law enforcement officers, he entered the force looking to serve the community that he loved, and after less than 10 years on the force, during which Chief Simmons served on numerous state and federal task forces and completed both Bachelors' and Masters' degrees, he received a promotion to Sergeant. This promotion, a reflection of Chief Simmons assiduous work ethic and unquestioned commitment to excellence, would portend many future promotions to come.

In 1997, Chief Simmons was appointed the city's SWAT Commander, a position he held for four years, and in 1998 he received yet another promotion to Lieutenant. During this period, Chief Simmons also graduated from the FBI National Academy in Quantico, VA, while also serving as a member of the U.S. Customs Blue Lighting Strike Force. In 2002, Chief Simmons was promoted to Captain, before being appointed Assistant Chief of Police in 2005. Following the retirement of his predecessor, Chief John W. Mathis, Chief Simmons was nominated and chosen to serve as the Chief of Police for the Pensacola Police Department.

During Chief Simmons' years at the helm, the Pensacola Police Department has worked tirelessly to protect and serve the local citizens, and Chief Simmons has overseen several impressive accomplishments. Most importantly, under his leadership, the City of Pensacola has recorded the lowest crime rate in recorded history, while also pursuing a rigorous accreditation process from the Commission for Florida Law Enforcement Accreditation, Inc. certifying the department's professional excellence.

Given Chief Simmons' dedication to his community and the department, it should come as no surprise that he is one of the most decorated officers in Pensacola Police Department history. While his full list of awards and commendations is too numerous to mention, he has received the department's highest award for heroism—the Gold Medal of Valor—and numerous merit awards from both the department and the city. In addition, Chief Simmons has been recognized by state and local law enforcement bodies on several occasions, receiving both the Drug Enforcement Administration's Achievement Award and induction into the Police and Firefighters Heroes Hall of Fame.

Chief Simmons is also a true leader in the Northwest Florida civic community, and, in addition to his service as a police officer, he has also served in many leadership capacities at civic organizations. Among these positions, he currently serves on the Board of Trustees of Pensacola State College, a position appointed by the Governor of Florida, and he has served on the Board of Directors of Ronald McDonald House, Favorhouse of Northwest Florida, the Community and Alcohol Commission, as well as the Pensacola Chamber of Commerce's Military Affairs Committee.

As a former Deputy Sheriff, I understand the important and sometimes underappreciated role of law enforcement officers. Each and every day, dedicated law enforcement officers put themselves in danger to protect and serve their community as an officer of the law. Chief Simmons exemplifies all of the qualities of a world-class law enforcement officer, and his decades of service are a testament to his commitment to our Nation and the law enforcement community.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to recognize Chief Simmons for his service to the people of Northwest Florida. My wife Vicki and I congratulate him on his retirement and wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

FEDERAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE NONPROFIT FAIRNESS ACT OF 2015

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 2015

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, over two years ago the House came together in the wake of Superstorm Sandy and overwhelmingly supported and passed the Federal Disaster Assistance Nonprofit Fairness Act. Because the Senate failed to take action before the close of the 113th Congress, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has continued to deny houses of worship access to otherwise generally available disaster relief funds.

Today, along with my colleagues GRACE MENG and PETE KING, I am reintroducing this important legislation to achieve fairness and nondiscrimination in the manner by which FEMA distributes federal disaster assistance.

Houses of worship are foundational pillars of our communities. In the aftermath of disasters, they help feed, comfort, clothe, and shelter thousands of victims—yet when it comes to federal relief, they continue to be left out and left behind. While FEMA has a policy in place to aid nonprofit facilities damaged in disasters, it has excluded houses of worship from such support. This policy is patently unfair, unjustified, and discriminatory and may even suggest hostility to religion.

Plain and simple, it is wrong—and it is time that Congress ensures fundamental fairness for these essential private nonprofits. The bipartisan Federal Disaster Assistance Nonprofit Fairness Act of 2015 will ensure that houses of worship are eligible for federal disaster aid administered by FEMA. It is important to note that FEMA's discriminatory policy of exclusion is not prescribed by any law. There is nothing in the Stafford Act that precludes funds to repair, replace, or restore houses of worship.

Further, congressional precedent favors enactment of this legislation, as there are several pertinent examples of public funding being allocated to houses of worship. In 1995, federal grants were explicitly authorized and provided to churches damaged by the Oklahoma City terrorist attack. The Department of Homeland Security's (DHS) Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) provides funding to houses of worship for security upgrades. The Department of the Interior (DOI) proves funding to grants for historically significant properties, including active churches and active synagogues. The Small Business Administration (SBA) provides low-interest loans to houses of worship.

A controlling Department of Justice (DOJ) Office of Legal Counsel (OLC) memorandum explains in detail the legal principles that make the Federal Disaster Assistance Nonprofit Fairness Act constitutional. In a 2002 written opinion, the OLC concluded it was constitutional for Congress to provide disaster relief and reconstruction funds to a religious Jewish school, along with all sorts of other organizations, following a devastating earthquake. The same principles apply to protect religious organizations following other natural disasters, such as devastating hurricanes or tornadoes.

As the OLC memo concluded, ''we believe that provision of disaster assistance to the religious school cannot be materially distinguished from aid programs that are constitutional under longstanding Supreme Court precedent establishing that religious institutions are fully entitled to receive generally available government benefits and services, such as fire and police protection.''

This bipartisan legislation exhibits no government preference for or against religion, or any particular religion, as it merely permits houses of worship to receive the same type of generally available assistance. It not only passes the test of constitutionality, but the test of basic decency—permitting houses of worship to receive the same type of generally available assistance as many other similarly situated nonprofits in picking up the pieces after devastation.

As Professor Alan Dershowitz of Harvard Law School concluded in his 2013 analysis of the bill, ''once FEMA has the policy in place to aid various nonprofit organizations with their building repairs, houses of worship should not be excluded from receiving this aid on the same terms. This is all the more appropriate given the neutral role we have witnessed houses of worship play, without regard to the religion of those affected, in the wake of Sandy and countless previous disasters. Federal disaster relief aid is a form of social insurance and a means of helping battered communities get back on their feet. Churches, synagogues, mosques, and other houses of worship are an essential part of the recovery process.''

Similarly, Professor Douglas Laycock of the University of Virginia School of Law concluded that ''charitable contributions to places of worship are tax deductible, without significant controversy, even though the tax benefits to the donor are like a matching grant from the government. These deductions have been uncontroversial because they are included without discrimination in the much broader category of all not-for-profit organizations devoted to charitable, educational, religious, or scientific purposes. The neutral category here is equally broad. To include houses of worship in disaster relief is neutral; to exclude them would be affirmatively hostile. There is no constitutional obstacle to including them.''

This legislation is supported by a broad coalition of organizations who believe that the recovery of houses of worship is essential to the recovery of neighborhoods, towns, and States. Houses of worship are critical public institutions within our communities, and they must not be denied the equal treatment they deserve. I urge my colleagues to move swiftly and pass this much needed legislation.

RECOGNIZING SAMANTHA MOEN

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 2015

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Samantha Moen, of Santee, California, who qualified for the USA Shooting's National Junior Olympic Championship in International Trap. Samantha's hard work and dedication to the sport of trap shooting have earned her the distinct honor of representing not only the City of Santee, but the State of California in this month's Championship, taking place in Colorado Springs, Colorado.

Since 1995, USA Shooting has operated as the National Governing Body for the sport of shooting in the United States. The nonprofit organization represents all shooting athletes who go on to represent the United States in the Olympic and Paralympic games, meaning that only the nation's most qualified and distinguished shooters have the opportunity to train and compete at their Colorado Springs headquarters.

For many, the invitation to the National Junior Olympic Championship is the first opportunity young shooters have at realizing their dream of representing the United States on the international stage of shooting. In the case of Samantha, who took home the Silver Medal in the California Junior State Olympics, the sport of shooting has offered her something more than the opportunity to compete at the national level—it's paved her way to compete at the top collegiate shooting program in the nation, at Lindenwood University in St. Charles, Missouri.

In order to realize her dream of representing the United States in the Olympics, Samantha will have to continue honing her trap shooting abilities in the coming years. And I have no doubt that the experience of competing later this month in Colorado Springs will only further instill a desire in Samantha to strive for the best.

I'm honored to wish Samantha Moen the best of luck at the USA Shooting's National Junior Olympic Championship. I am sure Samantha will represent our community and state well, and am hopeful she will one day represent our nation on the international stage.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARK POCAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 2015

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, on July 14, 2015 I missed the first recorded vote, Roll #435. On Roll Call #435, I would have voted YEA (Passage of H.R. 251).

HONORING STERLING SMITH

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life and accomplishments of Sterling Smith, an extraordinary civic leader who will be remembered for his invaluable contributions to the community.

Sterling graduated from the University of Washington in 1963. From there, he secured a position teaching at Chinook Junior High, where he became chair of the English Department, and then later at Tyee High School. Sterling was well known as a beloved teacher with a high standard of excellence for his students. On top of his success as an educator, he was also known for his compassion, good humor, and the significant influence he had on the lives of his students.

During my own time as a student at Tyee, I was fortunate to have Sterling as a teacher. I am grateful for the positive impact that Sterling had on my life and my decision to pursue a career in public service. Sterling continued to teach language arts at Tyee until he retired in June 1994.

Sterling was an incredible educator and treasured community member dedicated to serving others in various capacities. He served on several boards that interviewed candidates running for office, including candidates for the Washington State Governor's office. Moreover, Sterling spent countless hours volunteering at the Kubota Gardens, one of Seattle's beautiful Japanese gardens and a cultural center for the region. Along with his partner, Jem, Smith was the caregiver to 37 patients living with AIDS over a 22 year span. On numerous occasions, Sterling and Jem also opened their Federal Way home and gardens to community activities, including events for the Federal Way Symphony Orchestra and the South End Social Group picnic.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I recognize the life of Sterling Smith, an individual whose unrelenting and quiet dedication to his students and community serves as an example of the tremendous impact one person can have.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF MR. MICHAEL GODBEY

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 2015

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding educator, Michael Godbey. Mr. Godbey leads Frankfort High School as its principal. Mr. Godbey's career as an educator spans twenty years. In this time he has served as an instructional assistant, bus driver, mathematics teacher, assistant principal, director of curriculum and instruction, and principal. Under Godbey's leadership, Frankfort High School has earned the classification of a Proficient and Progressing High School based on Kentucky's Next Generation Learner Accountability system. Frankfort High School was also ranked the Twelfth Best High School in the Commonwealth of Kentucky by U.S. News and World Report in 2014.

Mr. Godbey was recently selected as the 2015 Principal of the Year for the Commonwealth of Kentucky. This Award was presented by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP). Godbey earned this award by his accomplishments in the education field over the years. His dedication to the education of his students is evident.

Godbey earned his B.A. in Secondary Education from the University of Kentucky and his M.A. in Education from Eastern Kentucky University. Prior to his tenure at Frankfort High School, Godbey worked in the Danville, Kentucky Independent School district. He and his wife Claudia reside in Nicholasville, Kentucky with their sons Jared and Hayden.

Education of our nations' young men and women is critically important. Mr. Godbey has exemplified strong leadership and innovation and is very deserving of the recent Principal of the Year award. Mr. Speaker, I applaud his creative talents and dedication in the education field.

STATE BOARD OF NURSING APPOINTMENT

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Dr. Doris Jackson, DHA (ABD) for being appointed to the Texas Board of Nursing by Governor Greg Abbott.

Dr. Jackson, a Pearland resident, is a registered nurse and a professor at Lone Star College's associate degree nursing program in Kingwood. She is also a member of the Society of Pediatric Nurses, Texas Nurse Association, American Nurse Association and the Student Nurse Association Faculty Advisor. Dr. Jackson has used her role to care for others and to help future nurses become the best that they can be. Her appointment is well-deserved.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations to Dr. Doris Jackson on her appointment to the Texas Board of Nursing. Governor Abbott made a great decision in selecting you.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RICHARD M. NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 2015

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, on July 14th, 2015, I was unavoidably detained in a caucus event with several of my colleagues. Had I been present and voting on Roll Call No. 435, I would have voted yea.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 2015

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, during the week of July 6th I was unable to travel to Washington, D.C. for health reasons.

Had I been present, I would have cast the following votes:

July 7
Roll Call 390—yes
Roll Call 391—yes
July 8
Roll Call 392—no
Roll Call 393—yes
Roll Call 394—yes
Roll Call 395—yes
Roll Call 396—yes
Roll Call 397—yes
Roll Call 398—yes
Roll Call 399—yes
Roll Call 400—yes
Roll Call 401—yes
Roll Call 402—yes
Roll Call 403—yes
Roll Call 404—yes
Roll Call 405—yes
Roll Call 406—yes
Roll Call 407—no
Roll Call 408—no
Roll Call 409—no
Roll Call 410—no
Roll Call 411—yes
Roll Call 412—yes
Roll Call 413—yes
Roll Call 414—yes
Roll Call 415—yes
Roll Call 416—yes
Roll Call 417—yes
Roll Call 418—yes
Roll Call 419—no
Roll Call 420—no
Roll Call 421—yes
Roll Call 422—yes
Roll Call 423—no
July 9
Roll Call 424—no
Roll Call 425—no
Roll Call 426—no
Roll Call 427—yes
Roll Call 428—no
Roll Call 429—no
Roll Call 430—no
July 10
Roll Call 431—no
Roll Call 432—yes
Roll Call 433—yes

HONORING ANGEL GOMEZ AND OPERATION H.O.P.E.

HON. BETO O'ROURKE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 2015

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the tireless work and service to El Paso of Angel Gomez.

Angel Gomez is a lifelong El Pasoan, graduate of Bowie High School, and a Veteran of the United States Navy. After serving our nation in uniform, Angel continued his life of service by making a difference in the lives of El Pasoans.

Angel Gomez founded Operation H.O.P.E. (Helping Other People Endure) with long-time friend Ron Standing in November of 2009. With the continuous loving support of his wife, Patricia, and their daughter, Rubi, Angel has been able to bring a smile to the faces of thousands of families in need within the El Paso community.

Whether it is school supplies, clothing, blankets, toiletries, toys, food, or funeral services, Angel Gomez and Operation H.O.P.E. have consistently provided assistance and charitable work every Thanksgiving, Christmas, Easter, and throughout the year.

His commitment to helping others is truly inspiring and is an example for all Americans. I thank Angel Gomez and Operation H.O.P.E. for their passion for service and for helping so many in our community.

IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 5021

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 2015

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the following statement I made last year on H.R. 5021:

I am pleased that Congress is finally acting today, not with a looming crisis, but one that is already upon us. This is entirely predictable.

I have been arguing for months that Congress needs to act because the stopgap measure we did last Congress was designed to create precisely this Congress at precisely this time.

Sixty-two groups may have signed on a letter of support, but they prefer us to act meaningfully for long-term funding. They accept this because it is the only alternative to shutting down activities this summer.

My Republican friends are unwilling—not unable—but unwilling to resolve the funding contradictions. Revenues have failed to keep pace with the demands of an aging growing Nation, making no change for 21 years, as our infrastructure ages and falls apart, our Nation continues to grow and transportation patterns change. It is guaranteed that we should change as well.

This Congress has refused to address its responsibilities. The House Ways and Means Committee has not had a single hearing on transportation finance. One of our most important responsibilities, uniquely ours, one that is unlike so many other items we deal with, it is possible to resolve. We haven't had a hearing in the 43 months that the Republicans have been in charge of Congress.

Now, I understand there are conflicts within the Republican Caucus. There are some that appear satisfied with locking us into a slow, steady decline called for in the Republican budget— no new projects until October of 2015 and a 30 percent reduction over the next decade, at exactly the time the Federal partnership should be enhanced, not reduced.

There are others in the Republicans whose answer is to just abandon ship, to give up on the Federal partnership, slash the Federal gas tax, and abandon any hope of a national transportation policy and partnership to help States with projects that are multistate in nature or that need to be done whether economic times are bad.

That would be tragic and wrong to abandon the partnership that has meant so much, but it is part of what is driving some of our Republican Tea Party friends. Just because there may not be a majority in the Republican ranks for either approach does not mean that we should continue to dither.

Because Republicans friends are unwilling or unable to resolve this, we have frozen the Transportation Committee in place. They don't have a bill. They are not going to have a bill unless we resolve what the budget number is: increase, continue the downward slide, or abandon it altogether.

We will be no better off next May to resolve this question. In fact, we will be worse off because we will be in the middle of a Presidential campaign, with a new Congress, maybe new committee lineups.

We should reject this approach to hand off our responsibilities. We should resolve the resource question, and we should commit that this Congress is not going to recess for August vacation, not going to recess to campaign in October, until we have worked to give the American people a transportation bill they need—deserve—to jump-start the economy, create hundreds of thousands of family-wage jobs, and strengthen communities and families across the Nation.

American infrastructure used to be the best in the world and a point of pride bringing Americans together. It is now a source of embarrassment and deep concern as we fall further and further behind global leaders.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $18,151,890,180,391.62. We've added $7,525,013,131,478.54 to our debt in 6 years. This is over $7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

IN HONOR OF MR. WOODROW R. PACKER, SR.

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding educator and respected community leader, Mr. Woodrow R. Packer, Sr. Mr. Packer departed to his eternal reward on Saturday, July 11, 2015. A funeral service will be held at 11:00 a.m. on Friday, July 17, 2015 at St. Paul's Memorial Chapel in Lawrenceville, Virginia, where Mr. Packer's family will be surrounded by friends and loved ones paying their respects to a man who touched many lives, including my own.

Mr. Packer was born in Wilcox County, Alabama, on March 11, 1919 as the eleventh of twelve children born to the late Hal and Lucy Packer. Over the course of his lifetime, Mr. Packer exemplified the meaning of servant leadership. In 1942, Mr. Packer left his family in Alabama to serve his country in World War II, spending time in North Africa and Italy. Following his service in the war, he was honorably discharged as a Staff Sergeant in 1945.

Throughout his life, Mr. Packer always demonstrated a passion for knowledge. He earned a Bachelor of Science and Master of Education degree from Alabama State University in Montgomery, Alabama. He studied further at Carnegie-Mellon Institute of Technology in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Wesleyan University in Middletown, Connecticut; the University of Virginia in Charlottesville, Virginia; Virginia State University in Petersburg, Virginia; and the University of Georgia in Athens, Georgia.

During his lifelong pursuit of knowledge, Mr. Packer strove to impart this knowledge upon his students. In 1948, he began his career as an educator at Choctaw County High School in Butler, Alabama. Mr. Packer later became principal of Blount High School in Anniston, Alabama and then of Chickasaw Terrace School in Prichard, Alabama. In 1964, Mr. Packer moved to Farmville, Virginia to teach at R.R. Moton High School, now a historic landmark of the Civil Rights Movement.

Mr. Packer then went on to serve Saint Paul's College in Lawrenceville, Virginia for 27 years, first as an instructor, then as a Dean, before retiring as Vice President for Student Affairs. His dedication to Saint Paul's College was evident in the number of students he recruited, many from his home state of Alabama, which led to his being deemed ''The Alabama Dean.''

After retiring from education in 1991, he continued to contribute to the community by helping numerous friends and neighbors in Brunswick County. Mr. Packer served in countless leadership roles with organizations such as the Alberta Family Health Service, Brunswick Chamber of Commerce, Lawrenceville Rotary Club, and the Lawrenceville Town Council.

George Washington Carver once said, ''No individual has any right to come into the world and go out of it without leaving behind distinct and legitimate reasons for having passed through it.'' We are all so blessed that Mr. Woodrow Packer passed this way and during his life's journey did so much for so many for so long. He leaves behind a great legacy in education to the thousands of students, teachers, and administrators whose lives he touched and brightened.

On a personal note, Mr. Packer and his family were close personal friends of my family, as well as a role model and mentor to me. I have truly been blessed by his friendship, counsel and inspiration throughout the years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me and my wife, Vivian, in paying tribute to Mr. Woodrow R. Packer, Sr. for his dedication to educating young people, his passion for his country, and his deep commitment to his family and his community. We extend our deepest sympathies to Mr. Packer's family and friends during this very difficult time. May they be consoled and comforted by their abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks and months ahead.

RECOGNIZING MICHAEL F. COLLEY

HON. STEVE STIVERS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 2015

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my mentor and friend Michael F. Colley, who passed away at the age of 78 on June 20, 2015.

Michael Colley was born in Youngstown, Ohio and grew up in Columbus, Ohio. After graduating from St. Charles Preparatory School, Michael attended the Ohio State University where he served as President of his fraternity, Kappa Sigma, and was a member of the baseball team. Michael continued his education at Ohio State after graduation in law school, where he earned his Juris Doctoral degree in 1961.

Following his graduation from law school, Michael served in the Ohio National Guard and as an Assistant Prosecutor in the Columbus City Attorney's Office. Soon after, he went into private practice where he had an extremely successful career for his clients in personal injury, medical malpractice and product liability. Throughout his career, Michael served as president of state and national legal organizations: Ohio Academy of Trial Lawyers, the Franklin County Trial Lawyers Association, the Association of Trial Lawyers of America, and the American Board of Trial Advocates. Michael is distinguished as the only person to serve as president of both the Association of Trial Lawyers of America and the American Board of Trial Advocates.

Outside of the courtroom, Michael remained involved in his community and his alma mater. In 1968, Michael helped form the Direction for Youth and Families to help struggling youth and families in central Ohio. In 1991, Michael was appointed to the Board of Trustees for Ohio State and later served as Chairman of the Board. Michael rarely missed a Buckeye football or basketball game throughout his lifetime.

Michael showed an incredible dedication to his community and public service throughout his life.

HOMETOWN BASKETBALL STARS

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Harrison twins from Richmond, TX in Fort Bend County for their outstanding performance and success in their young basketball careers.

Together, they won a basketball state championship for Travis High School, competed in two NCAA Final Fours and were prospects in the 2015 NBA draft. Andrew Harrison was selected by the Phoenix Suns to play in the NBA before being traded to the Memphis Grizzlies. Aaron Harrison has the opportunity to play in the NBA summer league for the Charlotte Hornets. These young men have made their parents, coaches, and the rest of Fort Bend County proud.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations to the Harrison twins on all of their achievements. We look forward to hearing more about their continued success on and off the court.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JONATHAN ROSADO

HON. BRENDAN F. BOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 2015

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Jonathan Rosado, senselessly murdered in the Cayuga section of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania late last year, was a model citizen who generously shared his strong character and kind spirit through the act of teaching tennis to disadvantaged children. Jonathan's commitment to his students was motivated by far more than the perfection of the game's technique, though; he was deeply committed to serving as a thoroughly positive role model for his pupils. Jonathan fostered the Legacy Youth Tennis program's presence in the Hunting Park community, a groundbreaking addition to youth programming for this North Philadelphia neighborhood.

Jonathan's ingenuity and steadfast commitment to community service has served as a tremendous benefit to the many lives he has 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. His selflessness helped to cultivate the potential of the children in his community, who will in turn grow up to follow Jonathan's constructive example.

Although he is sorely missed by all, Jonathan's bright spirit will continue to be felt in Hunting Park long into the future. I submit this statement so that Jonathan's example can be more widely witnessed across the nation and across time.

IN HONOR OF THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF TRINITY TEST

HON. BEN RAY LUJÁN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 2015

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of those who have fallen ill or passed on due to radiation exposure from the Trinity test. On this day 70 years ago, rural New Mexico became ground zero for the detonation of the first nuclear bomb. While it would usher in the start of the atomic age, it also marked the beginning of sickness and suffering for generations of people who lived and grew up in the Tularosa Basin and other areas downwind of the test site.

Today, we remember those who continue to bear the costs of nuclear testing decades later and recommit to seeking recognition and compensation for the men and women who have been gravely impacted. As a nation we have a responsibility to act and acknowledge the pain that so many New Mexicans and other downwinders have experienced following the Trinity Test. The legacy of that moment in our nation's history is still alive and continues to be felt to this very day by all those battling cancer and other diseases as a result of radiation exposure.

It is long past time for Congress to take action and pass legislation expanding the Radiation Expose Compensation Act so that these individuals are no longer left behind, and so that we can come to terms with the full impact of the nuclear age.

Though we can never fully compensate these Americans for what they have lost, they deserve to be recognized and receive just compensation that will help generations of families who have gotten sick because of uranium mining or nuclear testing. The men and women who have suffered from radiation exposure must not be forgotten.

IN OPPOSITION TO THE RULE ON H.R. 5021

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 2015

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the following statement I made last year on the Rule on H.R. 5021:

I listened carefully to what you said, and you are right—this closed rule is a disservice. My respected friend from Florida, I think, is just wrong.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a solution, and it is not a deliberate, thoughtful process. We have not had a single hearing on transportation finance in the Ways and Means Committee all year. We didn't have one the year before that. We haven't had a hearing in the 43 months that Republicans have been in charge.

This is a perfectly predictable problem that was created by the halfhearted bill that they passed last Congress. We knew this was coming for months. Now we are here.

With all due respect, I, too, am disappointed that we have a rule that does not make in order broad discussion and amendment. We have been unable in this Congress to deal meaningfully with the looming transportation crisis.

The gentleman is on the Transportation Committee. He doesn't have a bill. We are almost through this Congress, and we don't have a bill. America is falling apart. America is falling behind. We have failed to give America's communities the resources and a robust 6-year reauthorization plan.

We have done it before under the chairmanship of Bud Shuster and Ranking Member Jim Oberstar, and I was happy to have played a small role. That bill made a difference.

If we fail to come to grips with the funding level and, instead, in approving this rule and the underlying bill, this Congress is giving itself a ticket out of town to adjourn and pass it on to not just the next Congress but to the Congress after that. Make no mistake. In May 2015, you are not going to be in any different a place. It is going to be May 2017.

Congress has legitimate policy differences. I appreciate my friend from New Jersey. Some people think that the Federal Government should get out of the partnership that we have had and reduce or eliminate the Federal gas tax.

They are willing to give up on the successful partnership and let each State decide what to do, when it wants to do it, or what it is able or not able to do. They would abandon all sense of a national vision and the ability to shape transportation policies. That is rejected by the mayors, rejected by county commissioners, rejected by State transportation officials. They want that partnership.

Frankly, there are some people who feel the gas tax ought to be adjusted to deal with inflation and increased fuel economy as well as the demands of a growing Nation with an aging infrastructure.

Some people are comfortable with the Republican budget, which will have no new projects for 15 months and will doom us to a 30 percent reduction over the next 10 years.

Those are legitimate policy differences, but we are not dealing with them here on the floor. We are shrugging our shoulders, passing them on to the next Congress and, frankly, to the Congress after that.

I agree with the people who build and maintain and use our transportation infrastructure. We should address this infrastructure question head on. American infrastructure used to be the best in the world and a point of pride, bringing Americans together. It is now a source of embarrassment and deep concern as we fall further and further behind global leaders.

We ought to reject this rule. We ought to allow full debate and, by all means, resolve the funding question now so we can go forward. America deserves no less.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE INTRODUCTION OF THE COMMISSION ON AMERICANS LIVING ABROAD ACT OF 2015

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 2015

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, there are an estimated 6–8 million constituents scattered across the world who promote our culture and values while strengthening our nation's global influence as they live and work abroad. For years I have worked to ensure that overseas Americans can fully exercise their rights as U.S. citizens by having their voices heard loud and clear by Congress. Eight years ago, I formed the Congressional Americans Abroad Caucus because I wanted to bring awareness and focus to the concerns of those residing abroad. U.S. citizens remain just that, citizens, regardless of where they choose to live and should not be ignored by virtue of residence.

Our constituents living and working abroad have consistently voiced concerns about the impact federal policies have on the issues directly affecting them like voting, immigration, access to financial institutions, and taxation. The time has come to take a look at the importance of federal policies for our overseas community rather than continuing to ignore the calls from our abroad constituents. That is why today I am introducing the Commission on Americans Living Abroad Act, which creates an Executive Commission with the main purpose of examining those concerns. The Commission creates a 10 member panel to examine the impact of federal policymaking on U.S. citizens abroad. The resulting study would then be used by Congress and the Executive Branch when considering the best steps we can take to engage the abroad community and ensure their voices are heard. This process will ensure clearer awareness of the federal issues impacting Americans abroad and will open a path for coordination with those communities towards more robust representation.

We must take a real and comprehensive look at how we, as Members of Congress, respond to U.S. citizens living abroad. Each of our constituents has a right to have their interests represented and to have a role in the political process. The Commission on Americans Living Abroad would establish a foundation from which we can work to better serve the needs of our global constituents. I welcome and urge my colleagues to lend their support to this bill.

HONORING THE LIFE OF NORMAN BUCHERT

HON. TED LIEU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 2015

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker. I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Mr. Norman Buchert, a loving family man and successful engineer. Upon graduating from the University of Florida, Norman began working in a nascent aerospace industry at the Kennedy Space Center, contributing to the development of the Apollo 11 launch and other space shuttle launches. Throughout his life he loved to tell stories about his time working in the space program.

While Norman's career as an engineer is remarkable, his role as a loving family man is what he will be remembered for most. I have had the privilege of working closely with his daughter, Genelle, who truly embodies his caring spirit. He has left a positive mark on our world and that his legacy will live on through his family.

Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleagues will join with me in honoring the life of this special man. We should all be so fortunate to live such a full life. I submit his obituary:

Norman Charles Buchert was born in Cincinnati, Ohio on May 13, 1942. He graduated from Port St. Joe High School, Port St. Joe, Florida; and from the University of Florida with a BS and MS in Electrical Engineering.

His career began at Kennedy Space Center on January 27th, 1967 with North American Aviation (NAA) as an RF and Telemetry Engineer working on the Apollo/Saturn Launch Vehicle second stage. He then worked on the Saturn V moon launches including the Apollo II launch to the moon (and back) and worked in the Saturn V Launch Control Center Firing room at the RF and Telemetry console. He later transferred to the Apollo Command and Service Module (CSM) organization to work on the experiments that the CSM carried to the moon and the Lunar Sounder experiment searching for water on the moon. Their first daughter, Genelle, was born shortly after man's first walk on the moon. Twenty two months later their second daughter, Charisse, was born.

In 1972, he began work as a Space Shuttle design integration engineer in Downey, California for NAA. In 1975, their third daughter, Felicia, was born. That same year he transferred back to KSC to help design, manufacture and install the Orbiter Processing Facility Communications and Tracking checkout station. In 1984, they welcomed their youngest daughter, April. Promoted to Supervisor of the NAA Communications and Tracking group, he supervised the checkout of the first Shuttle launch Orbiter Communications and Navaids Systems eventually becoming the Director of Advanced Programs and Business Development for Rockwell (formerly NAA) at KSC. After Boeing purchased the Space Division portion of Rockwell in 1996, Norman became the Director of Advanced Engineering for the Space Shuttle Program finishing his career in this capacity. Norman received many awards and recognitions including the Astronaut Snoopy award for his work on the Apollo Program presented by Apollo astronaut, Hank Hartsfield.

Norman worked for Boeing for over 44 years; was an avid University of Florida Gator sports fan; enjoyed talking about his experiences in the space program as a KSC

docent; was active in his church; was a doting grandfather, and devoted owner of his prized mutt, Mars Rover.

He is survived by Carol, his wife of 47 years, daughters, Genelle Buchert, Charisse Buchert, Felicia Kai (Sam) and April Walters (Cameron); brother Jerry Buchert (Laurie), sisters, Margie Vogt (Jim) and Carole Pille (Skip), half sister Chris Haley (Pat) and step sister Marlene Guerrieri (Bruno); beloved grandchildren Annabella Kai, Graciella Kai and Serenity Kai (with a fourth grandchild in progress) and many nieces and nephews.

Norman was welcomed into Heaven on May 9, 2015, after a brave and courageous battle with cancer. He was preceded in death by his father Robert Valentine Buchert and mothers, Erline Buchert and Norma Riester Boehl. He will be in our hearts always.

HONORING APHRODITE LOUTAS

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 2015

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and thank my constituent Aphrodite Loutas, who is retiring after a distinguished 28-year career of public service. Ms. Loutas has been District 14 Chief of Staff for the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Service (USCIS) since her appointment in 2009 and is currently the Acting District Director.

Ms. Loutas started her federal government service with Immigration and Naturalization Services (INS) in 1987 as a Supervisory Legalization Officer for the Legalization Program. She became an Immigration Examiner in 1990, and was a supervisor in Citizenship from 1991 through 1997. In 1997 she served as Central Regional Coordinator for the Headquarters Office of Naturalization Operations.

Ms. Loutas was then appointed as Special Assistant to the District Director in the Chicago district in 1999 and served in that capacity until 2005. From 2005 to 2009, she was the Assistant Director for Mission Support.

Ms. Loutas was honored in 2011 with the USCIS Director's Heritage Award for her outstanding service.

My staff and I have had the pleasure of working closely with Ms. Loutas since 1999. She is compassionate, efficient, effective, and an exemplary public servant. She will be greatly missed.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, July 16, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 21

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of General Mark A. Milley, USA, to be Chief of Staff of the Army.

SH–216

10 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Administration's immigration enforcement policies.

SD–226

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Paul Wayne Jones, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Poland, Hans G. Klemm, of Michigan, to be Ambassador to Romania, Kathleen Ann Doherty, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Cyprus, and James Desmond Melville, Jr., of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Estonia.

SD–419

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Subcommittee on Employment and Workplace Safety

To hold hearings to examine the Department of Labor's investment proposal for American families and retirees.

SD–430

JULY 22

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Investment

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Financial Stability Oversight Council designation process.

SD–538

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Marie Therese Dominguez, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation.

SR–253

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine reauthorizing the Higher Education Act, focusing on exploring barriers and opportunities within innovation.

SD–430

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine protecting the electric grid from the potential threats of solar storms and electromagnetic pulse.

SD–342

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of John Michael Vazquez, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey, Wilhelmina Marie Wright, to be United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota, Paula Xinis, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland, and Cono R. Namorato, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice.

SD–226

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

To hold hearings to examine targeted tax reform, focusing on solutions to relieve the tax compliance burden for America's small businesses.

SR–428A

1:30 p.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Oversight, Agency Action, Federal Rights and Federal Courts

To hold hearings to examine Supreme Court activism and possible solutions.

SD–226

2:15 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings to examine safeguarding the integrity of Indian gaming.

SH–216

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine combating medicare provider enrollment fraud.

SD–562

JULY 23

10 a.m.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine health information technology, focusing on information blocking and potential solutions.

SD–430

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Denise Turner Roth, of North Carolina, to be Administrator of General Services, General Services Administration.

SD–342

AUGUST 4

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the back-end of the nuclear fuel cycle and related legislation, including S. 854, to establish a new organization to manage nuclear waste, provide a consensual process for siting nuclear waste facilities, ensure adequate funding for managing nuclear waste.

SD–366

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S5091–S5132

Measures Introduced: Eighteen bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 1766–1783, and S.J. Res. 19. **Page S5129**

Measures Reported:

Special Report entitled "Further Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals from the Concurrent Resolution for Fiscal Year 2016". (S. Rept. No. 114–81)

S. 1647, to amend title 23, United States Code, to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs, with amendments. (S. Rept. No. 114–80) **Pages S5128–29**

Measures Considered:

Every Child Achieves Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of S. 1177, to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that every child achieves, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S5092–S5125**

Adopted:

Alexander (for McCain/Reid) Amendment No. 2111 (to Amendment No. 2089), to express the sense of Congress that John Arthur "Jack" Johnson should receive a posthumous pardon for the racially-motivated conviction in 1913 that diminished the athletic, cultural, and historical significance of Jack Johnson and unduly tarnished his reputation. **Pages S5094–95**

Murray (for Bennet/Ayotte) Amendment No. 2141 (to Amendment No. 2089), to provide for shared services strategies and models. **Page S5095**

Alexander (for Ayotte/Blumenthal) Amendment No. 2145 (to Amendment No. 2089), to allow States to use State activity funds provided under part A of title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 for certain evidence-based mental health awareness programs. **Page S5095**

Murray (for Udall) Amendment No. 2149 (to Amendment No. 2089), to allow the Bureau of Indian Education to apply for certain competitive grants under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. **Page S5095**

Murray (for Feinstein) Amendment No. 2150 (to Amendment No. 2089), to allow eligible entities to use funds provided under part A of title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 for bilingual paraprofessionals and linguistically responsive materials. **Page S5095**

Murray (for Carper/Ayotte) Modified Amendment No. 2151 (to Amendment No. 2089), to amend part A of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improve preparation programs and strengthen support for principals and other school leaders. **Page S5095**

Murray (for King/Capito) Amendment No. 2154 (to Amendment No. 2089), to authorize the Institute of Education Sciences to conduct a study on student access to digital learning resources outside of the school day. **Pages S5095–96**

Alexander (for Thune) Amendment No. 2155 (to Amendment No. 2089), to require a report on responses to Indian student suicides. **Page S5096**

Alexander (for Flake) Amendment No. 2157 (to Amendment No. 2089), to reserve funds for an evaluation of early learning alignment and improvement grants. **Page S5096**

Alexander (for Lee) Amendment No. 2234 (to Amendment No. 2089), to establish a rule of construction regarding travel to and from school. **Page S5096**

Murray (for Booker) Amendment No. 2170 (to Amendment No. 2089), to amend the early learning alignment and improvement grant program under part I of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that States support early childhood education programs that maintain disciplinary policies that do not include expulsion or suspension of participating children. **Page S5096**

Murray (for Coons) Amendment No. 2178 (to Amendment No. 2089), to encourage increasing the amount of funds available for parent and family engagement. **Page S5096**

Alexander (for McCain) Amendment No. 2181 (to Amendment No. 2089), to allow States to use funding under part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to replicate and

expand successful practices from high-performing public schools. **Page S5096**

Murray (for Whitehouse) Amendment No. 2185 (to Amendment No. 2089), to support innovation schools. **Page S5096**

Alexander (for Blunt) Amendment No. 2195 (to Amendment No. 2089), to amend section 1113(c) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to allow local educational agencies to address the needs of children in schools served by schoolwide programs by providing school-based mental health programs. **Page S5096**

Murray (for Gillibrand) Amendment No. 2216 (to Amendment No. 2089), to require a report on cybersecurity education. **Pages S5096–97**

Alexander (for Graham) Amendment No. 2199 (to Amendment No. 2089), to include entrepreneurship as a local educational agency allowable use of funds under title II. **Page S5097**

Alexander Amendment No. 2201 (to Amendment No. 2089), to provide that State assessments not evaluate or assess personal or family beliefs and attitudes, or publicly disclose personally identifiable information. **Page S5097**

Murray (for Bennet) Amendment No. 2225 (to Amendment No. 2089), to improve title I by including information about assessments in the categories of information that parents have a right to know about. **Page S5097**

Murray (for Booker/Bennet) Amendment No. 2224 (to Amendment No. 2089), to assess and improve educator support and working conditions. **Page S5097**

Alexander (for Cornyn) Amendment No. 2227 (to Amendment No. 2089), to reauthorize the Education Flexibility Partnership Act of 1999. **Page S5097**

Rejected:

By 44 yeas to 53 nays (Vote No. 238), Murray (for Markey) Amendment No. 2176 (to Amendment No. 2089), to establish a climate change education program. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, was not agreed to.) **Pages S5102, S5115**

By 58 yeas to 39 nays (Vote No. 239), Murray (for Heitkamp) Amendment No. 2171 (to Amendment No. 2089), to reinstate grants to improve the mental health of children. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, was not agreed to.) **Pages S5099, S5115–16**

By 46 yeas to 50 nays (Vote No. 240), Alexander (for Kirk) Amendment No. 2161 (to Amendment No. 2089), to ensure that States measure and report on indicators of student access to critical educational resources and identify disparities in such resources. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, was not agreed to.) **Pages S5093, S5116–17**

By 43 yeas to 54 nays (Vote No. 241), Murray (for Murphy) Amendment No. 2241 (to Amendment No. 2089), to amend the accountability provisions. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, was not agreed to.) **Pages S5102, S5106–08, S5114–15, S5117**

Withdrawn:

Murray (for Warren/Gardner) Amendment No. 2120 (to Amendment No. 2089), to amend section 1111(d) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 regarding the cross-tabulation of student data. **Pages S5093, S5104**

Alexander (for Wicker) Amendment No. 2144 (to Amendment No. 2089), to provide States and local educational agencies with resources on climate theory to promote improved science education. **Pages S5102, S5115**

Pending:

Alexander/Murray Amendment No. 2089, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S5093**

Murray (for Peters) Amendment No. 2095 (to Amendment No. 2089), to allow local educational agencies to use parent and family engagement funds for financial literacy activities. **Page S5093**

Murray (for Coons/Rubio) Amendment No. 2243 (to Amendment No. 2089), to authorize the establishment of American Dream Accounts. **Page S5098**

Alexander (for Cruz/Lee) Amendment No. 2180 (to Amendment No. 2089), to provide for State-determined assessment and accountability systems. **Page S5098**

Alexander (for Hatch/Bennet) Amendment No. 2082 (to Amendment No. 2089), to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 relating to early learning. **Page S5099**

Murray (for Warren) Amendment No. 2106 (to Amendment No. 2089), to amend title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to include specialized instructional support personnel in the literacy development of children. **Page S5099**

Alexander (for Burr/Bennet) Modified Amendment No. 2247 (to Amendment No. 2089), to amend the allocation of funds under subpart 2 of part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. **Pages S5099–S5102, S5108–11, S5117**

Murray (for Murphy) Amendment No. 2186 (to Amendment No. 2089), to establish the Promise Neighborhoods program. **Page S5102**

Murray (for Brown/Manchin) Amendment No. 2100 (to Amendment No. 2089), to amend title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of

1965 to establish a full-service community schools grant program. **Page S5102**

Murray (for Sanders) Amendment No. 2177 (to Amendment No. 2089), to provide for youth jobs. **Pages S5102, S5112–14**

Murray (for Casey) Amendment No. 2242 (to Amendment No. 2089), to establish a Federal-State partnership to provide access to high-quality public prekindergarten programs from low-income and moderate-income families to ensure that they enter kindergarten prepared for success.

Page S5102, S5111–12

Murray (for Schatz) Amendment No. 2130 (to Amendment No. 2089), to amend title I to support assessments of school facilities. **Page S5102**

Murray (for Nelson) Modified Amendment No. 2215 (to Amendment No. 2089), to include partnering with current and recently retired STEM professionals and tailoring educational resources to engage students and teachers in STEM.

Pages S5102–03

Murray (for Manchin/Ayotte) Amendment No. 2222 (to Amendment No. 2089), to amend the State plan requirements of section 1111 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to support children facing substance abuse in the home.

Page S5103

Alexander (for Boozman/Gillibrand) Amendment No. 2231 (to Amendment No. 2089), to support professional development to help students prepare for postsecondary education and the workforce.

Page S5103

Murray (for Baldwin/Whitehouse) Amendment No. 2188 (to Amendment No. 2089), to ensure States will ensure the unique needs of students at all levels of schooling. **Page S5103**

Alexander (for Capito/Durbin) Amendment No. 2156 (to Amendment No. 2089), to amend the State report card under section 1111 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to include the rates of enrollment in postsecondary education, and remediation rates, for high schools. **Page S5103**

Alexander (for Thune) Amendment No. 2232 (to Amendment No. 2089), to allow extended services Project SERV grants under part A of title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to be available for violence prevention activities.

Page S5103

Murray (for King/Capito) Amendment No. 2256 (to Amendment No. 2089), to amend the definitions of eligible technology and technology readiness survey and to provide a restriction on funds.

Pages S5103–04

Murray (for Schatz) Amendment No. 2240 (to Amendment No. 2089), to provide resources needed to study and review Native American language medium schools and programs. **Page S5104**

Murray (for Warren/Gardner) Amendment No. 2249 (to Amendment No. 2089), to amend section 1111(c) of the ESEA to require States to provide an assurance regarding cross-tabulation of student data.

Page S5104

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 86 yeas to 12 nays (Vote No. 237), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on Alexander/Murray Amendment No. 2089 (listed above). **Page S5098**

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at a time to be determined by the Majority Leader, in consultation with the Democratic Leader, on Thursday, July 16, 2015, Senate vote on or in relation to the following amendments: Murray (for Coons/Rubio) Amendment No. 2243 (to Amendment No. 2089) (listed above), Alexander (for Cruz/Lee) Amendment No. 2180 (to Amendment No. 2089) (listed above), Alexander (for Hatch/Bennet) Amendment No. 2082 (to Amendment No. 2089) (listed above), Murray (for Warren) Amendment No. 2106 (to Amendment No. 2089) (listed above), Alexander (for Burr/Bennet) Modified Amendment No. 2247 (to Amendment No. 2089) (listed above), Murray (for Murphy) Amendment No. 2186 (to Amendment No. 2089) (listed above), Murray (for Brown/Manchin) Amendment No. 2100 (to Amendment No. 2089) (listed above), Murray (for Sanders) Amendment No. 2177 (to Amendment No. 2089) (listed above), Murray (for Casey) Amendment No. 2242 (to Amendment No. 2089) (listed above), Murray (for Schatz) Amendment No. 2130 (to Amendment No. 2089) (listed above), Murray (for Nelson) Modified Amendment No. 2215 (to Amendment No. 2089) (listed above), Murray (for Manchin/Ayotte) Amendment No. 2222 (to Amendment No. 2089) (listed above), Alexander (for Boozman/Gillibrand) Amendment No. 2231 (to Amendment No. 2089) (listed above), Murray (for Baldwin/Whitehouse) Amendment No. 2188 (to Amendment No. 2089) (listed above), Alexander (for Capito/Durbin) Amendment No. 2156 (to Amendment No. 2089) (listed above), Alexander (for Thune) Amendment No. 2232 (to Amendment No. 2089) (listed above), Murray (for King/Capito) Amendment No. 2256 (to Amendment No. 2089) (listed above), Murray (for Schatz) Amendment No. 2240 (to Amendment No. 2089) (listed above), and Murray (for Warren/Gardner) Amendment No. 2249 (to Amendment No. 2089) (listed above); that no second-degree amendments be in order to any of the amendments prior to the votes on or in relation to

the amendments; that there be two minutes equally divided prior to each vote; that all after the first vote in each series be ten minutes in length; and that the following amendments in this agreement be subject to a 60 affirmative vote threshold for adoption: Murray (for Coons/Rubio) Amendment No. 2243 (to Amendment No. 2089), Murray (for Sanders) Amendment No. 2177 (to Amendment No. 2089), and Murray (for Casey) Amendment No. 2242 (to Amendment No. 2089). **Page S5097**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at 10:45 a.m., on Thursday, July 16, 2015, Senate vote on or in relation to the following amendments in the order listed: Alexander (for Cruz/Lee) Amendment No. 2180 (to Amendment No. 2089), Murray (for Sanders) Amendment No. 2177 (to Amendment No. 2089), Murray (for Coons/Rubio) Amendment No. 2243 (to Amendment No. 2089), Alexander (for Burr/Bennet) Modified Amendment No. 2247 (to Amendment No. 2089), Murray (for Brown/Manchin) Amendment No. 2100 (to Amendment No. 2089), Murray (for Casey) Amendment No. 2242 (to Amendment No. 2089), Alexander (for Hatch/Bennet) Amendment No. 2082 (to Amendment No. 2089), Murray (for Warren) Amendment No. 2106 (to Amendment No. 2089), Murray (for Schatz) Amendment No. 2130 (to Amendment No. 2089), Murray (for Murphy) Amendment No. 2186 (to Amendment No. 2089), Murray (for Nelson) Modified Amendment No. 2215 (to Amendment No. 2089), Murray (for Manchin/Ayotte) Amendment No. 2222 (to Amendment No. 2089), Alexander (for Boozman/Gillibrand) Amendment No. 2231 (to Amendment No. 2089), Murray (for Baldwin/Whitehouse) Amendment No. 2188 (to Amendment No. 2089), Alexander (for Capito/Durbin) Amendment No. 2156 (to Amendment No. 2089), Alexander (for Thune) Amendment No. 2232 (to Amendment No. 2089), Murray (for King/Capito) Amendment No. 2256 (to Amendment No. 2089), Murray (for Schatz) Amendment No. 2240 (to Amendment No. 2089), and Murray (for Warren/Gardner) Amendment No. 2249 (to Amendment No. 2089). **Page S5125**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, July 16, 2015; and that all time during the adjournment of the Senate count post-cloture on Alexander/Murray Amendment No. 2089 (listed above). **Page S5132**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

3 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

2 Army nominations in the rank of general.

2 Marine Corps nominations in the rank of general.

3 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force and Army.

Page S5132

Messages from the House: **Page S5126**

Measures Referred: **Page S5126**

Executive Communications: **Pages S5126–28**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S5129–31**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Page S5131**

Additional Statements:

Amendments Submitted: **Page S5131**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S5131–32**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S5132**

Record Votes: Five record votes were taken today. (Total—241) **Pages S5098, S5115–17**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:22 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, July 16, 2015. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S5132.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

CFPB SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's semi-annual report to Congress, after receiving testimony from Richard Cordray, Director, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

INTEGRITY OF INTERNATIONAL SOCCER

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the governance and integrity of international soccer, after receiving testimony from Andrew Jennings, British Broadcasting Corporation, Penrith, United Kingdom; Daniel Flynn, United States Soccer Federation, Chicago, Illinois; Michael Hershman, Fairfax Group, McLean, Virginia; and Sunjeev Bery, Amnesty International USA, New York, New York.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee ordered favorably reported S. 1732, to authorize elements of the Department of Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Kristen Marie Kulinowski, of New York, to be a Member of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board for a term of five years, who was introduced by Senator Markey, and Gregory Guy Nadeau, of Maine, to be Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, who was introduced by Senators Collins and King, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARDS HAITI

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Transnational Crime, Civilian Security, Democracy, Human Rights, and Global Women's Issues concluded a hearing to examine United States policy towards Haiti prior to the elections, after receiving testimony from Thomas C. Adams, Haiti Special Coordinator, Office of the Haiti Special Coordinator, Department of State.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Perry L. Holloway, of South Carolina, to be Ambassador to the Co-operative Republic of Guyana, Laura Farnsworth Dogu, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Nicaragua, Roberta S. Jacobson, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the United Mexican States, and Peter F. Mulrean, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Haiti, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

SECURING THE BORDER

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine securing the border, focusing on understanding threats and strategies for the maritime border, after receiving testimony from Rear Admiral Peter J. Brown, Assistant Commandant for Response Policy, Coast Guard, Randolph D. Alles, Assistant Commissioner, Office of Air and Marine, Customs and Border Protection, and Peter T. Edge, Executive Associate Director, Homeland Security Investigations, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, all of the Department of Homeland Security.

JUVENILE JUSTICE IN INDIAN COUNTRY OVERSIGHT

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine juvenile justice in Indian Country, focusing on challenges and promising strategies, after receiving testimony from Robert L. Listenbee, Administrator, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, Department of Justice; Darren Cruzan, Director, Office of Justice Services, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; Addie C. Rolnick, University of Nevada William S. Boyd School of Law, Las Vegas; and Carla Knapp, Boys and Girls Clubs of America, Fort Myers, Florida.

DIABETES RESEARCH

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded a hearing to examine diabetes research, focusing on improving lives on the path to a cure, after receiving testimony from Griffin P. Rodgers, Director, National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services; Habib Zaghouani, University of Missouri School of Medecine, Columbia; Amelia Cooper, Kansas City, Missouri, and Isabelle Levesque, Arundel, Maine, both of JDRF Children's Congress; Robert S. Amato, Johnston, Rhode Island; and Kate Hall, Casco, Maine.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 20 public bills, H.R. 3064–3083; and 4 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 63; and H. Res. 363–365 were introduced. **Pages H5235–38**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H5238–39**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Moolenaar to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H5175**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:14 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H5183**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Reverend Dr. William Langford, Great Bridge Baptist Church, Chesapeake, Virginia. **Page H5183**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Page H5183**

Breast Cancer Awareness Commemorative Coin Act: Agreed by unanimous consent that the text of H.R. 2722, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of the fight against breast cancer, as proposed to be passed under suspension of the rules, be modified by the amendment placed at the desk. **Pages H5183–84**

Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015, Part II: The House passed 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, by a recorded vote of 312 ayes to 119 noes, Roll No. 441. **Pages H5188–S5213**

Rejected the Van Hollen motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 185 yeas to 244 nays, Roll No. 440. **Pages H5210–13**

H. Res. 362, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 2898) and (H.R. 3038) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 245 ayes to 183 noes, Roll No. 439, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 245 yeas to 182 nays, Roll No. 438. **Pages H5197–98**

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure which was debated on Tuesday, July 14th:

Breast Cancer Awareness Commemorative Coin Act: H.R. 2722, amended, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of the fight against breast cancer, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 421 yeas to 9 nays with one answering "present", Roll No. 442. **Pages H5213–14**

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, July 16. **Page H5214**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Steve Gleason Act of 2015: 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; and **Pages H5214–17**

Medicare Independence at Home Medical Practice Demonstration Improvement Act of 2015: 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. **Pages H5217–19**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H5184.

Senate Referrals: S. 1300 and S. 1482 were held at the desk. S. 756 was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. **Page H5184**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H5197, H5197–98, H5212–13, H5213 and H5213–14. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:38 p.m.

Committee Meetings

RECOGNIZING THE CONTINUING CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE 1890S LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITIES ON THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PASSAGE OF THE SECOND MORRILL ACT

Committee on Agriculture: Full Committee held a hearing on recognizing the continuing contributions of the 1890s Land-Grant Universities on the 125th Anniversary of the passage of the Second Morrill Act. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE OF SNAP: DEVELOPING AND USING EVIDENCE-BASED SOLUTIONS

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Nutrition held a hearing entitled "Past, Present, and Future of SNAP: Developing and Using Evidence-Based Solutions". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MONETARY POLICY AND THE STATE OF THE ECONOMY

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Monetary Policy and the State of the Economy". Testimony was heard from Janet Yellen, Chair of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

U.S. ECONOMIC AND MILITARY ALLIANCES IN ASIA

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific held a hearing entitled "U.S. Economic and Military Alliances in Asia". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE RISE OF RADICALIZATION: IS THE U.S. GOVERNMENT FAILING TO COUNTER INTERNATIONAL AND DOMESTIC TERRORISM?; MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''The Rise of Radicalization: Is the U.S. Government Failing to Counter International and Domestic Terrorism?''; and a markup on H.R. 2899, the ''Countering Violent Extremism Act of 2015''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses. H.R. 2899 was ordered reported, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 1656, the ''Secret Service Improvements Act of 2015''. H.R. 1656 was ordered reported, as amended.

OVERSIGHT HEARING ON THE OFFICE OF INFORMATION AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law held a hearing entitled ''Oversight Hearing on the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs''. Testimony was heard from Howard A. Shelanksi, Administrator, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs; and public witnesses.

THE FUTURE OF HYDRAULIC FRACTURING ON FEDERALLY MANAGED LANDS

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing entitled ''The Future of Hydraulic Fracturing on Federally Managed Lands''. Testimony was heard from Neil Kornze, Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Indian, Insular and Alaska Native Affairs held a hearing on H.R. 1028, the ''Return of Certain Lands At Fort Wingate to The Original Inhabitants Act''; H.R. 2684, the ''Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas Equal and Fair Opportunity Settlement Act''; and H.R. 2733, the ''Nevada Native Nations Lands Act''. Testimony was heard from Representatives Pearce, Babin, and Amodei; Michael Smith, Deputy Director, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; and public witnesses.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM, PART II

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Criminal Justice Reform, Part II''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

CYBERSECURITY: THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Information Technology; and Subcommittee on the Interior, held a joint hearing entitled ''Cybersecurity: The Department of the Interior''. Testimony was heard from Sylvia Burns, Chief Information Officer, Department of the Interior; and Mary Kendall, Deputy Inspector General, Department of the Interior.

INVESTIGATING CONTRACT MISCONDUCT AT THE NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Investigating Contract Misconduct at the National Weather Service''. Testimony was heard from Mark Greenblatt, Deputy Assistant General for Compliance and Ethics, Office of Inspector General, Department of Commerce.

TAKING FLIGHT: SMALL BUSINESS UTILIZATION OF UNMANNED AIRCRAFT

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Taking Flight: Small Business Utilization of Unmanned Aircraft''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE; EXPLORING VA'S ADMINISTRATION OF INDIVIDUAL UNEMPLOYABILITY BENEFITS

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 1994, the ''VA Accountability Act of 2015''; and a hearing entitled ''Exploring VA's Administration of Individual Unemployability Benefits''. H.R. 1994 was ordered reported, as amended. Testimony was heard from Daniel Bertoni, Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security, Government Accountability Office; Bradley Flohr, Senior Advisor, Compensation Service, Veterans Benefits Administration; and public witnesses.

WELFARE REFORM PROPOSALS, SPECIFICALLY INVOLVING THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES (TANF) PROGRAM

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Human Resources held a hearing on welfare reform proposals, specifically involving the reauthorization of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program. Testimony was heard from Kristen Cox, Executive Director, Governor's Office of Management and Budget, State of Utah; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATES

Joint Economic Committee: Committee concluded a hearing to examine what lower labor force participation rates tell us about work opportunities and incentives, after receiving testimony from Scott Winship, Manhattan Institute for Policy Research, New York, New York; and Aparna Mathur, American Enterprise Institute, and Elisabeth S. Jacobs, Washington Center for Equitable Growth, both of Washington, D.C.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 16, 2015

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: to hold hearings to examine pending Forest Service and forestry related bills, including S. 61, to provide for the conveyance of certain National Forest System land in the State of Louisiana, S. 755, to designate as wilderness certain public land in the Cherokee National Forest in the State of Tennessee, S. 1100, to require State and local government approval of prescribed burns on Federal land during conditions of drought or fire danger, S. 1110, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to publish in the Federal Register a strategy to significantly increase the role of volunteers and partners in National Forest System trail maintenance, S. 1671, to reauthorize the National Forest Foundation Act, S. 1712, to amend the Small Tract Act of 1983 to expand the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to sell or exchange small parcels of National Forest System land to enhance the management of the National Forest System, resolve minor encroachments, S. 1733, to require the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a forest incentives program to keep forests intact and sequester carbon on private forest land of the United States, and S. 1744, to authorize the sale of certain National Forest System land in the State of Georgia, 10 a.m., SR–328A.

Committee on Appropriations: business meeting to mark up an original bill entitled, ''Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016'', 10:30 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the semiannual monetary policy report to Congress, 2:30 p.m., SD–538.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining, to hold hearings to examine S. 132, to improve timber management on Oregon and California Railroad and Coos Bay Wagon Road grant land, S. 326, to amend the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 to provide cancellation ceilings for stewardship end result contracting projects, and S. 1691, to expedite and prioritize forest management activities to achieve ecosystem restoration objectives, 2:45 p.m., SD–366.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine HealthCare.gov controls, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine human rights around the world, focusing on corruption, Global Magnitsky, and modern slavery, 10 a.m., SD–419.

Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health Policy, to hold hearings to examine wildlife poaching, 2 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management, to hold hearings to examine the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs' role in the regulatory process, 2 p.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 1169, to reauthorize and improve the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, and S. 1599, to provide anti-retaliation protections for antitrust whistleblowers, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific; and Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade, joint hearing entitled ''Reviewing the U.S.-China Civil Nuclear Cooperation Agreement'', 9 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, hearing entitled ''The Goldman Act to Return Abducted American Children: Ensuring Accurate Numbers and Administration Action'', 10 a.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Transportation Security, hearing entitled ''Examining the Federal Air Marshal Service and Its Readiness to Meet the Evolving Threat'', 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, July 16

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of S. 1177, Every Child Achieves Act, with a series of votes on or in relation to amendments to the Alexander/Murray Amendment No. 2089 to the bill at 10:45 a.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, July 16

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 2898—Western Water and American Food Security Act (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barr, Andy, Ky., E1072
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E1073
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E1073, E1075
Boyle, Brendan F., Pa., E1074
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1073
Granger, Kay, Tex., E1069
Huffman, Jared, Calif., E1069, E1070
Hunter, Duncan, Calif., E1072
Kelly, Mike, Pa., E1070
Lieu, Ted, Calif., E1075
Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E1072
Luján, Ben Ray, N.M., E1074
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E1075
Miller, Jeff, Fla., E1071
Nolan, Richard M., Minn. E1072
O'Rourke, Beto, Tex., E1073
Olson, Pete, Tex., E1072, E1074
Pocan, Mark, Wisc., E1072
Roskam, Peter J., Ill., E1070
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E1076
Sewell, Terri A., Ala., E1069
Smith, Adam, Wash., E1072
Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E1071
Stivers, Steve, Ohio, E1074
Webster, Daniel, Fla., E1070

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.