



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 2015

No. 140

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 28, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JEFF DENHAM to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

HONDURAS MUST PROTECT HUMAN RIGHTS, VULNERABLE COMMUNITIES

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, last week I joined a fact-finding delegation to Honduras led by WOLA, the Washington Office on Latin America. We looked at the problem of violence and the lack of opportunity in order to understand why families and young people continue to flee the country. We wanted to learn what the Honduran

Government and people were doing in response to the problems that confront their country and how the United States might help. We met with families, young people, and community leaders in several marginal and violent communities, including those who benefit from programs at Casa Alianza.

The delegation also visited an innovative USAID-sponsored violence prevention program. It not only offers programs for young people in a poor and dangerous neighborhood, but brings together community leaders and local institutions to tackle local problems. By strengthening local leaders and groups and working with trained and vetted local police, crime levels have dropped and new opportunities for youth have been created. These are hopeful results for a community that 1 year ago was under siege by violent criminal actors.

We also met with many NGOs, human rights defenders, and international organizations to understand the intertwined problems of human rights, Democratic governance, and corruption. We had substantial conversations with Honduran President Juan Orlando Hernandez and met with our Ambassador, James Nealon, and his team, and I am grateful for how generous they were with their time.

I would like to share with my colleagues a few thoughts and conclusions from this trip.

First, I have no doubt that violence or lack of opportunity are driving families and young people to flee Honduras. I saw the marginal communities and heard the stories from families about the problems young people face. The best thing we can do is support efforts that break the cycle of violence and help build opportunities for youth in Honduras and elsewhere in Central America. At Casa Alianza and the USAID project, we saw the kind of programs that actually make a difference. That is where we should be directing our assistance.

Additionally, I also heard how long-term drought is exacerbating hunger, malnutrition, and the loss of livelihoods in rural central Honduras and igniting a new wave of migration.

Second, I heard from returned migrants and the families of migrants, including those whose loved ones have disappeared and never been heard from again. Migrants face abuse as they travel. They are extorted by authorities in Mexico and sometimes Guatemala and robbed or kidnapped and held for ransom by criminal groups. Young women run the risk of being trafficked and forced into prostitution.

We heard from returned migrants, especially those who had been stopped in Mexico, about the return journey and the lack of services at the El Corinto border crossing. We met migrants who had fled gang violence only to be forced to return to the same dangers.

I was moved by many of these stories. Migrants, even those traveling without legal documents, have basic rights, and we should be working with the Governments of Mexico and Honduras to ensure that they get decent treatment, access to needed services, and the protection they deserve.

Third, human rights abuses continue to be a serious problem in Honduras. Longtime human rights defenders, journalists, and gay, lesbian, and transgender activists described ongoing threats, attacks, and even assassinations, and the response by the police and the attorney general has not improved. In fact, a U.S.-supported special investigative unit that was supposed to focus on attacks on the LGBT community, journalists, and others has investigated even fewer cases this year than last.

I am troubled by the government's focus on special military police units, whose human rights record isn't good. I support the U.S. decision not to provide aid to the military police. Instead, the Honduran Government needs to

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H6263

clean up and strengthen civilian police and the Attorney General's Office.

My trip to Honduras was both challenging and inspiring. I saw troubling problems of poverty and violence, heard painful stories about migrant abuses and disappearances, and saw major problems in the area of human rights and the protection of human rights defenders and activists.

But I also saw hope. I met with young people who dream of bright futures for themselves in Honduras, with student and youth leaders who are campaigning selflessly and courageously to build mechanisms to tackle corruption, and with LGBT activists, human rights defenders, and journalists who are standing up to threats. I saw community-led projects to combat violence and poverty that are making a real difference.

Mr. Speaker, last week our Nation was graced by the presence of Pope Francis. I was deeply moved by his call for us to welcome the stranger, to help the most vulnerable among us, and to work together for the common good. I believe each of those calls to action apply to the case of Honduras, both in how we respond to Honduras fleeing to the United States to find safe haven and a new life and how we help Hondurans respond to their own problems inside their country.

I look forward, Mr. Speaker, to working with my colleagues to help the Honduran people deal successfully with these challenges.

DKI APCSS 20TH ANNIVERSARY VIDEO MESSAGE

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

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 20th anniversary of the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies, located in Waikiki, Hawaii. I want to extend my congratulations to the Center on reaching this important milestone.

For the last 20 years, the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies has made significant strides in educating, connecting, and empowering security practitioners. I would like to thank the Center for their leadership. I am pleased to see the APCSS renamed as the Daniel K. Inouye Center, honoring the legacy of the late Senator who advocated strongly for peace and stability around the world.

As the United States shifts its focus to the Asia-Pacific region, the Daniel K. Inouye Center will be uniquely situated to play a critical role in driving our Nation's security policy.

The U.S. rebalance to Asia will rely heavily on Hawaii's location and relationship with our partner nations in the region.

I can think of no better venue than the Inouye Center for bringing together representatives from different countries to discuss joint cooperation on important issues.

As I have witnessed firsthand, the Center is focused on producing results. This will be crucial as we continue to move forward with the rebalance and begin to tackle some of the most pressing security-related issues.

Once again, I want to extend my congratulations on 20 years of service and my warmest thanks—mahalo—for the tremendous work being done there.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Dear Lord, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We come to You as a Nation in the midst of significant imminent transition, even as important disagreements on policy promise vigorous debate in the days and weeks to come. As people look for causes and solutions, the temptation is great to seek ideological position.

We ask that You might send Your spirit of peace and reconciliation; that instead of ascendancy over opponents, the Members of this people's House and all elected to represent our Nation might work together humbly, recognizing the best in each other's hopes, to bring stability and direction toward a strong future.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. KILDEE 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.

CYBER WEEK

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to ad-

dress the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this week the House Armed Services Committee, led by Chairman MAC THORNBERRY, marks Cyber Week, a week that highlights the importance of cyber to our families and to our military. This week of hearings, with witnesses from private corporations and the Department of Defense, is a fitting start as we also recognize Cyber Security Awareness Month during October.

Recent cyber attacks, like the devastating attack on the Office of Personnel Management, have made it clear that cyber is the new domain of attacks on American families. Personal data, such as Social Security numbers, financial information, and security clearance documents, were stolen, putting the personal and financial security of our citizens at risk. The attack underscores the increased reports of cyber attacks against our military Web sites, government data, and businesses.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, with dedicated staff members like Pete Villano, Kevin Gates, and Nevada Schadler, I look forward to Cyber Week's focus to protect American families.

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

GOP GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, almost unbelievably here we are just 2 days away from another GOP government shutdown. Republicans, who control both Houses of Congress, have yet to bring a budget agreement, just a couple of days before the government shuts down, that would keep government open. Democrats stand ready to negotiate, to talk, to come up with an agreement that can move this country forward, that can keep government open, at the very least.

We just can't afford another government shutdown. The last time this happened, it cost the economy billions of dollars and people lost their jobs. Shutting this government down, allowing the government to be shut down over a partisan ideological point, is reckless, and it ought to be avoided at all costs.

You don't have to look very far in the headlines to see that the Republican Conference is in some disarray. I understand that. The politics of that are just going to have to work themselves out.

Meanwhile, the business of the American people has to be attended to. We have got to get this country back to work. If we don't do that, we will not be doing the jobs that people sent us here to do.

THE CITY OF CARPINTERIA'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

(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 to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the city of Carpinteria.

Incorporated on September 28, 1965, the city of Carpinteria is home to over 13,000 residents on the central coast of California. It is known as one of America's finest small towns, and Carpinteria has also been recognized as one of the American cities with the highest quality of life.

The city of Carpinteria is a leader in environmental stewardship, working to protect California's precious coastline. In fact, Carpinteria City Beach has been recognized as the world's safest beach. Their local economy has thrived with its vibrant cultural history, and this unique agricultural region is home to California's famed avocado festival.

I am proud to honor the city of Carpinteria on their 50th anniversary. It is a key treasure on the central coast.

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, September 25, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
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 September 25, 2015 at 5:12 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 2082.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 3 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1500

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 3 o'clock p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

PROTECTING AFFORDABLE COVERAGE FOR EMPLOYEES ACT

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1624) to amend title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to revise the definition of small employer, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1624

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 "Protecting Affordable Coverage for Employees Act".

SEC. 2. REVISION OF DEFINITION OF SMALL EMPLOYER UNDER HEALTH INSURANCE MARKET PROVISIONS.

(a) PPACA AMENDMENTS.—Section 1304(b) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18024(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "101" and inserting "51";

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking "100" and inserting "50"; and

(3) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

"(3) STATE OPTION TO EXTEND DEFINITION OF SMALL EMPLOYER.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), nothing in this section shall prevent a State from applying this subsection by treating as a small employer, with respect to a calendar year and a plan year, an employer who employed an average of at least 1 but not more than 100 employees on business days during the preceding calendar year and who employs at least 1 employee on the first day of the plan year."

(b) PHSA AMENDMENTS.—Section 2791(e) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg-91(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking "101" and inserting "51";

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking "100" and inserting "50"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(7) STATE OPTION TO EXTEND DEFINITION OF SMALL EMPLOYER.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (2) and (4), nothing in this section shall prevent a State from applying this subsection by treating as a small employer, with respect to a calendar year and a plan year, an employer who employed an average of at least 1 but not more than 100 employees on business days during the preceding calendar year and who employs at least 1 employee on the first day of the plan year."

(c) DEPOSIT OF SAVINGS INTO MEDICARE IMPROVEMENT FUND.—Section 1898(b)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395iii(b)(1)) is amended by striking "\$0" and inserting "\$205,000,000".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may

have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD on H.R. 1624.

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

There was no objection.

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

The bipartisan bill before us today is a much-needed fix for small-business owners and employees struggling to comply with the healthcare law. H.R. 1624 is a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Public Health Service Act to revise the definition of small employer. The bill would allow the States to continue defining the small group health insurance market as employers with 1 to 50 employees.

Section 1304 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act changed the Federal definition of the small group market to include employers with 1 to 100 employees. The States, however, have been allowed to continue defining the small group market as employers with 1 to 50 employees until January 1, 2016.

But beginning on or after January 1, 2016, plans sold or renewed for employers with 51 to 100 employees will be subject to the various small group health plan regulations established by PPACA. These more restrictive rating rules will increase health insurance premiums for these employers and reduce flexibility in benefit design.

The new requirements could also lead some employers with 51 to 100 employees to self-insure to avoid higher premiums. If that happens, this could result in adverse selection in the small group pool and higher premiums for employers with 1 to 50 employees.

Unless this current law is reversed, the disruption in the marketplace will be significant. For example, it is estimated that, under current law, more than 3 million employees will experience a double-digit percent increase in their healthcare premiums.

Ultimately, cost increases for small employers will change their choices regarding offering coverage, could change their business model, and will ultimately be felt by millions of workers.

Because the impact of current law will vary by State, defining the small group market should be left to the States, which is a policy envisioned in H.R. 1624.

I am pleased to say there is considerable support for this legislation in the House and the Senate.

The flexibility that would be given to States with immediate passage of H.R. 1624 would help ensure stable, small group health insurance markets that reflect the unique characteristics in each of the States.

If Congress passes H.R. 1624, premiums will be lower and allow millions of employees and employers to keep the plan they have and like. This is a

commonsense policy that deserves our bipartisan support.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 1624.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, at this point, I reserve the balance of my time so that Congressman GUTHRIE can speak first.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), the vice chair of the Health Subcommittee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here.

I rise in support of H.R. 1624, the Protecting Affordable Coverage for Employees Act. This bill, which I introduced along with my friend from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS), Congressman MARKWAYNE MULLIN of Oklahoma, and KYRSTEN SINEMA of Arizona will protect smaller employers from increased healthcare costs and will prevent their employees from being forced out of their current healthcare plans.

The small group market is currently defined as 1 to 50 employees, but a provision in the healthcare law will expand the group's size from 1 to 100 on January 1. With this expansion comes more onerous regulations and the expectation of dramatic rate hikes.

One estimate by Oliver Wyman predicts that those in the 51 to 100 group will see an average of an 18 percent premium increase in 2016 based on the new rating rules alone. H.R. 1624 stops the mandated expansion of the small group market that will occur on January 1 and allows States to define their own market.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard from many Kentuckians who would be impacted by this change, and their concerns are real. Small businesses are afraid to expand, and mid-sized businesses have no idea what the costs would be or how they can plan for this new change.

This issue has widespread support, with over half the House as cosponsors and nearly a third of the Senate as cosponsors. Members on both sides of the aisle agree that we must act now to stop this new mandate.

It has been a great pleasure working with the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS). It is an issue that we see is happening in Washington, that is happening out in our districts, out across to the businesses.

Both sides of the aisle have come together to say: Let's change the law. Let's make sure that the small businesses and medium-sized businesses are not affected, and let's move forward.

It wasn't just that we signed our names as cosponsors. There was a lot of hard work that I know the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS) did to bring more and more cosponsors to this bill. This is a significant change. It is significant for the people who live in our districts. I encourage support.

I appreciate Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. MULLIN.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to first thank my colleague from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE). It has been a pleasure and honor to serve with him on this bill.

It is really important for us to understand how monumental this moment is. This isn't the biggest bill in the world. But, yet, at the same time, if you are a small business in the United States of America and you have 1 to 50 employees or now even 1 to 100 employees, this bill hopefully will help affect your business and your employees in a way that is better.

I rise in support of H.R. 1624. I truly appreciate the willingness to work on a bipartisan bill, as demonstrated today, which is going to positively impact so many communities across the country through the small businesses it will affect.

H.R. 1624, the Protecting Affordable Coverage for Employees Act, introduced by my colleagues, once again, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. SINEMA, and myself—two Republicans and two Democrats—is a true bipartisan effort—would stop a potential health insurance rate shock by allowing States to determine the appropriate size of their small group market.

As a former small-business owner myself, I recognize the struggle there is to live out the American Dream. I know how difficult it can be when a specific sector of small business is affected by regulations and laws created by local, State, or Federal governments.

I have seen the impact in neighborhoods throughout my district when a small local business opens their doors or closes their doors. Their supply chain is local. Their employees have a vested interest in their success. Their customers treasure the connection a small hometown business brings.

I know I echo the view of the entire U.S. House of Representatives when I applaud these small businesses, the risks that they have taken, and the celebration of their successes.

The Affordable Care Act isn't perfect. By no means is the Affordable Care Act perfect. But I am grateful for all the benefits that the law has provided since its enactment.

Today more than 16 million Americans have gained access to affordable health insurance that did not have it before enacting the act. My district is one of only two districts in the United States to see a double-digit increase in insured residents since the implementation of the Affordable Care Act.

The Affordable Care Act is the biggest change to American health care in the past 70 years. It brings down costs, covering more Americans and making dozens of other crucial changes to how our Nation views health care. However, no law is perfect.

When it was first created, Social Security didn't cover agricultural and domestic workers. Medicaid didn't begin to cover mammograms until 1991. Even with these fundamental programs of

our Nation's safety net, improvement and compromise was necessary to lead to more perfect laws.

While certain States, like California, have decided to move forward with the expansion, this bill still provides States the flexibility to ensure market stability for small businesses across the country.

I appreciate the bipartisan effort to bring this bill to the floor. I look forward to advancing the PACE Act and continuing to build on a record of working together in a bipartisan fashion.

I was just sharing a moment with my colleague from Kentucky, Congressman GUTHRIE, in talking about how proud I am of this moment and how much I appreciate his willingness to reach across the aisle and work with us to make sure that we bring a fix—not the biggest fix, but a fix—that will help American businesses and American workers across this country.

It is an opportunity for us to work together. But, more importantly, it is an opportunity for us to do the job that we were elected to do: to put aside partisan bickering, to make sure that we look at what is best for America, try our best to bring a bill to the floor through both houses, and, hopefully, get the signature of the President of the United States.

Again, it was due to this bipartisan effort that I think that what I just described is going to happen. Come January of 2016, it is going to be a better place for all of us—for our businesses and our workers—because we were willing to work together.

Once again, it is not the easiest thing to do, but it is something that, unfortunately, is far too rare. I hope that this is the beginning, the beginning of many of us working together and making good things happen for America and its Territories.

I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 1624.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. It is an important bill. It is a bipartisan bill. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 1624.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, since the passage of the Affordable Care Act, 17.6 million Americans have gained health insurance coverage and are no longer one accident, injury, or diagnosis away from financial ruin. This is the largest reduction in the uninsured in four decades.

The ACA has increased access and reduced financial barriers to important preventive services, such as cancer screenings and well-woman visits by requiring their coverage with no cost sharing. The law also stopped insurers from discriminating based on pre-existing conditions or placing annual limits on how much health care they will cover.

Though the ACA is already helping millions nationwide, no law is perfect, and there are certainly ways we can improve the ACA and build upon its successes. Given the political theatre that tends to surround the ACA, I am pleased to see that my Republican colleagues

are ready to work together on bipartisan proposals such as H.R. 1624 with the goal of strengthening the law. Unfortunately, though, I do not agree with the approach this bill takes.

H.R. 1624 would permanently change the law to make the small group expansion currently required under the ACA optional for states and allow states to “opt in” if they choose. Research tells us that some states simply are not ready to expand their small group market and that expansion in these states could result in higher costs for certain consumers. However, the small group expansion was included in the ACA for good reason. The benefits of expansion such as added consumer protections and increased stability for small employers are important and achievable goals. States like Washington are already experiencing the benefits of an expanded small group market.

I am concerned that H.R. 1624 is premature, and I would instead prefer a few year transitional delay of the small group expansion or an “opt out” option for states instead. I believe these alternatives would ensure that states continue to work towards the goal of expansion, rather than disregarding the provision altogether.

Mr. Speaker, I am also disappointed that this bill was not considered under regular order. Such an important issue deserves thoughtful discussion and opportunities for amendments. I had hoped to offer an amendment that would allow states to “opt out” of the expansion. Since I was unable to discuss this amendment and other potential changes to the bill with my colleagues in a committee markup, I remain uncertain that this legislation is the best course of action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1624, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1515

GOLD STAR FATHERS ACT OF 2015

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 136) to amend chapter 21 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that fathers of certain permanently disabled or deceased veterans shall be included with mothers of such veterans as preference eligibles for treatment in the civil service.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 136

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 “Gold Star Fathers Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. PREFERENCE ELIGIBLE TREATMENT FOR FATHERS OF CERTAIN PERMANENTLY DISABLED OR DECEASED VETERANS.

Section 2108(3) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking subparagraphs (F) and (G) and inserting the following:

“(F) the parent of an individual who lost his or her life under honorable conditions while serving in the armed forces during a period named by paragraph (1)(A) of this section, if—

“(i) the spouse of that parent is totally and permanently disabled; or

“(ii) that parent, when preference is claimed, is unmarried or, if married, legally separated from his or her spouse;

“(G) the parent of a service-connected permanently and totally disabled veteran, if—

“(i) the spouse of that parent is totally and permanently disabled; or

“(ii) that parent, when preference is claimed, is unmarried or, if married, legally separated from his or her spouse; and”.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendment made by this Act shall take effect 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 136, the Gold Star Fathers Act of 2015. This important piece of legislation supports fathers of permanently disabled or deceased veterans in their search for employment with the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, under current law, mothers of certain permanently disabled or deceased veterans receive preference in hiring for civil service positions in recognition of their sacrifice. That preference applies when the mother is widowed, divorced, or separated, or if their husband is totally or permanently disabled.

The Gold Star Fathers Act of 2015 extends this same benefit to fathers. The bill also grants preference in hiring to parents who never married along with those that are widowed, divorced, or legally separated.

I thank Senators WYDEN, BROWN, and COLLINS for their work over several Congresses on this important issue, and Congresswoman ESTY for sponsoring the House companion bill.

Mr. Speaker, we owe a debt of gratitude to our veterans and to the mothers and fathers of our veterans. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 136, the Gold Star Fathers Act of 2015, bipartisan legislation introduced

by my colleague, Senator RON WYDEN of Oregon, last January and cosponsored by Senators SHERROD BROWN of Rhode Island and SUSAN COLLINS of Maine. This bill passed the United States Senate by unanimous consent in May of this year and was favorably reported out of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee in July.

This legislation also has bipartisan support in the House in the form of identical legislation, H.R. 1222, introduced by my colleague, Representative ELIZABETH ESTY, of Connecticut.

In appreciation of the sacrifices that Gold Star families have made on behalf of our grateful Nation, the Gold Star Fathers Act would extend the 10-point hiring preference for Federal civilian jobs to the fathers of servicemembers who have been permanently disabled or who lost their lives while serving on Active Duty. This would be identical to the Federal hiring preference that has been available to our Gold Star Mothers since 1948.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is reflective of the immense gratitude that we hold as a nation for the parents of our fallen and disabled heroes. It also recognizes the profound sacrifice that our Gold Star families continue to endure every day. It is a burden that is shouldered by the very few on behalf of the entire Nation.

Back in South Boston, my mother-in-law, Helen Shaughnessy, originally Helen Bailey, is a Gold Star sister. She lost her brother, Arnie Bailey, in April of 1944 on his first jump over the Rhine close to the end of the Second World War in Europe. I know that their family continues to carry that pain and that burden each and every day.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support Ms. ESTY in her efforts, along with Senator WYDEN and others in the Senate, to support S. 136.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY). I would like to introduce and welcome her remarks. She is the lead sponsor of this bill in the House and has been a true champion on behalf of veterans all over this country.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 136, the Senate companion to my bill in the House, the Gold Star Fathers Act of 2015.

I want to thank Chairman CHAFFETZ and Ranking Member CUMMINGS for their support of our Gold Star families and for prioritizing this bipartisan bill that would bring equity to the treatment of all Gold Star families, and I want to thank my friends Mr. WALBERG and Mr. LYNCH for their support today.

Mr. Speaker, on Memorial Day last year, I met with Gold Star families in Waterbury, Connecticut, and I heard the stories of how deeply they feel the loss of their loved ones, whether that loss was a year ago, 20 years ago, or 40 years ago. I heard from mothers and I heard from fathers about the difficulty of continuing on without a member of their family that they held so dear.

Those willing to make the ultimate sacrifice for their country deserve to know that we will support and care for their loved ones they leave behind. After talking with these families, I knew that we needed to do more for these grieving families and we needed to do more to recognize the sacrifice of their loved ones. That is why I introduced the House bill companion of the Gold Star Fathers Act.

Mr. Speaker, our country has long recognized that mothers who have lost a child in military service or are caring for their son or daughter who was permanently disabled in the military deserve a hand when seeking Federal employment. Currently, qualifying mothers of certain disabled or deceased veterans are eligible to receive the veterans hiring preference that will no longer be used by their loved one when applying for certain Federal service jobs.

However, mothers are not the only ones who grieve. The loss of a child is felt just as strongly by our veterans' fathers as by their mothers. It is time to ensure equal treatment of and respect for all parents of deceased or disabled veterans. That is why the Gold Star Fathers Act would extend this hiring preference to fathers as well.

In many cases, not only have the parents undergone significant trauma emotionally, but they have lost a working-age member of their family; and in the case of a permanently disabled child, they may have mounting medical bills to deal with as well. It is time to establish equality in our Nation's treatment of the parents of deceased and disabled veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Senators WYDEN, COLLINS, and BROWN for their leadership on the Gold Star Fathers Act in the Senate, and I want to thank my former colleague Representative Tim Bishop for his past leadership on this issue as well.

Mr. Speaker, I call on all of my colleagues to join us in honoring our Gold Star families. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of this bipartisan, unanimously supported Gold Star Fathers Act.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this commonsense bill. It is more than common sense. We talk about family values a lot. These are family values. These are highest family values of parents that have raised young people who are willing to step forward for our country without consideration of their own lives or their futures in most cases. So I applaud my colleagues' efforts on this behalf, and I support and ask that this bill be supported fully by this body.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 136.

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.

WOUNDED WARRIORS FEDERAL LEAVE ACT OF 2015

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 313) to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide leave to any new Federal employee who is a veteran with a service-connected disability rated at 30 percent or more for purposes of undergoing medical treatment for such disability, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 313

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 "Wounded Warriors Federal Leave Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL LEAVE FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES WHO ARE DISABLED VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 63 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 6329. Disabled veteran leave

"(a) During the 12-month period beginning on the first day of employment, any employee who is a veteran with a service-connected disability rated at 30 percent or more is entitled to leave, without loss or reduction in pay, for purposes of undergoing medical treatment for such disability for which sick leave could regularly be used.

"(b)(1) The leave credited to an employee under subsection (a) may not exceed 104 hours.

"(2) Any leave credited to an employee pursuant to subsection (a) that is not used during the 12-month period described in such subsection may not be carried over and shall be forfeited.

"(c) In order to verify that leave credited to an employee pursuant to subsection (a) is used for treating a service-connected disability, such employee shall submit to the head of the employing agency certification, in such form and manner as the Director of the Office of Personnel Management may prescribe, that such employee used such leave for purposes of being furnished treatment for such disability by a health care provider.

"(d) In this section—

"(1) the term 'employee' has the meaning given such term in section 2105, and includes an officer or employee of the United States Postal Service or of the Postal Regulatory Commission;

"(2) the term 'service-connected' has the meaning given such term in section 101(16) of title 38; and

"(3) the term 'veteran' has the meaning given such term in section 101(2) of such title."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 63 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 6328 the following:

"6329. Disabled veteran leave."

(c) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to any employee (as that term is defined in section 6329(d)(1) of title 5, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)) hired on or after the date that is one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of this Act—

(1) the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall prescribe regulations with respect to the leave provided by the amendment in subsection (a) for employees, but not including employees of the United States Postal Service or the Postal Regulatory Commission; and

(2) the Postmaster General shall prescribe regulations for such leave with respect to officers and employees of the United States Postal Service and the Postal Regulatory Commission.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 313, the Wounded Warriors Federal Leave Act of 2015, sponsored by my colleague, Congressman STEPHEN LYNCH. This important piece of legislation supports wounded warriors newly hired in the Federal Government.

The Wounded Warriors Federal Leave Act of 2015 supports our disabled veterans transitioning to civilian careers by providing sick leave for medical treatments and appointments that are related to their service-connected disability.

Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan legislation provides immediate access to sick leave for any new Federal employee who is a veteran with a service-connected disability rated at 30 percent or more for the purposes of undergoing medical treatment for such disability.

Because Federal employees begin with a zero sick leave balance and accrue sick leave over time, disabled veterans beginning civilian jobs often have insufficient sick leave to attend medical appointments required for treatment of their service-connected disabilities. This bill provides our newly hired disabled veterans with immediate access of up to 13 days for sick leave so that our disabled veterans do not have to take unpaid leave to care for their service-connected injuries.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 313 is supported by a number of veterans and employee organizations, including the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Federal Managers Association.

I commend Mr. LYNCH for his leadership on this issue and for working with Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ranking Member CUMMINGS, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Ms. NOR-TON to bring this bipartisan legislation before the committee. I also want to acknowledge Senators TESTER, MORAN, and TOOMEY for their work on the Senate companion bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 313, the Wounded Warriors Federal Leave Act of 2015.

I introduced this bipartisan legislation in January of this year, and I am proud that it has now gained the support of over 30 Democratic and Republican Members of Congress.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), for his remarks and his support of this bill. At the outset, I would also like to thank Chairman JASON CHAFFETZ and Ranking Member ELIJAH CUMMINGS along with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee for their leadership in bringing H.R. 313 to the floor. I would also like to thank many of the veterans groups and Federal unions and workforce organizations that have joined together to endorse this legislation. They include the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, and the 31 unions and member organizations that make up the Federal Postal Coalition.

Let me also commend Jennifer Hemingway of the majority staff for the Oversight and Government Reform Committee and Lena Chang of the Democratic staff for our committee for their great work on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the Wounded Warriors Federal Leave Act will address a problem faced by many wounded warriors who are transitioning to civilian life through new careers in the Federal workforce. Currently, a first-year Federal employee will begin his or her career with zero sick leave in the event of a medical event. That is because under current law, full-time Federal employees only earn 4 hours of paid sick leave for each pay period that they work.

Obviously, starting from the beginning, they will have zero balance in their sick leave bank—with a maximum of 104 hours of paid sick leave that is available per year. Nevertheless, new employees start with zero. While Federal workers are able to carry over unused annual sick leave from year to year, they begin their first year on the job with no sick leave whatsoever.

Now, this lack of initial leave for newly hired Federal workers is particularly burdensome on those employees who are also wounded warriors. These

employees need to make regular visits to the VA to seek medical treatment for post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, and other service-connected disabilities, and they are quickly forced to burn up any sick leave that they do accrue during their first year at a Federal agency.

□ 1530

Several wounded warriors who have transitioned to the Federal workforce following their tours of duty in Iraq and Afghanistan and other assignments have highlighted this difficulty during discussions with me and my staff.

These workers reported that, without sufficient leave during their first year on the job, they were routinely faced with the difficult choice between having to take a day off work without pay or simply skipping their scheduled VA appointments altogether. Some wounded warriors reported that the closest VA facility to their job was located a 2- or 3-hour drive away.

As additionally noted by the Federal Managers Association: “Young men and women struggle with available leave as they attempt to keep service-related, medically-necessary appointments, which puts undue stress on both managers and their Federal employees as they try to meet their Congressionally-mandated missions and goals.”

Mr. Speaker, we must afford our wounded warriors the flexibility to receive medical care as they transition to serving our Nation in a new capacity, through a Federal civilian job. The Wounded Warriors Federal Leave Act would do just that.

This bill will provide first-year Federal employees who have a VA disability rating of 30 percent or greater with 104 hours of wounded warrior leave from the moment they begin their Federal workforce careers. This includes eligible new hires at our Nation’s largest employer of veterans—the Defense Department—as well as the United States Postal Service.

H.R. 313 also recognizes that these dedicated Federal workers will have accumulated up to 104 hours of traditional sick leave by the end of their first year on the job. That is why the bill also provides that any unused wounded warrior leave would not carry over beyond the second year.

The Wounded Warriors Federal Leave Act will also provide critical importance, given that the most recent Federal data on veterans employment indicates that Federal agencies are hiring a growing number of veterans each year. In fiscal year 2014, nearly 60,000, or 33.2 percent, of new hires at Federal agencies were veterans. That is an increase of 9.2 percent over fiscal year 2009.

With the number of our young people who have served multiple tours of duty—three, four, five tours of duty in Iraq and Afghanistan—this is especially important. Approximately 16,000 of newly Federal employees were wounded warriors with a disability rating of 30 percent or greater.

Again, I am thankful to Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. CONNOLLY. And, also, I want to thank Mr. TESTER. When we sent this bill over to the Senate looking for a cosponsor in the Senate, Senator TESTER was quick to step up and take on this fight in the Senate. I want to thank him for his work on this bill in the Senate side.

In closing, I urge all our Members to vote in favor of H.R. 313.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I truly thank Congressman LYNCH for his leadership on this issue. It is an issue not only whose time has come, but probably should have come long before this. It is a great idea that deals with the reality of what we face in dealing with wounded warriors and their ongoing success that this country—a grateful country—ought to be involved with encouraging.

I urge the adoption of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 313.

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.

FEDERAL VEHICLE REPAIR COST SAVINGS ACT OF 2015

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 565) to reduce the operation and maintenance costs associated with the Federal fleet by encouraging the use of remanufactured parts, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 565

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 “Federal Vehicle Repair Cost Savings Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that, in March 2013, the Government Accountability Office issued a report that confirmed that—

(1) there are approximately 588,000 vehicles in the civilian Federal fleet;

(2) Federal agencies spent approximately \$975,000,000 on repair and maintenance of the Federal fleet in 2011;

(3) remanufactured vehicle components, such as engines, starters, alternators, steering racks, and clutches, tend to be less expensive than comparable new replacement parts; and

(4) the United States Postal Service and the Department of the Interior both informed the Government Accountability Office that the respective agencies rely on the use of remanufactured vehicle components to reduce costs.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term “Federal agency” has the meaning given that term in section 102 of title 40, United States Code; and

(2) the term “remanufactured vehicle component” means a vehicle component (including an engine, transmission, alternator, starter, turbocharger, steering, or suspension component) that has been returned to same-as-new, or better, condition and performance by a standardized industrial process that incorporates technical specifications (including engineering, quality, and testing standards) to yield fully warranted products.

SEC. 4. REQUIREMENT TO USE REMANUFACTURED VEHICLE COMPONENTS.

The head of each Federal agency—

(1) shall encourage the use of remanufactured vehicle components to maintain Federal vehicles, if using such components reduces the cost of maintaining the Federal vehicles while maintaining quality; and

(2) shall not encourage the use of remanufactured vehicle components to maintain Federal vehicles, if using such components—

(A) does not reduce the cost of maintaining Federal vehicles;

(B) lowers the quality of vehicle performance, as determined by the employee of the Federal agency responsible for the repair decision; or

(C) delays the return to service of a vehicle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALBERG. 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 material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of S. 565, the Federal Vehicle Repair Cost Savings Act of 2015. This bill is a bipartisan and bicameral effort designed to reduce the costs of maintenance for the Federal vehicle fleet.

The Federal Vehicle Repair Cost Savings Act encourages agencies to use remanufactured vehicle components when doing so will reduce maintenance costs while also maintain quality.

The term “remanufactured vehicle components” refers to components that have been returned to same-as-new or better condition and performance by a standardized industrial process that incorporates technical specifications.

In 2013, a Government Accountability Office report found that remanufactured vehicle components, such as engines, starters, alternators, steering racks, and clutches, tend to be less expensive than comparable new parts.

In fact, a 2012 study by the U.S. International Trade Commission found that remanufacturing parts can result in savings of 85 percent of the energy

and material used to manufacture equivalent new parts. Further, this study found that remanufactured parts are, on average, 20 to 50 percent less expensive.

Requiring agency heads under this bill to encourage their Federal vehicle maintenance staff to use remanufactured components will reduce maintenance costs, which totaled \$975 million in 2011, for 588,000 vehicles.

This bill is also supported by the Motor and Equipment Manufacturers Association, which directly employs over 734,000 people in U.S. manufacturing jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressmen HUIZENGA and ASHFORD for their work on the House companion bill. I also want to thank Senators PETERS and LANKFORD for their work on this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan cost savings legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of S. 565, the Federal Vehicle Repair Cost Savings Act, introduced by Senator PETERS of Michigan.

I would also like to recognize Representative BILL HUIZENGA of Michigan for his good work on this legislation.

S. 565 passed the United States Senate by unanimous consent last month. With today’s House passage, it can go straight to the President’s desk for his signature.

The Federal Vehicle Repair Cost Savings Act would require the head of each Federal agency to encourage the use of remanufactured vehicle components if doing so would reduce costs while maintaining high quality. The intent behind this bill is to raise awareness of the option of using remanufactured parts and inform agency fleet managers of this cost-saving option.

I would note that the bill encourages the heads of Federal agencies to use remanufactured parts, but the decision ultimately to do so would remain at the discretion of fleet managers.

According to a March 2013 Government Accountability Office report, Federal agencies spent about \$1 billion on vehicle repair and maintenance in 2011. The report also found that remanufactured vehicle components tend to be much less expensive. For example, the Postal Service and the Department of Interior informed GAO that they rely on remanufactured vehicle components to reduce costs.

Mr. Speaker, this is a commonsense piece of legislation that seeks to save taxpayer dollars and better ensure that the Federal Government is purchasing high-quality products.

I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to vote for this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), my good friend and colleague.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, especially my friend, Chairman CHAFFETZ, and my friend, Mr. WALBERG, here from Michigan, as well as Ranking Member CUMMINGS, for bringing this bipartisan, bicameral bill to the floor to save taxpayer dollars and create jobs.

I often hear, like most of us do, from our constituents: Why can’t Congress work together and get something done and eliminate wasteful spending and create jobs? Well, we have got it, folks. Here we go.

With the Federal Vehicle Repair Cost Savings Act, I teamed up with Senator GARY PETERS, also of Michigan. We are going to save literally millions of taxpayer dollars by reducing spending on Federal vehicle maintenance and create good manufacturing jobs.

Our commonsense bill calls on Federal agencies to use remanufactured components to repair and maintain the Federal vehicle fleet when using those parts would lower costs, achieve higher safety standards, and maintain quality and performance.

Remanufactured parts are less expensive than brand-new parts and have been returned to same-as-new condition. I know this from firsthand experience, owning a small sand and gravel operation where we oftentimes use remanufactured parts on our own trucks. The component may be an engine, may be a transmission, may be a drivetrain, may be a rear end or an alternator. Each of those repairs presents an opportunity to be more fiscally responsible with taxpayer dollars.

In 2013, a GAO report found that the Federal Government owns a fleet of approximately 588,000 vehicles. The cost of maintaining that fleet has ballooned to nearly \$1 billion.

While it is clear there needs to be a fleet of these Federal vehicles to have access to a reliable motor pool, it is important that these vehicles be maintained efficiently and effectively to ensure that those tax dollars—our precious tax dollars—are used in the most effective way possible.

In addition to eliminating wasteful spending, this legislation serves as an important boost to good-paying jobs and remanufacturing suppliers.

According to the Motor and Equipment Manufacturers Association, remanufacturing of motor vehicle parts is responsible for over 30,000 full-time jobs across the United States. For example, in my district, Valley Truck Parts, headquartered in Wyoming, employs 250 Michiganders. In Kentwood, Michigan, North America Fuel Systems Remanufacturing employs more than 150 people.

These companies, among so many others across Michigan and so many other States, demonstrate how remanufacturing supports good-paying middle class jobs in States like Michigan and Ohio and North Carolina and Pennsylvania and so many others. It is

going to play an expanded role, I believe, in making this Federal Government even more efficient.

I encourage my colleagues to join us in this effort to save millions of taxpayer dollars, support good jobs, and make the Federal Government run more efficiently.

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

In closing, having heard the comments on this, I urge the adoption of this commonsense bill that encourages also us doing an environmental thing as well in using resources that we have.

I ask that my colleagues support this commonsense bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 565.

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.

GRANTS OVERSIGHT AND NEW EFFICIENCY ACT

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3089) to close out expired grants, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3089

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 "Grants Oversight and New Efficiency Act" or the "GONE Act".

SEC. 2. IDENTIFYING AND CLOSING OUT EXPIRED GRANTS.

(a) EXPIRED GRANT REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall instruct the head of each agency, in coordination with the Secretary, to submit to Congress and the Secretary a report, not later than December 31 of the first calendar year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act, that—

(A) lists each covered grant held by such agency;

(B) provides the total number of covered grants, including the number of grants—

- (i) by time period of expiration;
- (ii) with zero dollar balances; and
- (iii) with undisbursed balances;

(C) for an agency with covered grants, describes the challenges leading to delays in grant closeout; and

(D) for the 30 oldest covered grants of an agency, explains why each covered grant has not been closed out.

(2) USE OF DATA SYSTEMS.—An agency may use existing multiagency data systems in order to submit the report required under paragraph (1).

(3) EXPLANATION OF MISSING INFORMATION.—If the head of an agency is unable to submit all of the information required to be included in the report under paragraph (1), the report shall include an explanation of why the information was not available, including

any shortcomings with and plans to improve existing grant systems, including data systems.

(b) NOTICE FROM AGENCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date on which the head of an agency submits the report required under subsection (a), the head of the agency shall provide notice to the Secretary specifying whether the head of the agency has closed out grant awards associated with all of the covered grants in the report and which covered grants in the report have not been closed out.

(2) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which all of the notices required pursuant to paragraph (1) have been provided or March 31 of the calendar year following the calendar year described in subsection (a)(1), whichever is sooner, the Secretary shall compile the notices submitted pursuant to paragraph (1) and submit to Congress a report on such notices.

(c) INSPECTOR GENERAL REVIEW.—Not later than one year after the date on which the head of an agency provides notice to Congress under subsection (b)(2), the Inspector General of such agency with more than \$500,000,000 in grant funding shall conduct a risk assessment to determine if an audit or review of the agency's grant closeout process is warranted.

(d) REPORT ON ACCOUNTABILITY AND OVERSIGHT.—Not later than 6 months after the date on which the second report is submitted pursuant to subsection (b)(2), the Director of Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall submit to Congress a report on recommendations for legislation to improve accountability and oversight in grants management, including the timely closeout of a covered grant.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGENCY.—The term "agency" has the meaning given that term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) CLOSEOUT.—The term "closeout" means a closeout of a grant account conducted in accordance with part 200 of title 2, Code of Federal Regulations, including sections 200.16 and 200.343 of such title, or any successor thereto.

(3) COVERED GRANT.—The term "covered grant" means a grant in an agency cash payment management system held by the United States Government for which—

(A) the grant award period of performance, including any extensions, has been expired for not less than 2 years; and

(B) closeout has not yet occurred in accordance with section 200.343 of title 2, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALBERG. 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 material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I introduced H.R. 3089, the Grants Oversight and New Efficiency, or GONE, Act, to bring much-needed accountability to the Federal grant-making process.

This bipartisan bill requires each agency to report to Congress on the amount of expired and empty grant accounts that remain open on the government's books.

Under the bill, the agencies must examine the 30 grants that have been expired for the longest period of time and explain why these grants have not been closed.

One year after this initial report, these agencies will update Congress, reporting on which accounts previously identified have been closed and which remain open. These reports will help Congress better understand why expired grant accounts remain open at taxpayer expense.

Mr. Speaker, in fiscal year 2014, Federal grant expenditures exceeded \$529 billion, and that is real money. This enormous amount of money demands strong financial management to protect taxpayer dollars from waste.

In 2012, GAO released a report on the timeliness of grant closeouts by Federal agencies. The report found nearly \$1 billion remaining in undisbursed funds within expired grant accounts.

Within one of the grant management systems GAO examined, there were almost 1,000 accounts that had been expired for 5 years or more and still had not been closed out.

□ 1545

GAO found out that this same management system contained 28,000 expired grant accounts with no funds in them. Mr. Speaker, expired grant accounts create multiple levels of waste.

First, the undisbursed funds remaining in expired accounts could be better used for their appropriated purpose or returned to the Treasury to help bring down the deficit and mounting debt.

Second, agencies pay a monthly fee for each account that remains open within the Federal payment management system. As a result, agencies could be spending roughly \$2 million per year to maintain these 28,000 accounts with no funds in them, assuming they have not been closed. Surely we can find a better use for these taxpayer dollars rather than wasting funds maintaining expired accounts.

Finally, grants that are not properly closed out slow the grant-making agency from conducting the necessary oversight to ensure that funds were properly spent and that taxpayer money is not being wasted. The GONE Act is a response to these issues.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3089 utilizes the Department of Health and Human Services to coordinate with agencies to provide these reports to Congress. HHS was chosen for this role because of some of its successful closeout efforts implemented in 2011. HHS's commendable work on grant closeout is exactly

why we added a provision to this bill requiring HHS to coordinate with the Office of Management and Budget in reporting to Congress on legislative changes needed to improve the process of grants administration.

H.R. 3089 strengthens oversight by asking the inspectors general of the largest grant-making agencies to conduct a risk assessment of their agency's grant closeout processes.

I thank Senators FISCHER and MANCHIN for their work on the Senate companion bill, S. 1115, including their work on the bill before the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to bring some commonsense steps to the Federal grant-making process by supporting this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the legislation under consideration, H.R. 3089, the Grant Oversight and New Efficiency Act, was introduced by my friend Mr. WALBERG of Michigan in July of this year; and it was reported out of the House Oversight Committee with the support of Mrs. BRENDA LAWRENCE, also of Michigan, this month. This bill would require one-time reports from Federal agencies on expired grants.

As noted earlier by Mr. WALBERG, in a report by the Government Accountability Office, Federal agencies do not always close out expired grants properly. In fact, GAO has found that in 2011, nearly \$800 million in undisbursed balances remained in expired grant accounts. That money could be returned to the Treasury and spent on any number of pressing priorities here in the House and Senate.

In particular, Mr. WALBERG's bill, H.R. 3089, would require agencies to report to the Secretary of Health and Human Services and Congress on grants that have expired and whether they have undisbursed balances. The bill would also require agencies to make recommendations on which grants should be closed out immediately as well as explain why certain grants were not properly closed out to begin with.

I commend the Representatives from Michigan, both Mr. WALBERG, our lead sponsor on this bill, and Mrs. LAWRENCE, for their work on this bipartisan bill. This is a commonsense, good government measure that every Member should support.

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his support and leadership on the floor. I thank the chairman and ranking member of our committee. Most importantly, I thank my good friend and colleague from Michigan, Congresswoman BRENDA LAWRENCE, for her support and helpful additions to this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this commonsense bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3089, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AIRPORT AND AIRWAY EXTENSION ACT OF 2015

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3614) to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3614

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2015".

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—AIRPORT AND AIRWAY PROGRAMS

Sec. 101. Extension of airport improvement program.

Sec. 102. Extension of expiring authorities.

Sec. 103. Federal Aviation Administration operations.

Sec. 104. Air navigation facilities and equipment.

Sec. 105. Research, engineering, and development.

Sec. 106. Funding for aviation programs.

Sec. 107. Essential air service.

TITLE II—REVENUE PROVISIONS

Sec. 201. Expenditure authority from Airport and Airway Trust Fund.

Sec. 202. Extension of taxes funding Airport and Airway Trust Fund.

TITLE I—AIRPORT AND AIRWAY PROGRAMS

SEC. 101. EXTENSION OF AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 48103(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting "and \$1,675,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on March 31, 2016."

(2) OBLIGATION OF AMOUNTS.—Subject to limitations specified in advance in appropriation Acts, sums made available pursuant to the amendment made by paragraph (1) may be obligated at any time through September 30, 2016, and shall remain available until expended.

(3) PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION.—For purposes of calculating funding apportionments and meeting other requirements under sections 47114, 47115, 47116, and 47117 of title 49, United States Code, for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on March 31, 2016, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall—

(A) first calculate such funding apportionments on an annualized basis as if the total amount available under section 48103 of such title for fiscal year 2016 were \$3,350,000,000; and

(B) then reduce by 50 percent—

(i) all funding apportionments calculated under subparagraph (A); and

(ii) amounts available pursuant to sections 47117(b) and 47117(f)(2) of such title.

(b) PROJECT GRANT AUTHORITY.—Section 47104(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking "September 30, 2015," and inserting "March 31, 2016,".

SEC. 102. EXTENSION OF EXPIRING AUTHORITIES.

(a) Section 47107(r)(3) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking "October 1, 2015" and inserting "April 1, 2016".

(b) Section 47115(j) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting "and for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on March 31, 2016" after "fiscal years 2012 through 2015".

(c) Section 47124(b)(3)(E) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting "and not more than \$5,175,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on March 31, 2016," after "fiscal years 2012 through 2015".

(d) Section 47141(f) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking "September 30, 2015" and inserting "March 31, 2016".

(e) Section 50905(c)(3) of title 51, United States Code, is amended by striking "October 1, 2015," and inserting "April 1, 2016,".

(f) Section 186(d) of the Vision 100—Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act (117 Stat. 2518) is amended by inserting "and for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on March 31, 2016," after "fiscal years 2012 through 2015".

(g) Section 409(d) of the Vision 100—Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act (49 U.S.C. 41731 note) is amended by striking "September 30, 2015" and inserting "March 31, 2016".

(h) Section 140(c)(1) of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (49 U.S.C. 47113 note) is amended by striking "fiscal years 2013 through 2015," and inserting "fiscal years 2013 through 2016,".

(i) Section 411(h) of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (49 U.S.C. 42301 prec. note) is amended by striking "September 30, 2015" and inserting "March 31, 2016".

(j) Section 822(k) of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (49 U.S.C. 47141 note) is amended by striking "September 30, 2015" and inserting "March 31, 2016".

SEC. 103. FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION OPERATIONS.

Section 106(k) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (C) by striking "and" at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (D) by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:

"(E) \$4,870,350,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on March 31, 2016."; and

(2) in paragraph (3) by inserting "and for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on March 31, 2016" after "fiscal years 2012 through 2015".

SEC. 104. AIR NAVIGATION FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT.

Section 48101(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(5) \$1,300,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on March 31, 2016.".

SEC. 105. RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT.

Section 48102(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7) by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (8) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(9) \$78,375,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on March 31, 2016.”.

SEC. 106. FUNDING FOR AVIATION PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 48114 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2) by striking “2015” and inserting “2016”; and

(2) in subsection (c)(2) by striking “2015” and inserting “2016”.

(b) COMPLIANCE WITH FUNDING REQUIREMENTS.—The budget authority authorized in this Act, including the amendments made by this Act, shall be deemed to satisfy the requirements of subsections (a)(1)(B) and (a)(2) of section 48114 of title 49, United States Code, for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on March 31, 2016.

SEC. 107. ESSENTIAL AIR SERVICE.

Section 41742(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and \$93,000,000 for fiscal year 2015” and inserting “\$93,000,000 for fiscal year 2015, and \$77,500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on March 31, 2016.”.

TITLE II—REVENUE PROVISIONS**SEC. 201. EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY FROM AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9502(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “October 1, 2015” in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) and inserting “April 1, 2016”, and

(2) by striking the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (A) and inserting “or the Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2015”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 9502(e)(2) of such Code is amended by striking “October 1, 2015” and inserting “April 1, 2016”.

SEC. 202. EXTENSION OF TAXES FUNDING AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND.

(a) FUEL TAXES.—Section 4081(d)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “March 31, 2016”.

(b) TICKET TAXES.—

(1) PERSONS.—Section 4261(k)(1)(A)(ii) of such Code is amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “March 31, 2016”.

(2) PROPERTY.—Section 4271(d)(1)(A)(ii) of such Code is amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “March 31, 2016”.

(c) FRACTIONAL OWNERSHIP PROGRAMS.—

(1) TREATMENT AS NON-COMMERCIAL AVIATION.—Section 4083(b) of such Code is amended by striking “October 1, 2015” and inserting “April 1, 2016”.

(2) EXEMPTION FROM TICKET TAXES.—Section 4261(j) of such Code is amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “March 31, 2016”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3614.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, on September 30, 2015, the authorization for the Federal Aviation Administration programs and taxes that fund those programs will expire. H.R. 3614 is a clean, 6-month extension of all necessary authorizations through March 31 of 2016.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation, I believe it is critical for Congress to come together in a bipartisan, long-term FAA reauthorization bill.

On the Aviation Subcommittee, Chairman SHUSTER and I have had great working partnerships with Congressman DEFAZIO and Congressman LARSEN. I want to thank Congressman DEFAZIO and Congressman LARSEN for their bipartisan cooperation in this very important area.

Without an extension, the FAA will not be able to spend funds from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund. Therefore, airport construction projects across the country will be halted, contractors that support FAA will not be paid, construction jobs will be lost, and thousands of FAA employees could be furloughed.

In my district in New Jersey, I have the privilege of representing approximately 4,000 FAA employees and contractors who work at the FAA's premier technical center in the Nation. They contribute an extraordinary amount of energy and dedication to making sure that aviation continues to move forward. Without them, the state of aviation in our country would suffer, and we cannot afford them to be at home for failing because we failed to do our work and pass an extension bill.

A lapse in the authorization will also result in the halt of certification and registration of new aviation products, greatly disrupting the aviation manufacturing industry and jeopardizing more good paying jobs. The FAA's aircraft registry would close, delaying deliveries of new aircraft. As many as 10,000 aircraft a month could be grounded if registration cannot be renewed.

H.R. 3614 will allow us to continue developing a bipartisan, long-term reauthorization bill which will improve, rebuild, and modernize our Nation's safe, yet highly antiquated, aviation system.

I urge support of H.R. 3614.

I reserve the balance of my time

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

Mr. Speaker, I agree with my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey, that it is essential that we pass H.R. 3614—the Senate passed it expeditiously—and it be signed by the President. We cannot afford even, you know, the thought of a shutdown of the FAA. We have actually gone down that road in the past.

Chairman MICA, in July of 2011, put some provisions into an FAA reauthorization that were objectionable to two very powerful Senators, and we actually went through a shutdown. What we lost was \$400 million of revenue because the excise tax expired.

Now, one airline, to give them credit, did pass the savings through, the excise tax, Alaska Airlines. All the other airlines kept the money, and we lost \$400 million from the trust fund.

Capital programs ground to a halt. Airport construction ground to a halt, threatening tens of thousands of jobs. Airport inspectors had to work. They were essential employees. They weren't paid, and they couldn't get government vouchers, so they had to use their personal credit cards to purchase tickets to go to work to do their job, which they weren't being paid for.

I mean, this was the ultimate of absurdity. I only go into some detail on that because that is relevant to this extension.

This is a 6-month extension. That should give us more than ample time to agree upon a long-term FAA authorization. Much work has already been done on major portions of the bill, but some disagreements remain over the future of the air traffic organization.

My preference would be to insulate the entire FAA from future vicissitudes of Congress going off the rails with a shutdown and furloughs and provisions that are unacceptable to the Senate that cause a temporary lapse in authorization. You know, we can get there. We are very close now. This year, all but 7 percent of the FAA's budget will be paid for by user fees, excise taxes, and others, so we are quite close.

We would like to reform procurement, to streamline it and make it work better at the FAA. When I was a very young Member of Congress, I got to witness the airport air traffic controller's workstation of the future. That was 1987. Well, it is 2015, and they don't have them yet.

The FAA is the only agency of government worse at procurement than the Pentagon. Congress has tried to reform it; it didn't stick. We have got to try something different to get it to be more agile to give us the 21st century equipment and software that we need.

Then there are issues of the actual sort of shape of the FAA bureaucracy, a little bit like that in the middle. Congress, also back in 1986, gave the FAA license to reform personnel practices to deal with some of that mid-level management bulge and streamline the agency and decisionmaking process, but that didn't take either.

So the three problems are the predictability of funding and the agency being able to look into the future without having to worry about shutdowns, furloughs—I don't know how much time they spent over the last couple of weeks getting ready for this shutdown that everyone thought would come this week before Speaker BOEHNER announced his retirement; that has got to

be dealt with—and then also the procurement reform and the personnel.

The chairman's solution is to separate only the air traffic organization from the FAA and insulate that from Congress and those sorts of problems and make it, you know, free of the procurement rules and a lot of the personnel rules. I would prefer to do that with the entire agency, because there are functions—we do have the best air traffic control system in the world. We are busier in the U.S. with more planes under instrument flight rules on a daily basis, about 20 percent more on an IFR average, than Canada, U.K., France, and Germany combined.

So we know we have a safe system. We move massive amounts of air traffic. We don't want to mess that up. And I understand, but I also don't think we can isolate it from other decision-makers in the agency and leave them subject to the vicissitudes of Congress.

The people who do the certifications, who do the inspections, who do the safety, it seems to me it should all be moved; and I propose a 21st century constitutionally chartered corporation in order to accomplish those goals and make it self-funding, self-sufficient, and not subject to appropriations or shutdowns or anything else that a future Congress might imagine. So that is the hangup. We haven't agreed on that part yet, but I think we can.

We share common objectives, and 6 months should be more than ample time. I am hopeful that early this fall the chairman and I can resolve those issues with other members of the committee, and then we can go forward with our colleagues in the Senate and hopefully have, you know, a bill on the President's desk early, early next year, if not by the end of this year, although December promises to be perhaps a bit chaotic around here.

□ 1600

In any case, 6 months should be ample time. I do not anticipate multiple short-term extensions. I don't want them, nor does the chairman, nor do, I believe, any other thoughtful members of the committee.

I see the gentleman from New Jersey shaking his head. We couldn't agree more. We have been down that road before, down that runway before. We don't want to go down that runway again.

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

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN).

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the temporary measure to extend the authorization of the FAA today, but I do so with great disappointment. We could be on the floor today to enact a longer term FAA reauthorization bill.

In the last 2 years, the Subcommittee on Aviation, led by my colleague from New Jersey, Mr. LOBIONDO, has held 16 hearings on a variety of topics. We have heard from stakeholders that there is a long list of things that we need to do to stay competitive with our economic rivals and keep our airspace the safest and most efficient in the world:

We need to reform aircraft certification so that manufacturers can get the newest, safest equipment to market.

We need to set clear rules for unmanned aerial vehicles and accelerate efforts for their safe use.

We need to advance NextGen programs to move air traffic faster and more efficiently.

Chairman SHUSTER, Chairman LOBIONDO, Ranking Member DEFAZIO, and I have achieved a bipartisan agreement on most of these major key issues that we need to address. That bill is ready to go.

We didn't hear during these hearings that we needed to privatize air traffic control. Now, some people want to privatize air traffic control. I know that they want to do this in good faith. But we don't need to do it, and it is preventing the things that we need to do from getting done.

An entire bipartisan bill is being held up because we can't agree yet on the details of what would be a very complex proposal. I fail to understand why at this juncture such a proposal is necessary, particularly when it prevents significant and much-needed reform from taking place.

There is no dispute that today we safely operate the most complex and congested airspace in the world. Last year the Government Accountability Office asked 76 aviation stakeholders whether the FAA is capable of operating an efficient air traffic control system. The overwhelming majority, 64 of those, said the FAA is, in fact, capable of doing so. Privatizing the current system is clearly not a pressing need. It is a want.

I wish I could say today I am surprised that we find ourselves here today, but many people have been saying for a long time that this was the situation that we would be facing on September 30. In fact, when we held a hearing on air traffic privatization back in March, I predicted we were headed down this road of multiple short-term reauthorizations.

The bipartisan portions of the bill that Chairman SHUSTER, Chairman LOBIONDO, Ranking Member DEFAZIO, and I have agreed to would have immediate benefits all over the country.

In my home State of Washington, it would protect and create American jobs through airport construction and aerospace manufacturing; it would improve aviation safety; it would improve the way the aircraft and parts are certified to get newer and safer technology to market; it would build on the safety improvements that this body

has made following the tragic Colgan flight 3407 in 2009; it would improve the regulation and the development of unmanned aerial systems, which continue to proliferate in our airspace.

We need a strong regulatory system in place to safely grow the unmanned aircraft industry, and until we act, that system cannot be in place. For every day of this extension, travelers and the aerospace industry will not receive the improvements and protections that we have crafted in the bipartisan portions of the bill that we are close to agreeing on. We will continue to fall behind other countries that are making similar improvements.

As many lawmakers and aviation stakeholders recall, the last FAA reauthorization bill came after a period of 5 years and 23 short-term extensions. I had hoped we would avoid serial extensions this time around, but today we start down that path.

Yes, it is with disappointment that I am here to support a temporary extension and strongly urge all my colleagues to make sure this is the only temporary extension before enactment of a long-term bill.

We have a long list of things that we need to do today to improve our airspace. We should focus on those things instead of the things only that we want to do.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, here we are with a short-term extension for 6 months. I believe it is critical that we do this, obviously, as it is about to expire. There are things that not only do we want to do, but we need to do, to make sure that we have the safest airspace in the world.

We also need to make sure it is the most efficient airspace in the world. We can do that if we deploy the technology and the things we have been talking about for almost 2 years now to transform the FAA into something that can move quicker, that can deploy the technology that is available to us.

When we look around the world, there are over 50 countries that have taken the air traffic control organization out of government and have been able to maintain the highest levels of safety, but deploy technology that makes their airspace more efficient. That is the kind of thing we are looking at.

I think we are at a critical time. What we have been talking about is not anything new. It is something that we have been talking about for 20 years. In fact, the Clinton administration had a similar proposal, the Bush administration had a similar proposal, and here we are today talking about it. But I think that we have different groups that are looking positively at this.

We are very close to putting something together that, as I said, will transform the air traffic control system while keeping back in government

the safety and regulatory oversight to this agency to make sure that we are streamlining the certification process for our aviation industry that is manufacturing everything from Boeings to Gulfstreams, to the avionics, to the parts that go into these flying systems.

We have got to maintain our lead in the world. The way we do that is to streamline the certification process. The gentleman from Washington, who has Boeing in his district, agrees with me on that issue. There is a lot more in this that we need to do to move forward.

I think, as we get through September and into October, we are going to be able to see the bill that we have put forth that is going to have, I believe, bipartisan support not only from Congress, but around the country, around Washington, D.C., and, as I said, here in the House. In talking to the Senate, I am encouraged by what they have said about what we are looking at proposing.

Again, I would encourage all Members to support this 6-month extension to give us the time to get our bill on and off the floor and let the Senate work on it so we can truly do something that is bold, do something that is transformational, and do something that will be very, very positive for aviation, not only travel, but for the manufacturing industry in this country.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I have requests to speak from Members who aren't here.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, again, I would like to thank Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. LARSEN. I urge all my colleagues to support the legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, with passage of H.R. 3614 today, the House will "kick the can down the road" on a long-term FAA reauthorization for another six months. I certainly recognize the dire need to keep our airports and air travel system functioning in the face of an expiration of the FAA's authorization in less than 72 hours. However, I'm very disappointed that this bill does not contain any changes to current policy regarding aircraft noise impacts on communities surrounding airports.

Over the last several months, constituents throughout my Congressional District have experienced an alarming increase in aircraft noise due to the implementation of new flight paths under the FAA's Next Gen program. The new flight paths have caused certain communities to be hit especially hard by airplane noise, and other rural communities that have never experienced it are now being bombarded by noise. Many of these communities received little or no advance notice or opportunity to comment on the flight path changes before they were implemented, and they were blindsided when the changes went into effect earlier this year.

In July, I joined the Congressional Quiet Skies Caucus so that together we could make recommendations for the Transportation Committee to include in an FAA reauthorization bill. These recommendations include: ensuring that

FAA completes a robust community engagement process before flight paths are changed; requiring the FAA to use a new method of measuring noise that captures the true levels of noise on the ground; removing the categorical exclusion from full environmental reviews for flight path changes; and mandating independent research on the health impacts of aviation noise. These important reforms would substantially improve the FAA's process of addressing and avoiding noise impacts.

Once again, I wish to express my disappointment that the bill before us today simply reauthorizes the FAA for another six months with none of these important changes included. As the debate over a long-term FAA reauthorization continues, I hope these recommendations will be carefully considered and ultimately included in the final legislation. The ability to get a good night's sleep for thousands of my constituents depends on it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3614.

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.

EQUITABLE ACCESS TO CARE AND HEALTH ACT

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2061) to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2061

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 "Equitable Access to Care and Health Act" or the "EACH Act".

SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL RELIGIOUS EXEMPTION FROM HEALTH COVERAGE RESPONSIBILITY REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5000A(d)(2)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

"(A) RELIGIOUS CONSCIENCE EXEMPTIONS.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—Such term shall not include any individual for any month if such individual has in effect an exemption under section 1311(d)(4)(H) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act which certifies that—

"(I) such individual is a member of a recognized religious sect or division thereof which is described in section 1402(g)(1), and is adherent of established tenets or teachings of such sect or division as described in such section, or

"(II) such individual is a member of a religious sect or division thereof which is not described in section 1402(g)(1), who relies solely on a religious method of healing, and for whom the acceptance of medical health services would be inconsistent with the religious beliefs of the individual.

"(ii) SPECIAL RULES.—

"(I) MEDICAL HEALTH SERVICES DEFINED.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term "med-

ical health services" does not include routine dental, vision, and hearing services, midwifery services, vaccinations, necessary medical services provided to children, services required by law or by a third party, and such other services as the Secretary of Health and Human Services may provide in implementing section 1311(d)(4)(H) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

"(II) ATTESTATION REQUIRED.—Clause (i)(II) shall apply to an individual for months in a taxable year only if the information provided by the individual under section 1411(b)(5)(A) of such Act includes an attestation that the individual has not received medical health services during the preceding taxable year."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

(c) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in the amendment made by subsection (a) shall preempt any State law requiring the provision of medical treatment for children, especially those who are seriously ill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) 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 material on H.R. 2061 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 to speak in favor of the EACH Act. This bill would expand the religious liberty exemption to the individual mandate. Right now the exemption is minuscule. To qualify, you have to believe as a matter of faith in giving up any private or public insurance, including Social Security. That includes the Amish, the Order of Mennonites, and that is about it. That is way too strict.

Let's remember the reason for this mandate in the first place. The other side said that, if you get sick and you don't have insurance, the rest of us will have to pay for your health care. Well, we are talking about people who do not use health care. So why should they have to be forced to buy insurance for health care that they don't use?

I don't think we should force anybody to buy health insurance against their will, for that matter, but I think it is especially wrong to force people to buy insurance against their faith. This bill simply says: If you, as a matter of faith, don't use health care, then you are exempt from the individual mandate.

I am glad we are working on this long overdue change today. I would note that this came out of committee on a voice vote. I encourage Members to support it.

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

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

The current religious exemption from ACA mirrors other religious exemptions used in the Internal Revenue Code. The EACH Act provides that anyone who “is a member of a religious sect that relies solely on religious methods of healing and for whom medical care is inconsistent with religious beliefs” can claim a religious exemption from the individual mandate requirement.

As a step to maintain a narrowly defined religious exemption and meet concerns, this legislation is written more precisely than the previous bill that passed unanimously in this House.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), the author of the EACH Act.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman RYAN for his leadership on this issue. I really appreciate the Committee on Ways and Means allowing me, a noncommittee member, to be able to take this important piece of legislation to the floor today.

Today this Congress has an opportunity to work in a bipartisan way to promote religious liberty and, frankly, Mr. Speaker, fairness. H.R. 2061, the EACH Act, does this by modestly expanding the religious conscience exemption under the Affordable Care Act to include individuals like Christian Scientists, who rely solely on religious methods of healing.

The existing religious conscience exemption under the Affordable Care Act exclusively applies, as Chairman RYAN said, to a few certain sects of faith. As a result, many Americans—as I mentioned before, the Christian Scientists—are required to purchase medical health insurance that does not cover the health care of their religious practice or choice. Alternatively, they are forced to pay tax penalties for not purchasing such insurance.

A similar version of the EACH Act passed this House unanimously under the suspension of the rules during the last Congress. In order to improve the bill, as Mr. LEVIN, my colleague stated, modest changes to this bill’s language were made, with input from the Department of Treasury, the Department of Health and Human Services, and other key stakeholders.

Under this bill’s new language, applicants must annually attest to the exchange that they are a member of a religious group, that they rely solely on a religious method of healing, and that they have not received medical health services during the preceding taxable year.

Additionally, with the help of input from the American Academy of Pediatrics, the bill now makes it clear that the legislation does not preempt any

State laws requiring the provision of medical treatment for children. Further, if a parent needs to provide necessary medical services to a child, doing so would not invalidate the individual’s exemption.

The EACH Act is truly an example of bipartisan legislation with input from stakeholders to make it better. As of today, it has more than 100 Republican and more than 60 Democratic cosponsors.

I am particularly proud to have worked with my friend and colleague, Mr. KEATING, on moving this legislation forward. He knows this issue well. His home State of Massachusetts established a similar religious conscience exemption in State law, and it is working just as planned.

Mr. Speaker, I also represent Principia College in Elsah, Illinois. It is a college for Christian Scientists. I am proud to stand up and promote their religious liberty and that of many others in this great Nation.

I urge a “yes” vote.

□ 1615

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. DAVIS captured it quite well.

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, H.R. 2061, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENSURING ACCESS TO CLINICAL TRIALS ACT OF 2015

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 139) to permanently allow an exclusion under the Supplemental Security Income program and the Medicaid program for compensation provided to individuals who participate in clinical trials for rare diseases or conditions.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 139

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 “Ensuring Access to Clinical Trials Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. ELIMINATION OF SUNSET PROVISION.

Effective as if included in the enactment of the Improving Access to Clinical Trials Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-255, 124 Stat. 2640), section 3 of that Act is amended by striking subsection (e).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gen-

tleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) 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 material on S. 139, 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 support of S. 139, the Ensuring Access to Clinical Trials Act.

The National Institutes of Health says that there are 7,000 rare diseases affecting people in the United States, and if we are going to find cures for those diseases, the first thing we need to do is to get people to participate in clinical trials. All too often, researchers cannot find enough participants because so few people have these diseases in the first place.

Now—no surprise here—the government used to make it more difficult for researchers to find people. Say you had a rare disease and you were on public assistance, like SSI or Medicaid. If you got compensated for participating in one of these trials, you got smaller benefits. That is why, in 2010, we passed the Improving Access to Clinical Trials Act.

For the past 5 years, this law has allowed people to collect up to \$2,000 per year by participating in rare-disease clinical trials without threat of losing their SSI or Medicaid benefits. The GAO says the law is working. Ever since we passed this law, more people on SSI have been participating in clinical trials as a result of it.

The problem is this law expires next week, on October 5, so this bill would simply extend current law. That way, more people can participate in clinical trials without any reason to worry or without any threat to a loss of their benefits, and that way, we will continue to make strides in fighting these diseases. CBO tells us this bill will cost virtually nothing.

My friends, Senator HATCH and Senator WYDEN, introduced this bill in the Senate. It passed the Senate by unanimous consent. In the House, my colleagues Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. MARINO from Pennsylvania have introduced it along with 50 other cosponsors.

I will include in the RECORD a letter listing the many supporters of this legislation. It is a list of over 70 organizations, including the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, the Muscular Dystrophy Association, and the Huntington’s Disease Society of America, just to name a few.

SEPTEMBER 22, 2015.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. SANDER M. LEVIN,
Ranking Member, Committee on Ways and
Means, House of Representatives, Wash-
ington, DC.

Hon. CHARLES BOUSTANY, Jr.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Human Resources,
Committee on Ways and Means, House of
Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Human Re-
sources, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMEN RYAN AND BOUSTANY AND
RANKING MEMBERS LEVIN AND DOGGETT: The
undersigned organizations, representing mil-
lions of Americans with rare and genetic dis-
eases, advocates, industry, and academic in-
stitutions, write to express strong support
for H.R. 209/S. 139, the Ensuring Access to
Clinical Trials Act of 2015. This legislation
will permanently remove a barrier to clinical
research and allow Supplemental Security
Income (SSI) and Medicaid recipients to
participate in and benefit from clinical trials
without fear of losing vital benefits.

The Ensuring Access to Clinical Trials Act
of 2015 eliminates the sunset clause from the
Improving Access to Clinical Trials Act of
2009 (IACT), legislation signed into law in
2010, making the IACT a permanent law.
This will allow patients with rare diseases to
continue to receive up to \$2,000 in compensa-
tion for participating in clinical trials with-
out that compensation counting towards
their income eligibility limits for SSI and
Medicaid.

Removing barriers to drug trial participa-
tion is particularly important as recent ad-
vances in medical research and technology
allow for the development of new and prom-
ising medications. Securing an adequate
number of clinical trial participants is vital
for therapies that treat rare conditions, but
rare disease researchers in particular often
have difficulty recruiting drug trial partici-
pants, simply because they have a smaller
pool of patients.

Further, with the advent of precision medi-
cine, therapies are being customized to treat
a patient's specific genetic makeup. These
types of trials often require clinical trial
participants bearing specific genetic
mutations, which necessarily creates an even
more complex and exclusive clinical trial
recruitment process. Ensuring that all pa-
tients with rare diseases are able to partici-
pate in clinical trials can help open the door
for the advancement of new targeted thera-
pies in many important areas of medicine,
including cancer and rare diseases like cys-
tic fibrosis.

Now is the time to ensure that all patients
have access to clinical trials for potentially
life-saving treatments. We look forward to
working with you to secure passage of this
bill to enable Social Security beneficiaries
to participate in clinical trials so that re-
search into life-saving treatments may con-
tinue to advance.

Sincerely,

Actavis
Adult CF Program—Northwestern Univer-
sity
Adult Polyglucosan Body Disease Research
Foundation APBDRF
Alpha-1 Foundation
ALS Association
American Association for Respiratory Care
(AARC)
American Autoimmune Related Diseases As-
sociation (AARDA)
Amyloidosis Support Groups Inc.
Ann & Robert H. Lurie Children's Hospital of
Chicago

Antonio J. and Janet Palumbo Cystic Fibro-
sis Center, Pediatric and Adult Program,
Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh UPMC
Association of Clinical Research Organiza-
tions (ACRO)

Association of Gastrointestinal Motility Dis-
orders, Inc. (AGMD)
Batten Disease Support and Research Asso-
ciation

Biotechnology Industry Organization (BIO)
CADASIL Association Inc.

Cardio-Facio-Cutaneous International
CARES Foundation, Inc. (Congenital Adre-
nal hyperplasia Research, Education and
Support Foundation)

CF Care Center at Dayton Children's Hospi-
tial

Congenital Hyperinsulinism International
(CHI)

COPD Foundation

Cure CMD

Cure SMA

Cystic Fibrosis Foundation

Cystinosis Foundation

Debra of America

FasterCures

First Focus

Foundation Fighting Blindness

Foundation for Prader-Willi Research

Foundation to Eradicate Duchenne

Friedreich's Ataxia Research Alliance
(FARA)

Genetic Alliance

Hide & Seek Foundation for Lysosomal Dis-
ease Research

Huntington's Disease Society of America

International Fibrodysplasia Ossificans
Progressiva Association (IFOPA)

Indiana University School of Medicine, CF
Care Center

International Society of Nurses in Genetics
(ISONG)

Lymphangiomatosis & Gorham's Disease Al-
liance

Lymphedema Advocacy Group

Maine Medical Center CF Program

M-CM Network

MEBO Research, Inc.

Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
Cystic Fibrosis Care Center

MitoAction

MLD Foundation

Moebius Syndrome Foundation

Muscular Dystrophy Association

Myotonic Dystrophy Foundation

National Gaucher Foundation, Inc.

National MPS Society

National Organization for Albinism and
Hypopigmentation (NOAH)

National Organization for Rare Disorders
(NORD)

National PKU Alliance

National Spasmodic Torticollis Association

Parent Project Muscular Dystrophy (PPMD)

Parents and Researchers Interested in
Smith-Magenis Syndrome (PRISMS)

Progeria Research Foundation

ProMedica Toledo Children's Hospital

PXE International

Research! America

Rett Syndrome Research Trust

Stanley Manne Children's Research Institute

Tarlov Cyst Disease Foundation

The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia

The Detroit Medical Reserve Corps

The Massachusetts Medical Society

The National Alopecia Areata Foundation
(NAAF)

The State University of New York School of
Medicine and Biomedical Sciences

Trimethylaminuria Foundation

Tuberous Sclerosis Alliance

University of Michigan Health System, Cys-
tic Fibrosis Center

University of Pennsylvania Health System,
Cystic Fibrosis Center

University of Washington, Cystic Fibrosis
Care Center

Vertex Pharmaceuticals
Virginia Commonwealth University Health
System, Adult Cystic Fibrosis Program
Wilson Disease Association

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. This is com-
mon sense, and I urge my colleagues to
adopt this.

There is one more point I would like
to make. Nick Gwyn, the minority
staff director of the Human Resources
Subcommittee on Ways and Means, is
retiring.

I would like to take a minute to rec-
ognize Nick Gwyn for his work on this
issue. He is leaving the staff of Ways
and Means after serving on the com-
mittee since 1998. This should be the
last of many bills that he has helped
our colleagues manage on the floor.

During his time staffing the com-
mittee, Nick has worked on numerous
laws related to welfare, disability, and
unemployment policy. He also worked
closely with our staff to create bipar-
tisan child welfare laws that found
more loving families for children in
need.

We wish Nick well in the next stage
of his career, and we thank him for his
service to the committee, the House,
and the country.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I also
wanted to honor Mr. Gwyn, and this is
a good opportunity for us to do that.

I yield such time as he may consume
to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr.
LEVIN), the ranking Democrat on the
committee.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. DOGGETT and I will
say a few words, when many, many are
in order.

Nick Gwyn has been, as our chairman
said, a more than valuable member of
this staff and a more than dedicated
member of this staff. He has been in-
valuable. His dedication has been end-
less.

Nick is leaving to pursue family and
other needs. He knows he is going to
leave us in need, in terms of his im-
mense talents. His dedication to the
subject matter that is, by definition, so
directly involved with people is really
beyond estimation.

The subcommittee's work deals, as I
said, with the everyday challenges that
so many of the citizens in this country
face day in and day out. It was only a
few days ago that we heard from Pope
Francis how important it is for this in-
stitution to focus on the individual
needs of people, including those who
are poor, some with handicaps, but ev-
erybody who is in need of a hand up,
really, as much, if not more than, a
helping hand. And Nick has devoted
over a dozen years to this very purpose.

So, if I might say so, we have worked
together with Nick, and we just want
to thank him for more than a job well
done. We have been very proud to serve
with him.

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

I will just add, Nick, that I know you
have spent some 25 years here on the

Hill, 17 with our committee. Though I benefited from your good counsel before becoming the ranking Democrat on the Human Resources Subcommittee, I particularly appreciated your good counsel during the last 3 years, whether it was working on child abuse and our successful work with former Chair Dave Camp and getting a national commission or dealing with problems of the unemployed.

Just overall, the jurisdiction of our subcommittee is about children, children in need. Whether they are under this SSI program or child abuse or child care, they are children who should be able to rely on the Temporary Assistance for Needy Family program for their needs.

Nick has been an able advocate for children and someone who did work well, as Chairman RYAN said, with all members of our committee to advance these purposes. We wish him well in his new endeavors, and we thank him for his service.

Mr. Speaker, if I might talk just a little bit about the Ensuring Access to Clinical Trials Act, it is about getting new treatments quickly into the lives of patients that are suffering from dread diseases across America, reauthorizing existing law.

Senator RON WYDEN led this effort successfully in the Senate with Senator HATCH. And here, my colleagues, Mr. MARINO and Mr. JIM MCGOVERN, co-chairs of the Cystic Fibrosis Caucus, joined with me in the introduction of this legislation in the House.

The National Organization for Rare Disorders, and over 75 other organizations, has been a strong supporter of this legislation, and I thank them for their work on behalf of the legislation.

This bill makes permanent a law that is due to expire that will allow for individuals with certain debilitating conditions to exempt a small amount of their income gained from participating in medical trials from Supplemental Security Income, or SSI, and for Medicaid eligibility determination.

This exemption removes an important barrier to participating in clinical trials. If it is allowed to expire, patients contributing to vital research could face the difficult decision of either dropping out of the trials altogether or losing their benefits.

If you have ever met with someone with cystic fibrosis or someone in your family has it, you recognize how small the daily challenges that you face are compared to theirs.

I think of Nicole Flores in Austin, who has two children battling with rare diseases. She explained that patients shouldn't have to worry about losing assistance when they are just working hard to stay alive.

Over the past several months, I have heard from a number of families affected by rare diseases. These are parents who shared with me how far-reaching the modest relief this bill provides can provide for a number of people.

One couple recently sent me a picture of their 15-year-old son Mac Rung, who was diagnosed with cystic fibrosis at birth. Every morning and every evening, Mac undergoes chest therapy in order to clear his lungs and to avoid serious damage to help him get through the day. He takes medications with every meal to help him absorb his food and gain weight. He is battling a disease that many Americans have never heard of at an age where he shouldn't have to worry about anything other than school. And because this disease is progressive, they are really working against the clock.

Because of the approval of two new drugs, they told me that they never have had as much hope for Mac and his future as they do today. And while they are not a family that themselves rely on the bill that we have today before us, as Chairman RYAN indicated, they, and anyone with these rare diseases, stand to benefit if we have widespread participation in clinical trials on the approval of other new promising drugs like the ones that are already helping Mac.

Financially penalizing vulnerable people for participating in research does nothing to advance that research. The National Institutes of Health—NIH, as we know it—estimates that 25 million Americans are suffering because of rare disease.

I hope now that today, the House will join the Senate in approving the Ensuring Access to Clinical Trials Act and that we continue this important effort to support patients across the country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO).

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 209, the Ensuring Access to Clinical Trials Act, legislation that I have co-sponsored.

We must continue to ensure barriers do not stall patients from participating in rare disease clinical trials. This bill will continue to encourage rare disease patients, even those receiving Social Security Income or Medicaid benefits, to participate in clinical trials without jeopardizing their eligibility for those benefits. All patients should have access to these important and often life-saving trials that will advance medical research and work towards improving their health.

The Senate has taken the important step to pass this legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to advance this commonsense, bipartisan initiative and send it to the President's desk for his signature. I thank the chairman and all those involved in the House for their work on this.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman RYAN as well as Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member FRANK PALLONE, who marked up this bill, and urge bipartisan approval of it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I also urge our colleagues to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support S. 139, the Ensuring Access to Clinical Trials Act of 2015. This bill will ensure current Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and Medicaid recipients can maintain those benefits while participating in clinical trials. Keeping their benefits will help them, but as a doctor I know that their participation in such trials stands to benefit countless others as well who suffer from rare conditions, both in the U.S. and abroad. We should ensure that public policy encourages that whenever we can, and that's what this bill does.

Under current law, the Social Security Administration excludes up to \$2,000 annually in compensation received by individuals participating in rare disease clinical trials when determining their SSI and Medicaid eligibility and benefits. But this provision, put in place by bipartisan legislation in 2010, is set to expire on October 5, 2015. After that date, all payments for participating in such clinical trials would be counted as income for SSI and Medicaid recipients, reducing or even ending their eligibility for those benefits.

A number of people with rare diseases like Cystic Fibrosis receive SSI benefits. If this policy is not made permanent, an individual participating in a clinical trial for a new treatment for Cystic Fibrosis could see a reduction or even the complete elimination of those important benefits.

The reality is, most simply won't take that risk, and will avoid participating in such trials. As GAO found in a 2014 report, "some stakeholders noted that compensation decreased participation in clinical trials in the past because individuals were concerned about its impact on their SSI eligibility and benefits." On the other hand, "financial incentives to participate in clinical trials have generally been found to encourage participation in trials. This is likely because of the time, inconvenience, and expense that may be involved."

Ultimately, not continuing this policy could actually prevent clinical trials from occurring, since it would restrict the already small number of people able to participate in the trial in the first place.

That's why the passage of S. 139 is so important, as it will remove the sunset date for current law—October 5, 2015. Failing to do so would force individuals to once again choose between maintaining their current health and disability benefits and the chance to participate in a clinical trial that could improve or even cure their condition, as well as help others like them in the future.

This bill is simple and consistent with current SSI program exemptions. S. 139 strikes the October 5, 2015 sunset date on current policy, permitting SSI and Medicaid recipients with rare diseases to participate in such trials that help to advance research into finding cures. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that S. 139 will result in insignificant costs to the Federal government over the next 10 years, meaning no offset for this legislation is required.

But its true value to people with rare diseases—and those who in the future might benefit by their participation in clinical trials permitted under this legislation—could be enormous. Let's pass this important legislation.

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. 139.

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.

□ 1630

HIGHER EDUCATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3594) to extend temporarily the Federal Perkins Loan program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3594

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 “Higher Education Extension Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY AND INTEGRITY.

Section 114(f) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1011c(f)) is amended by striking “2015” and inserting “2016”.

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL PERKINS LOAN PROGRAM.

(a) **AUTHORITY TO MAKE LOANS.**—Section 461 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087aa) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) **AUTHORITY TO MAKE LOANS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—With respect to any student who is not described in paragraph (2), an institution of higher education may make loans under this part to such a student until September 30, 2016, from the student loan fund established under this part by the institution.

“(2) **ADDITIONAL LOANS FOR CERTAIN STUDENTS.**—With respect to any student who has received a loan made under this part for an academic year ending prior to October 1, 2016, an institution of higher education that has most recently made such a loan to the student for an academic program at such institution may continue making loans under this part through March 31, 2018, from the student loan fund established under this part by the institution to enable the student to continue or complete such academic program, but only if the institution has awarded all Federal Direct Stafford Loans for which such student is eligible.

“(3) **PROHIBITION ON ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS.**—No funds are authorized to be appropriated under this Act or any other Act to carry out the functions described in paragraphs (1) and (2) for any fiscal year following fiscal year 2015.”; and

(2) by striking subsection (c).

(b) **DISTRIBUTION OF ASSETS FROM STUDENT LOAN FUNDS.**—Section 466 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087ff) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “After September 30, 2003, and not later than March 31, 2004” and inserting “Beginning October 1, 2016”; and

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “2003” and inserting “2016”; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “After October 1, 2012” and inserting “Beginning October 1, 2016”.

(c) **ADDITIONAL EXTENSIONS NOT PERMITTED.**—Section 422 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1226a) shall not apply to further extend the duration of—

(1) the authority under paragraph (1) of section 461(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087aa(b)), as amended by subsection (a)(1) of this section, beyond September 30, 2016, on the basis of the extension under such subsection; or

(2) the authority under paragraph (2) of section 461(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087aa(b)), as amended by subsection (a)(1) of this section, beyond March 31, 2018, on the basis of the extension under such subsection.

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.

Section 491(k) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1098(k)) is amended by striking “2015” and inserting “2016”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 3594.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and rise in support of the Higher Education Extension Act of 2015.

Mr. Speaker, this week, several provisions of the Higher Education Extension Act are set to expire, including the Perkins Loan Program.

For several decades, the Perkins Loan Program has provided low-interest-rate loans to college students with severe financial need. If we allow this program to expire, it would be at a time when our Nation’s higher education system is failing many students trying to earn a college degree and a lifetime of opportunity and success.

College costs continue to soar, new rules and regulations discourage innovation and deny access, and students are struggling to complete their education, not to mention find good-paying jobs.

This is a very bleak reality facing students from my home State of Michigan and across the country. The American people deserve better. Students and families in my district and across the country deserve better, and my three children, who will one day in the not-so-distant future begin their college careers, deserve better. The reauthorization of the Higher Education Extension Act presents Congress an opportunity to strengthen higher education for students, families, and taxpayers.

My colleagues and I have already proposed a number of responsible re-

forms that promise to promote innovation, strengthen transparency, and help students complete their education. Members are also working to streamline the confusing maze of financial programs so that students can get the support they need.

As we continue our efforts to reauthorize the law, now is not the time to turn our backs on the students who rely on the Perkins Loan Program for their college education. Now is the time to help meet the immediate need of students in Michigan and across our country, and the Higher Education Extension Act of 2015 will do just exactly that.

This bipartisan proposal will extend for 1 year the Perkins Loan Program, allowing participating colleges and universities to continue to service their borrowers. It will also allow current Perkins recipients who remain in the same academic program to be eligible to receive those funds through March 2018. The legislation will also extend other provisions in the Higher Education Extension Act that aim to support students, institutions, and policymakers.

Finally, let me note for my colleagues and the American people, by reforming the Perkins Loan Program, we ensure that this legislation is fully paid for, at no additional cost to taxpayers.

I am proud to lead this bipartisan effort with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN), who shares my commitment to helping other students achieve their dream of a college education.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on the Higher Education Extension Act of 2015.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 3594, the Higher Education Extension Act, and I would like to thank my colleague, Mr. BISHOP, as well as my colleagues, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MESSER, and Ranking Member SCOTT, for their leadership on this issue.

This bill would extend the Perkins Loan Program for 1 year. Perkins loans are need-based loans which foster access to higher education for low-income students by providing low-interest loans to students in need. Colleges and universities tailor the program to best fit borrowers’ and educational institutions’ situations.

Perkins is a risk-sharing program, with institutions contributing one-third of their students’ awards. This “ownership interest” also contributes to the successful management of this vital program.

We have only 2 days before the Perkins Loan Program is set to expire, so we must act immediately.

Since its inception in 1958, over \$28 billion in loans have been made to students through almost 26 million aid awards. Perkins Loan borrowers are predominantly from lower income families and are often the first in their family to attend college.

Perkins loans have a set interest rate of 5 percent, which begins to accrue 9 months after the borrower ceases to be a student. However, this program has not been reauthorized since the 2009 fiscal year.

Besides making higher education accessible for lower income students, this program serves as an incentive for people who wish to go into a public service by offering targeted loan cancellations for specific progression in areas of national need, including teaching, nursing, and law enforcement.

Earlier this year, I introduced a bipartisan resolution in support of the Perkins loans with Congressman MESSER of Indiana, H. Res. 294, with 56 cosponsors. My colleague Representative LOUISE SLAUGHTER, a leader on this issue, offered a letter with more than 90 bipartisan signatures in support of this important program. Over 33 groups and higher educational institutions have supported this bill's reauthorization.

Bottom line, the Perkins Loan Program has helped millions of students and families struggling to find a way to pay for college. I applaud my colleague across the aisle, specifically, a thank-you to Mr. BISHOP, for helping to ensure students have access to Federal financial aid that they need to make college affordable and accessible.

I urge support of this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman BISHOP and Congressman POCAN for introducing H.R. 3594, the Higher Education Extension Act.

I would also like to thank Chairman KLINE and Ranking Member SCOTT for supporting a bipartisan effort to avoid the expiration of the Federal Perkins Loan Program, a program that helps make college affordable for low-income students across the country.

In my district in Oregon, across the State, and across the country, colleges and universities use the Perkins Loan Program to expand access to higher education. For example, Linfield College and Pacific University, in my district, award Perkins loans to hundreds of students; and University of Oregon and Oregon State University distribute Perkins loans to thousands, providing a clear benefit to students who have significant financial need.

As Congress works to reauthorize the Higher Education Extension Act, it is important that we continue to increase access to affordable higher education.

I commend my colleague for introducing the Higher Education Extension Act, and I ask all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this bipartisan bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER).

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for this bipartisan effort, and I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today also in support of the Higher Education Extension Act.

The Perkins Loan Program provides low-interest loans to economically disadvantaged students to help finance their postsecondary educations.

The Perkins Loan Program assisted nearly 540,000 American students nationwide in the 2013-2014 academic year by providing \$1.2 billion in loans. More than 1,500 colleges and universities across the United States participate in this popular program.

While the Perkins Loan Program is sometimes viewed as benefiting students predominately in the Northeast, California is the second largest recipient. In California, more than 46,000 students received these loans last year. These loans resulted in more than \$105 million in the last year to California students.

Students from across the country who attend California schools, like Saint Mary's College in my district, are able to receive a top-notch education through assistance programs like the Perkins Loan Program. Increasing access and improving affordability translates to increased opportunities for students and improves the Nation's economy by ensuring that today's students are tomorrow's highly trained workforce.

This bill is a necessary step to ensuring that our students continue to receive the assistance they need and deserve. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), who has been a leader on this issue.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I am very grateful to Mr. BISHOP and to Mr. MESSER and Mr. POCAN and all others who worked on this really important issue.

Mr. Speaker, the Perkins Loan Program is 57 years old. It is the Nation's longest running Federal student loan program. It is unlike any other Federal student aid program because this critical program is specifically directed at helping low-income students afford the cost of higher education. It helps the deserving students who would not be able to afford a college education otherwise, students that save up and work hard for every credit that they earn.

Without Perkins, 500,000 low-income students across the country, nearly 50,000 from the State of New York and over 6,000 in my district alone, would not have access to a critical safety net.

The Perkins Loan fills the gaps in student aid, and acts as a lifeline when

unforeseen disruptions jeopardize a student's ability to pay for college. They offer an affordable alternative to private student loans and, furthermore, they are self-sustaining, meaning that as graduated students pay back their loans, they fund the current students' loans.

This summer, 94 bipartisan colleagues joined me in a letter urging Chairman KLINE and Ranking Member SCOTT to ensure that the Perkins Loan Program was not allowed to expire, and I am grateful for their help here on this today.

I stood with students and the presidents of colleges and universities in my district, two of whom have received Perkins loans themselves, to voice support for the continuation of the program. Among the people attending were three medical students from the University of Rochester. Heaven knows, we cannot afford to lose the services of three medical students.

I was also privileged to stand with my good friend Congressman POCAN and to hear from advocates and students who see and experience the benefits of the Perkins loans every day.

While I strongly prefer a long-term reauthorization and look forward to working with my colleagues in the coming months to secure one, I am pleased that the Higher Education Extension Act succeeds in keeping the program alive, ensures that next year's incoming class will be able to access Perkins loans, and buys us some time to secure a lasting extension.

I urge passage of this bill for all those students whose education dreams depend on having the Perkins loans.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

I just want to again thank Representative BISHOP for all your work on this—thank you very much—and Chairman KLINE and Ranking Member SCOTT. This is, I think, a good example of how we can work together in a committee to make sure that higher educational needs are met.

I represent about 75,000 higher education students. With UW Madison as the flagship, about 45,000 students, we have other campuses for the UW system, Beloit College and other smaller private colleges, Madison College and others.

This is a really important program, not just back home in Wisconsin, but across the country; and the fact that we are able to get this done in a bipartisan manner shows how I think Congress can work its very best. So I urge my colleagues to support this.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to thank Mr. POCAN as well and all those that have come to support the bill.

Helping more individuals access and complete higher education is a goal we all share. Research shows that students who earn a degree or credential are more likely to succeed in today's global economy.

For example, those with an Associate Degree are expected to earn 27 percent more than those with a high school diploma over the course of a lifetime, underscoring the value of higher education.

□ 1645

Unfortunately, less than 60 percent of students complete their studies within 6 years often because they can't afford to. Failure to pass the Higher Education Extension Act of 2015 will only make it more difficult for some students to access and complete their education.

Students across the country—including in my home State of Michigan—count on the Perkins Loan Program to help afford a college education. By supporting this responsible bipartisan legislation, we will deliver certainty to students and institutions as we continue to work on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 3594.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, as we pass the Higher Education Extension Act of 2015, I would like to emphasize the importance of higher education in assisting our young people in building the knowledge and skills that will allow them to succeed in the workforce and, ultimately, help U.S. businesses and industry to compete in the global market.

Michigan is home to many outstanding colleges and universities and I often speak with families throughout the 14th District and the state about the financial burden created by the increasing cost of higher education. Like many Americans, I firmly believe that making higher education more affordable and accessible should be among our foremost priorities. During a recent trip to my District, I spoke with a student who held a full-time job while in school because her family could not afford her tuition. Although work can be extremely rewarding and helps to build a strong work-ethic, students who are forced to work long hours and attend school full-time often suffer diminished academic success.

Since 1986, the Federal Perkins Loan Program has been an essential part of college financial aid packages because it provides a long-term and low-interest alternative to expensive private loans for students. Extending the Perkins Loan Program will provide lower income students with the funding they need to attend college with their full focus on their education. Additionally, the cost of this extension is not borne by taxpayers. Rather, the Perkins Loan Program fully funds itself when past loan recipients pay-off the balance of their loan.

I am proud that our Chamber has taken this important step toward ensuring all young people have the opportunity to benefit from a world class education. I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for supporting the fight to make higher education affordable and accessible for all Americans.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, which would extend the Perkins Loan program for one year, so that students who have demonstrated exceptional financial need can complete their undergraduate or graduate education in order to become academically qualified to join our workforce.

Historically, Perkins loans have served our students well by offering low-cost loans with flexible repayment terms and generous forgiveness options. They are often the difference between whether or not our students can afford to attend college, including 12,000 students in Texas.

For the academic year 2013–2014, nearly 500,000 students who needed financial assistance were awarded nearly \$1 billion in Perkins loans. And throughout its 57-year history, more than 30 million students with need have benefited from this program.

The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that the federal government will reclaim nearly \$5 billion in revenue from Perkins loans over the next ten years. That is \$5 billion that should be returned to students to help keep college affordable for the most financially challenged students. And that is \$5 billion that would have been lost if the program is not extended.

Without Perkins loans, schools would lose the necessary flexibility to help students cover their expenses after federal grants and Stafford loans are applied or unforeseen circumstances jeopardize a student's ability to pay for college.

If we want the United States of America to remain a global leader with the competitive edge necessary to sustain economic growth and job creation, we need the best, most highly trained workforce to sustain our advantages. The Perkins Loan program is a major part of helping our students develop, reach for and join that workforce.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to extend the federal Perkins Loan program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3594.

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.

AMERICAN SAMOA MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE POSTPONEMENT

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2617) to amend the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007 to postpone a scheduled increase in the minimum wage applicable to American Samoa, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2617

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

SECTION 1. MINIMUM WAGE FOR AMERICAN SAMOA.

(a) MINIMUM WAGE.—Paragraph (2) of section 8103(b) of the Fair Minimum Wage Act

of 2007 (29 U.S.C. 206 note) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) the minimum wage applicable to American Samoa under section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(a)(1)) shall be—

“(A) the applicable wage rate in effect for each industry and classification as of September 29, 2015; and

“(B) increased by \$0.50 an hour (or such lesser amount as may be necessary to equal the minimum wage under section 6(a)(1) of such Act), beginning on December 31, 2016, and on December 31 of every third year thereafter, until the minimum wage applicable to American Samoa under this paragraph is equal to the minimum wage set forth in such section.”.

(b) GAO REPORTS.—Section 8104 of the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007 (29 U.S.C. 206 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “September 1, 2011” and inserting “April 1, 2017”; and

(B) by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: “The Government Accountability Office shall submit a subsequent report not later than April 1, 2020.”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “the study under subsection (a)” and inserting “any report under subsection (a)”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) REPORT ON ALTERNATIVE METHODS OF INCREASING THE MINIMUM WAGE IN AMERICAN SAMOA.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Government Accountability Office shall transmit to Congress a report on alternative ways of increasing the minimum wage in American Samoa to keep pace with the cost of living in American Samoa and to eventually equal the minimum wage set forth in section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(a)(1)).”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP) and the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. 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 H.R. 2617.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2617. This legislation is simple and straightforward. It would delay for 15 months a minimum wage increase that will take effect in American Samoa in just 2 days. If this increase takes effect, it will harm the very people it was intended to help, the hard-working men and women of American Samoa.

The reason we are here today is also quite simple. We are here because the local government in American Samoa is urging us to do this. We are here because the employers in American Samoa, who are few and far between, are urging us to do this. And, most importantly, we are here because the

workers in American Samoa are urging us to do this.

You don't have to take my word for it. Those are the facts that have been reported by the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office. For years, the territory has been plagued by a weak economy, fewer jobs, and higher inflation.

The tuna canning industry, an essential part of the American Samoa economy, has been hit especially hard. According to our own independent government watchdog, previous wage increases have forced employers to delay expansion, limit overtime, and cut labor costs, which means that they have ultimately had to lay off workers. Many fear these tough challenges will only get worse if we fail to act now.

It should be noted that this isn't the first time we have had to take this step. When our Democratic colleagues were in control a few years back, they passed legislation delaying the arbitrary wage increase they set in motion. That effort passed with strong bipartisan support, and I expect today's legislation will as well.

I also want to note that the legislation will help us end a dangerous pattern of uncertainty and last-minute delays. Under the bill, the Government Accountability Office is required to report on alternatives to setting the minimum wage in American Samoa.

No doubt there are a number of alternatives Congress could consider. For example, local leaders have proposed bestowing upon them the responsibility for setting wages in their local communities. While this is certainly an interesting idea, it is a debate for another day.

Today let's do the right thing by passing this important legislation.

In closing, I wish to thank my colleague from American Samoa, Delegate AMATA RADEWAGEN, for authoring this legislative proposal and for her tireless leadership on behalf of her constituents.

I urge all of my colleagues to stand with the people of American Samoa and support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, reducing the income inequality between the people I represent in the Northern Mariana Islands and Americans in the rest of our Nation is one of my key goals as a Member of Congress.

Household median income in the Marianas was just \$20,000 in the last census compared to \$53,000 nationwide. For that reason, I have always supported the decision made in the 110th Congress to raise the minimum wage in the Marianas to the U.S. level in a series of graduated steps.

When that decision was enacted in Public Law 110-28, the locally set minimum wage in the Mariana Islands was just \$3.05 per hour and the minimum wage had been stuck at that level since the 1990s. Today the minimum wage

has effectively doubled to \$6.05 and will increase to \$6.55 a year from now.

That doubling of the minimum wage has occurred during a period of economic difficulty for the Mariana Islands. Gross domestic product was dropping by 8 percent, 12 percent, 19 percent in the first 3 years of minimum wage increase.

I should say, however, that these drops had nothing to do with the wage and everything to do with the loss of manufacturing because of the General Agreement of Tariffs and Trade and because of a loss of tourism.

In the most recent year for which GDP data is available for our islands, we had economic growth of 4.4 percent, even as the minimum wage continued to rise.

The U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis says that this economic growth reflects a growth in tourism, especially an increase in tourism from China. But it also reflects a growth in consumption because workers who are paid more can spend more, and that is good for the economy.

So I look forward to next year's increase of another 50 cents in the minimum wage in the Mariana Islands. I look forward to reaching the national minimum wage in 2019, and I support legislation raising the national minimum wage because I have now seen in my district that increasing wages can have a positive impact on economic activity and improve people's lives.

At the same time, I recognize that there is such a thing as economic reality. Raising the minimum wage too quickly could have a detrimental effect, could cause employment to shrink. For that reason, over the last 7 years that I have been in Congress, I worked with Members on both sides of the aisle to tailor the minimum wage increases to the specific economic realities in my district.

Instead of raising it by 50 cents every year, as the original law required, we skipped the increases in 2011, 2013, and this year, 2015. We arrived at the decision to stretch out the time of the increases by listening to employers on the island and to workers because workers also understand that increasing wages too quickly could jeopardize their jobs. We also listened carefully to the Government Accountability Office experts who look at the effect of these minimum wage increases periodically and report back to Congress.

I think that, so far, at least, we have successfully walked the fine line. We have kept the minimum wage increasing—faster than prices, GAO tells us—without disrupting the economy.

I am very grateful to both Democrats here in Congress, who agreed to slow down the increases, and to Republicans, who agreed to let the minimum wage keep going up. They did so, I think, because of a recognition that a relatively isolated island economy might need special consideration and because, when it comes to a decision that only affects a Member's own dis-

trict, there is a tradition of deference here in Congress to the views of that Member.

This is a very long way around to saying that I support H.R. 2617, the bill now under consideration.

The gentlewoman from American Samoa (Mrs. RADEWAGEN) has made the determination that what is best for her constituents is to delay further increases in the minimum wage. She too represents a relatively isolated island economy. Her constituents too have incomes much below the U.S. average. The specific economic factors in American Samoa are not the same as in the Northern Mariana Islands.

So while a delay for American Samoa may be appropriate, I would not want to imply a further delay for the Northern Marianas is called for at this time. But I do think that the same courtesy that the House has provided to me, when it comes to making a judgment about the well-being of the people I represent, should be given to the Delegate from American Samoa with respect to her own district.

For that reason, I urge Members to support passage of H.R. 2617.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from American Samoa (Mrs. RADEWAGEN).

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege for me to serve the people of American Samoa in the U.S. House of Representatives. My home district of American Samoa, an isolated group of islands, is 6 hours by plane south of Hawaii.

Sometimes we jokingly refer to our three main exports as canned tuna, military personnel, and NFL players.

Today I would like to talk about the canned tuna, though. Due to an oversight, the Fair Minimum Wage Act, which became law in 2007, contained language that stipulated that American Samoa must raise its minimum wage by 50 cents every 3 years starting in 2009 until it meets the Federal standard.

Since that time, Congress has graciously granted two waivers to American Samoa which prevents them from having to institute the increase, and wisely so. Had Congress not granted the waivers, the effects would have been absolutely devastating to our local economy, of which the tuna canneries comprise 80 percent.

When the Fair Minimum Wage Act was passed in 2007, American Samoa had two canneries on the island. As a direct result of the law and concern with future wage increases, in 2009, the day after a deadly tsunami struck our island, the cannery operated by Chicken of the Sea relocated to Thailand, causing thousands to instantly lose their jobs and hundreds shortly followed.

In Thailand, Chicken of the Sea now pays their workers a mere \$1.25 an hour and are rumored to be cutting wages further in 2016, while the workers in

American Samoa are paid \$4.76 an hour. While \$4.76 may not seem like a large amount here in the States, one must realize that, in American Samoa, the cost of living is drastically different.

Due to how the lands are owned and managed in American Samoa, there is actually no such thing as rent or a mortgage, items that often comprise up to one-half of a person's monthly expenses. Because our people do not have an expense for housing, \$4.76 an hour goes much further than it would here in the States.

While well-intended, the Fair Minimum Wage Act has placed the economic well-being of American Samoa in great jeopardy. No one would like to see the people of American Samoa prosper and have their wages increased more than I.

However, this is neither the time nor mechanism for such a drastic increase, as it would surely be the proverbial nail in the coffin for the local economy, as the two canneries that are currently operating out of American Samoa have stated the strong possibility of having to leave our island because they simply would not be able to compete financially against their foreign competitors. One of these canneries just opened this year and is trying to establish a toehold in the region. Without the extension, this will be very difficult for them.

Currently, due to many factors, the long-term continuity of the Pago Pago-based canneries is now threatened by reduced tuna deliveries and supply, which will negatively affect cannery production, impact cannery employment and support services, and could possibly destroy American Samoa's economy altogether.

□ 1700

Past decisions by the United States Government have led to the current dire situation.

In 2005, the U.S. Government agreed to reduce fishing opportunities by U.S. purse seine vessels on the high seas and within the U.S. EEZ. At the same time, the U.S. purse seine fleet contracted from 49 vessels in 1994 to 11 in 2007.

This major shift in the management of the purse seine fishery should have been recognized by the United States Government as significant in terms of fleet operations and the impact it would have on American Samoa. Unfortunately, it seems that the territory was not considered.

That same year, the U.S. allowed Taiwanese-built vessels to become U.S. flagged, thereby receiving the same benefits afforded under the South Pacific Tuna Treaty. These new vessels fish farther away from American Samoa and predominantly offload their catch in Thailand.

In 2013, the U.S. Government agreed to pay a combined amount, from both government and industry, of approximately \$90 million, while agreeing to further reduce the United States fishing effort on the high seas.

After that, in 2014, the United States agreed to an inexcusable deal, to the detriment of American Samoa, reducing the amount of fishing days available in Kiribati waters to the United States fleet from 4,313 to just 300 days in just 1 year. Kiribati waters are typically the most productive purse seine fishing grounds in close proximity to Pago Pago. However, the American Samoa-based purse seine vessels are now forced to travel great distances, making Pago Pago canneries less desirable and increasing transshipping to foreign ports.

In addition, the expansion of the Pacific Remote Islands Marine National Monument and the high seas effort limit have further reduce the fishing grounds available to the American Samoa-based purse seine fleet, lending to the dire situation facing American Samoa's local canneries. These are waters that have been fished by our people for many centuries.

Like other small island developing states and territories in the Pacific, American Samoa and the fishing industry it supports should be afforded special recognition, not crushed by the worst aspects of capitalism—and I say this as a devout capitalist.

Until we begin to safeguard our fishery interests in the region, American Samoa's tuna fisheries will continue to wither, creating economic ruin in American Samoa, the other Pacific territories, and even Hawaii, leaving the United States as a passive observer in the world's largest tuna fishery, leaving other nations such as China to run roughshod over fisheries to the detriment of not only the people, but the environment as well.

We must reverse some of the missteps the United States has taken over the years which have left the American Samoa economy in this highly vulnerable position. The closing off of large swaths of ocean, under the guise of national monuments, which cover thousands of square miles of traditional fishing grounds that our people have used for centuries, to the reduction in allotted fishing days that have gone from over 4,000 to under 500 in just 1 year, this is certainly not the time to put further pressure on an industry that is seemingly under attack from all sides, a local industry that operates at a loss in comparison to its competitors when it comes to labor, due to their longstanding relationship with the people of American Samoa, for which we are very grateful.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard some concern about Congress continuing to kick the can down the road on this issue. To those, I extend willing and eager hands for cooperation and assistance in fixing the mechanism by which the wages are set in American Samoa. The playing fields between the United States and American Samoa are too drastically different to place on the same wage scale, and to keep American Samoa tied to the current standard is dangerous and irresponsible. It is my plan

to use the time granted in the extension to work on a new mechanism for setting the minimum wage rate in American Samoa, and I happily encourage fellow Members to join me in this mission.

If there is ever any bill that I introduce that I wish I could vote against, this would be it. However, while it is difficult, I also know that it must be done. Oftentimes, the things that are the most difficult are also the most important, and currently, there is no issue more important to the economic well-being of American Samoa than this.

I respectfully and wholeheartedly ask my colleagues in both the House and Senate to support this legislation that is so absolutely critical to the economic stability of American Samoa.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 3 minutes.

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Without it, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid we will be back here in just a few months trying to figure out a way to subsidize what is already the most economically challenged territory or State in our Nation.

The tuna canning industry is all we have. There is no Coca-Cola or IBM. We have no Silicon Valley there to provide massive revenue and employment opportunity to the territory. There aren't numerous military and government facilities that provide sources of economic growth. We are not surrounded by fellow States that enable us to expand to other markets. All we have is the tuna industry, and we are grateful for them.

So again, I graciously ask my fellow colleagues to support this unfortunate, yet essential, piece of legislation. If you cannot support it, all I ask is that you do not block it, because it would be absolutely devastating to our people.

I want to thank Chairman KLINE, Ranking Member SCOTT, and the committee staff for their assistance in getting this measure to the floor, as well as the numerous other staff and Members who put in many hours of hard work to get us here today.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I do urge my colleagues to please support H.R. 2617.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as I noted earlier, this effort is supported by local leaders in American Samoa. It is supported by employers in American Samoa, and, most importantly, it is supported by the working men and women of American Samoa.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2617, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CROSS-BORDER RAIL SECURITY ACT OF 2015

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2786) to require the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to submit a report on cross-border rail security, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2786

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 “Cross-Border Rail Security Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. CROSS-BORDER RAIL SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the following:

(1) The number of shipments entering the United States by rail annually that are determined to be high-risk by the Commissioner.

(2) Specific details on the status of radiation detection units, by type, at each rail crossing on the northern and southern land borders as of such date of enactment.

(3) An assessment of whether additional radiation detection equipment is necessary to ensure that all such high-risk cross-border rail shipments are examined with appropriate equipment.

(4) A plan for ensuring that all relevant CBP personnel receive adequate training and guidance on the proper use of CBP’s Automated Targeting System for such high-risk cross-border rail shipments, the use of appropriate radiation detection equipment for examination of such high-risk cross-border rail shipments, and requirements for recording examination results.

(b) GAO AUDIT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall periodically audit U.S. Customs and Border Protection operations at rail crossings on the northern and southern international borders to ensure rail shipments are targeted, examined, and the results of such examinations properly documented.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VELA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2786, the Cross-Border Rail Security Act of 2015.

First, I would like to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VELA), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security, for introducing this thoughtful bill and working in a collaborative manner as this legislation moved through the committee process.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation requires the Commissioner of Customs and Border Protection to submit a report to Congress that outlines how and when high-risk rail shipments entering the United States are scanned for potential risks.

The impetus for this legislation was a recent inspector general report that found CBP was inadequately targeting high-risk rail shipments arriving in the U.S. from Canada and Mexico. This bill will help Congress better understand the frequency and location of such high-risk shipments and detail the current state of radiation detection equipment on our international railways.

Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues who also live along the border know, each year approximately 2.7 million containers enter the United States by rail. While most of the commodities transferred by rail do not pose significant homeland security threats, we must ensure that we are properly identifying and targeting those shipments which are high risk and conduct physical scanning when necessary.

To ensure proper oversight, it is very important to understand the capabilities of CBP, including the number, location, and type of detection equipment used at each cross-border rail crossing. We also need to understand what additional equipment and training is necessary to ensure our rail cargo system is secure.

As we know, proper training is an important force multiplier which will help maximize effectiveness of our Customs and Border Protection Officers, reducing wait times and increasing security.

Finally, H.R. 2786 requires the Government Accountability Office to perform a series of audits over CBP’s targeting of cross-border rail shipments.

Mr. Speaker, rail cargo is expected to increase over the next 10 years. This bill will ensure CBP adequately addresses this vulnerability and implements proper standards of screening and targeting for rail cargo. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2786.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2786, the Cross-Border Rail Security Act.

Mr. Speaker, in March of this year, the Department of Homeland Security’s inspector general released a report on high-risk cross-border rail cargo. The report concluded that U.S. Customs and Border Protection, or CBP, did not always use the required radiation detection equipment to examine shipments it determined to be high risk. Additionally, some ports of entry lacked the appropriate equipment to conduct these screenings, and training and oversight of targeting and examining such shipments was lacking.

In response to these troubling findings, my bill would require the CBP Commissioner to submit to the relevant congressional committees within 180 days of enactment a report regarding high-risk cross-border rail cargo shipments entering the United States.

Mr. Speaker, my bill would require the report to include information on the number of high-risk shipments crossing the border by rail, details on the radiation detection units at rail crossings, an assessment of whether additional equipment is necessary, and a plan for ensuring that all relevant CBP personnel receive appropriate training to appropriately target, examine, and record the disposition of such shipments. The bill requires the Government Accountability Office to audit periodically CBP operations at rail crossings to ensure rail shipments are being appropriately targeted, examined, and documented.

The community I represent has a vested interest in securing cross-border rail cargo. This past August, I was proud to be a part of the opening of the West Rail Bypass International Bridge located in Brownsville, Texas, the first international new rail crossing between the U.S. and Mexico in over a century.

Both of our land borders are dotted with these crossings, and, in fact, the majority of them are located on the northern border. The cargo that crosses by rail is destined for locations all over the United States, making the effective targeting and examining of high-risk shipments a national concern.

Mr. Speaker, my committee colleagues unanimously supported this bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to help strengthen the cross-border rail security by supporting H.R. 2786.

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

□ 1715

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

Mr. Speaker, I once again urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2786.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I rise in support of H.R. 2786, the “Cross-Border Rail Security Act of 2015,” which directs U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to report to Congress on its inspection of high-risk shipments entering the United States by rail.

Specifically, H.R. 2786 requires the CBP to report on the following matters related to homeland security:

- the number of high-risk rail shipments annually entering the country;
- the status of radiation detection units at each border rail crossing; and
- an assessment of whether additional radiation detection equipment is necessary.

The bill also requires CBP to develop a plan for ensuring that all relevant CBP personnel receive adequate training and guidance on the proper use of CBP's Automated Targeting System for such shipments, and in the use of appropriate radiation detection equipment for shipment examination, and requirements for recording examination results.

H.R. 2786 bill also requires the General Accountability Office to periodically audit CBP operations at rail crossings on borders to ensure rail shipments are targeted, examined, and the examination results are well documented.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is good for our nation and for my congressional district, which is centered in Houston, Texas.

Houston has been the hub of railroad hub of Texas since the 1880s and is known as the place "where 17 railroads meet the sea."

It is also the "the energy capital of the world."

Freight from the Houston area goes by railroad to destinations all over the United States, including Los Angeles, Long Beach, New York City, Charleston, and Savannah.

Over 1 billion tons of freight travels through Houston area each year; no other state comes close to the level of trade the metropolitan Houston region experiences.

One billion tons of freight leaves the Houston area each year, nearly two-thirds of which (645 million tons) involve goods come from foreign sources.

The top foreign freight origination point for the City of Houston is Mexico.

Mexico supplies over 50% of all international freight in the Houston area.

Europe and Canada are Houston's second largest foreign freight trading partners, accounting for over 27% of international freight in the Houston area.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in supporting H.R. 2786 because the safety of rail transit is critical to the security of the homeland and strength of our economy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2786.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

BORDER JOBS FOR VETERANS ACT OF 2015

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2835) to actively recruit members

of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection officers, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2835

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 "Border Jobs for Veterans Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Customs and Border Protection officers at United States ports of entry carry out critical law enforcement duties associated with screening foreign visitors, returning United States citizens, and imported cargo entering the United States.

(2) It is in the national interest for United States ports of entry to be adequately staffed with Customs and Border Protection officers in a timely fashion, including meeting the congressionally funded staffing target of 23,775 officers for fiscal year 2015.

(3) An estimated 250,000 to 300,000 members of the Armed Forces separate from military service every year.

(4) Recruiting efforts and expedited hiring procedures must be enhanced to ensure that individuals separating from military service are aware of, and partake in, opportunities to fill vacant Customs and Border Protection officer positions.

SEC. 3. EXPEDITED HIRING OF APPROPRIATE SEPARATING SERVICE MEMBERS.

The Secretary of Homeland Security shall consider the expedited hiring of qualified candidates who have the ability to perform the essential functions of the position of a Customs and Border Protection officer and who are eligible for a veterans recruitment appointment authorized under section 4214 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 4. ENHANCEMENTS TO EXISTING PROGRAMS TO RECRUIT SERVICE MEMBERS SEPARATING FROM MILITARY SERVICE FOR CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION OFFICER VACANCIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, and acting through existing programs, authorities, and agreements, where applicable, shall enhance the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security to recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection officers.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The enhanced recruiting efforts under subsection (a) shall—

(1) include Customs and Border Protection officer opportunities in relevant job assistance efforts under the Transition Assistance Program;

(2) place U.S. Customs and Border Protection officials or other relevant Department of Homeland Security officials at recruiting events and jobs fairs involving members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service;

(3) provide opportunities for local U.S. Customs and Border Protection field offices to partner with military bases in the region;

(4) include outreach efforts to educate members of the Armed Forces with Military Occupational Specialty Codes and Officer Branches, Air Force Specialty Codes, Naval Enlisted Classifications and Officer Designators, and Coast Guard competencies that are transferable to the requirements, qualifications, and duties assigned to Customs and Border Protection officers of available hiring opportunities to become Customs and Border Protection officers;

(5) identify shared activities and opportunities for reciprocity related to steps in hiring Customs and Border Protection officers with the goal of minimizing the time required to hire qualified applicants;

(6) ensure the streamlined interagency transfer of relevant background investigations and security clearances; and

(7) include such other elements as may be necessary to ensure that members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service are aware of opportunities to fill vacant Customs and Border Protection officer positions.

SEC. 5. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and by December 31 of each of the next three years thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall submit a report to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate that includes a description and assessment of the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security to hire members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service as Customs and Border Protection officers under section 4.

(b) CONTENT.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a detailed description of the efforts to implement section 4, including—

(A) elements of the enhanced recruiting efforts and the goals associated with such elements; and

(B) a description of how the elements and goals referred to in subparagraph (A) will assist in meeting statutorily mandated staffing levels and agency hiring benchmarks;

(2) a detailed description of the efforts that have been undertaken under section 4;

(3) the estimated number of separating service members made aware of Customs and Border Protection officer vacancies;

(4) the number of Customs and Border Protection officer vacancies filled with separating service members; and

(5) the number of Customs and Border Protection officer vacancies filled with separating service members under Veterans Recruitment Appointment authorized under section 4214 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 6. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act may be construed—

(1) as superseding, altering, or amending existing Federal veterans' hiring preferences or Federal hiring authorities; or

(2) to authorize the appropriation of additional amounts to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VELA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. MCSALLY. 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 material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 2835, the Border Jobs for Veterans

Act of 2015. This bill, which I introduced in June, seeks to increase the hiring of military veterans for Customs and Border Protection officer positions vital to our security here at home.

The Border Jobs for Veterans Act addresses two critical priorities: ensuring full staffing at our ports of entry and helping separating servicemembers transition to civilian life.

My district includes over 80 miles of the U.S. border as well as several ports of entry. I visited our ports in Nogales and Douglas numerous times to hear about their operations firsthand and have seen the critical law enforcement duties carried out by CBP officers at these ports, such as screening visitors, returning U.S. citizens, and cargo entering the United States.

In June, the Port Authority chair for the Mariposa port of entry in Nogales, just outside my district, reported that, while staffing numbers have grown nationally, “staffing numbers at Nogales and the Tucson Sector have remained essentially stagnant in recent memory while demand continues to grow.”

The port also estimates that CBP’s Tucson field office is currently operating at a 20-percent staffing deficit. While new hires have occurred since then, CBP estimates the Tucson field office still needs to fill roughly 200 officer positions.

In my conversations with CBP officers, they have repeatedly told me that inadequate staffing levels hamper their ability to do their jobs. They cite problems with recruiting and retention of new officers as well as lengthy and cumbersome hiring process, including delays due to backlogs of the necessary background checks. After a recent reduction in that process by roughly 50 percent, it still takes 180 days to hire a new officer at ports where there is a strong need now.

These hurdles to hiring acts as an impediment to cross-border trade that powers both Arizona and the Nation’s economy. According to the Arizona-Mexico Commission, more than 41.6 billion dollars’ worth of trade flows through Arizona’s ports of entry, \$16 billion of which is attributed to bilateral trade with Mexico.

But inadequate staffing at these ports of entry slows the flow of trade coming across the border, costing businesses millions of dollars, and ultimately hurts our attractiveness as a transportation and trade hub, something we simply cannot afford.

Each year approximately 250,000 to 300,000 members of the Armed Forces separate from military service. I recently visited the Veterans One-Stop Center in Pima County in my district, which helps veterans find employment after they leave the military, and I listened to their challenges and their stories firsthand.

Who better to address this shortfall and help to secure our ports than the highly trained patriotic Americans who just recently separated from the Armed Forces?

That is why H.R. 2835 requires the Secretary of Homeland Security to work with the Department of Defense to enhance our efforts to recruit members of the military who are separating to serve as Customs and Border Protection officers.

These efforts must include participation in relevant job fairs, transition programs, partnerships between CBP field offices and local military bases, and the identification of ways to streamline the transfer of background checks and security clearances.

This bill offers the men and women of our military another opportunity to serve the Nation. All DHS has to do is make sure that they are aware of the opportunities available at our Nation’s 329 ports of entry.

I want to thank my colleagues, Senators FLAKE, MCCAIN, JOHNSON, and SCHUMER, and their staffs for working on the Senate companion legislation and their help on the text of this bill.

I also want to thank Chairman THORBERRY and his staff for working with us to move this bill forward.

I urge all Members to join me in supporting the Border Jobs for Veterans Act of 2015.

I reserve the balance of my time.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 25, 2015.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write concerning H.R. 2835, the Border Jobs for Veterans Act of 2015, which has been referred to the Committee on Armed Services. In order to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, the committee will forgo action on this bill.

The committee’s waiver is conditional on our mutual understanding that you will amend H.R. 2835 to reflect the changes agreed to by our staffs. Forgoing consideration of the bill does not prejudice the committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the provisions contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the committee’s Rule X jurisdiction. I request that you urge the Speaker to appoint members of the committee to any conference committee convened to consider such provisions.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest into the committee report on H.R. 2835 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,
WILLIAM M. “MAC” THORBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, September 28, 2015.

Hon. MAC THORBERRY,
Chairman, House Armed Services Committee,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THORBERRY: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2835, the “Border Jobs for Veterans Act of 2015.” I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the House Armed Services Committee will forego action on the bill.

The Committee on Homeland Security concurs with the mutual understanding that the

language in the bill reflects the negotiations between our staffs and that by foregoing consideration of this bill at this time, the House Armed Services Committee does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this bill or similar legislation in the future. In addition, should a conference on this bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the House Armed Services Committee represented on the conference committee.

I will insert copies of this exchange in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. I thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,
MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman.

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

I rise in strong support of H.R. 2835, the Border Jobs for Veterans Act of 2015.

First of all, I would like to thank my colleague, Congresswoman MCSALLY, for introducing this wonderful piece of legislation. It not only helps us expedite the flow of traffic in trade at our borders, but it also helps and assists with our veterans we all represent.

H.R. 2835, the Border Jobs for Veterans Act of 2015, would require the Secretary of Homeland Security to consider expediting the hiring of qualified veterans to serve as U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers.

The bill also authorizes DHS to enhance its efforts to recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as CBP officers and requires DHS to report to Congress on its efforts.

Through their service, our Nation’s veterans have demonstrated their unwavering commitment to our country and its security. CBP would benefit greatly from their service within the agency’s ranks.

At the same time, expediting the hiring of qualified veterans could help alleviate the continued shortage of CBP officers at our ports of entry, helping to better secure our borders while facilitating legitimate trade and travel.

With that in mind, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2835, to facilitate the recruitment and hiring of America’s military veterans for new careers serving our country as U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I once again urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2835.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, and Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2835, “Border Jobs for Veterans Act of 2015.” which would guarantee more jobs for our many deserving veterans.

This bill requires the Homeland Security Department to prioritize the hiring of U.S. veterans as Custom and Border Protection (CBP) officers.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that the unemployment rate for our veterans is 7.2%, which is roughly 573,000 unemployed veterans nationally.

A study commissioned by the Department of Commerce's International Trade Administration found that in 2008, delays at POEs at the U.S.-Mexico border cost the U.S. economy 26,000 jobs, \$600 million in lost tax revenue, and \$5.8 billion in lost economic output.

According to CBP, 2,000 additional CBPOs will lead to the creation of approximately 66,000 new jobs and increase the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of the U.S. by up to \$4 billion.

The bill will ensure that:

CBP officials will be at recruiting events and jobs fairs for armed service members; Partnerships are fostered between military bases in regions where CBP Officers work;

Opportunities for the expedited hiring of certain service members with qualifications needed by CBP are prioritized; and

Transfers of relevant background investigations and security clearances are streamlined to facilitate transitions from military life to employment at the CBP.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced H.R. 76, the "Helping to Encourage Real Opportunity for Veterans Transitioning from Battlespace to Workplace Act of 2015," the HEROS Act, which is very similar to spirit to the bill before the House.

Studies have shown that more than 80% of veterans transitioning from military service to the civilian sector regard employer-provided Veterans support programs as "critical" or "important" to their success.

The "HERO Transitioning from Battlespace to Workplace Act of 2014" addressed these problems by providing strong incentives for employers to hire, retain, and employ veterans in positions that take maximum advantage of their skills and experience.

Nearly 90% of veterans believe they have the general skills needed to land their ideal job such as problem solving, leadership, ethics, and time management and most believe they possess specific marketable skills, such as information technology, health care, mechanical, and aviation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2835, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

MANDATORY PRICE REPORTING ACT OF 2015

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2051) to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to extend the livestock mandatory price reporting requirements, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the "Agriculture Reauthorizations Act of 2015".

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—MANDATORY PRICE REPORTING

Sec. 101. Extension of livestock mandatory reporting.

Sec. 102. Swine reporting.

Sec. 103. Lamb reporting.

Sec. 104. Study on livestock mandatory reporting.

TITLE II—NATIONAL FOREST FOUNDATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION

Sec. 201. National Forest Foundation Act reauthorization.

TITLE III—UNITED STATES GRAIN STANDARDS ACT REAUTHORIZATION

Sec. 301. Reauthorization of United States Grain Standards Act.

Sec. 302. Report on disruption in Federal inspection of grain exports.

Sec. 303. Report on policy barriers to grain producers.

TITLE I—MANDATORY PRICE REPORTING

SEC. 101. EXTENSION OF LIVESTOCK MANDATORY REPORTING.

(a) *EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.*—Section 260 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1636i) is amended by striking "September 30, 2015" and inserting "September 30, 2020".

(b) *CONFORMING AMENDMENT.*—Section 942 of the Livestock Mandatory Reporting Act of 1999 (7 U.S.C. 1635 note; Public Law 106-78) is amended by striking "September 30, 2015" and inserting "September 30, 2020".

SEC. 102. SWINE REPORTING.

(a) *DEFINITIONS.*—Section 231 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1635i) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (9) through (22) as paragraphs (10) through (23), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following:

"(9) *NEGOTIATED FORMULA PURCHASE.*—The term 'negotiated formula purchase' means a swine or pork market formula purchase under which—

"(A) the formula is determined by negotiation on a lot-by-lot basis; and

"(B) the swine are scheduled for delivery to the packer not later than 14 days after the date on which the formula is negotiated and swine are committed to the packer.";

(3) in paragraph (12)(A) (as so redesignated), by inserting "negotiated formula purchase," after "pork market formula purchase,"; and

(4) in paragraph (23) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking "and" at the end;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

"(D) a negotiated formula purchase; and".

(b) *DAILY REPORTING.*—Section 232(c) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1635j(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(D), by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

"(ii) *PRICE DISTRIBUTIONS.*—The information published by the Secretary under clause (i) shall include—

"(I) a distribution of net prices in the range between and including the lowest net price and the highest net price reported;

"(II) a delineation of the number of barrows and gilts at each reported price level or, at the option of the Secretary, the number of barrows and gilts within each of a series of reasonable price bands within the range of prices; and

"(III) the total number and weighted average price of barrows and gilts purchased through negotiated purchases and negotiated formula purchases."; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by adding at the end the following:

"(C) *LATE IN THE DAY REPORT INFORMATION.*—The Secretary shall include in the morning report and the afternoon report for the following day any information required to be reported under subparagraph (A) that is obtained after the time of the reporting day specified in that subparagraph."

SEC. 103. LAMB REPORTING.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall revise section 59.300 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations, so that—

(1) the definition of the term "importer"—

(A) includes only those importers that imported an average of 1,000 metric tons of lamb meat products per year during the immediately preceding 4 calendar years; and

(B) may include any person that does not meet the requirement referred to in subparagraph (A), if the Secretary determines that the person should be considered an importer based on their volume of lamb imports; and

(2) the definition of the term "packer"—

(A) applies to any entity with 50 percent or more ownership in a facility;

(B) includes a federally inspected lamb processing plant which slaughtered or processed the equivalent of an average of 35,000 head of lambs per year during the immediately preceding 5 calendar years; and

(C) may include any other lamb processing plant that does not meet the requirement referred to in subparagraph (B), if the Secretary determines that the processing plant should be considered a packer after considering the capacity of the processing plant.

SEC. 104. STUDY ON LIVESTOCK MANDATORY REPORTING.

(a) *STUDY REQUIRED.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Agricultural Marketing Service in conjunction with the Office of the Chief Economist and in consultation with cattle, swine, and lamb producers, packers, and other market participants, shall conduct a study on the program of information regarding the marketing of cattle, swine, lambs, and products of such livestock under subtitle B of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1635 et seq.).

(2) *REQUIREMENTS.*—The study shall—

(A) analyze current marketing practices in the cattle, swine, and lamb markets;

(B) identify legislative or regulatory recommendations made by cattle, swine, and lamb producers, packers, and other market participants to ensure that information provided under the program—

(i) can be readily understood by producers, packers, and other market participants;

(ii) reflects current marketing practices; and

(iii) is relevant and useful to producers, packers, and other market participants;

(C) analyze the price and supply information reporting services of the Department of Agriculture related to cattle, swine, and lamb; and

(D) address any other issues that the Secretary considers appropriate.

(b) *REPORT.*—Not later than March 1, 2018, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report containing the findings of the study conducted under subsection (a).

TITLE II—NATIONAL FOREST FOUNDATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION

SEC. 201. NATIONAL FOREST FOUNDATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION.

(a) **EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE MATCHING FUNDS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AND PROJECT EXPENSES.**—Section 405(b) of the National Forest Foundation Act (16 U.S.C. 583j-3(b)) is amended by striking “for a period of five years beginning October 1, 1992” and inserting “during fiscal years 2016 through 2018”.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Section 410(b) of the National Forest Foundation Act (16 U.S.C. 583j-8(b)) is amended by striking “during the five-year period” and all that follows through “\$1,000,000 annually” and inserting “there are authorized to be appropriated \$3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2018”.

(c) **TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.**—

(1) **AGENT.**—Section 404 of the National Forest Foundation Act (16 U.S.C. 583j-2) is amended—
(A) in subsection (a)(4), by inserting “notice or” after “authorized to accept”; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “under this paragraph” and inserting “by subsection (a)(4)”.

(2) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Section 407(b) of the National Forest Foundation Act (16 U.S.C. 583j-5(b)) is amended by striking the comma after “The Foundation shall”.

TITLE III—UNITED STATES GRAIN STANDARDS ACT REAUTHORIZATION

SEC. 301. REAUTHORIZATION OF UNITED STATES GRAIN STANDARDS ACT.

(a) **OFFICIAL INSPECTION AND WEIGHING REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **DISCRETIONARY WAIVER AUTHORITY.**—Section 5(a)(1) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 77(a)(1)) is amended in the first proviso by striking “may waive the foregoing requirement in emergency or other circumstances which would not impair the objectives of this Act” and inserting “shall waive the foregoing requirement in emergency or other circumstances that would not impair the objectives of this Act whenever the parties to a contract for such shipment mutually agree to the waiver and documentation of such agreement is provided to the Secretary prior to shipment”.

(2) **WEIGHING REQUIREMENTS AT EXPORT ELEVATORS.**—Section 5(a)(2) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 77(a)(2)) is amended in the proviso by striking “intracompany shipments of grain into an export elevator by any mode of transportation, grain transferred into an export elevator by transportation modes other than barge,” and inserting “shipments of grain into an export elevator by any mode of transportation”.

(3) **DISRUPTION IN GRAIN INSPECTION OR WEIGHING.**—Section 5 of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 77) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) **DISRUPTION IN GRAIN INSPECTION OR WEIGHING.**—In the case of a disruption in official grain inspections or weighings, including if the Secretary waives the requirement for official inspection due to an emergency under subsection (a)(1), the Secretary shall—
“(1) immediately take such actions as are necessary to address the disruption and resume inspections or weighings;
“(2) not later than 24 hours after the start of the disruption in inspection or weighing, submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes—
“(A) the disruption; and
“(B) any actions necessary to address the concerns of the Secretary relating to the disruption so that inspections or weighings may resume; and
“(3) once the initial report in paragraph (2) has been made, provide daily updates until official inspection or weighing services at the site of disruption have resumed.”.

“(1) immediately take such actions as are necessary to address the disruption and resume inspections or weighings;
“(2) not later than 24 hours after the start of the disruption in inspection or weighing, submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes—
“(A) the disruption; and
“(B) any actions necessary to address the concerns of the Secretary relating to the disruption so that inspections or weighings may resume; and
“(3) once the initial report in paragraph (2) has been made, provide daily updates until official inspection or weighing services at the site of disruption have resumed.”.

“(2) not later than 24 hours after the start of the disruption in inspection or weighing, submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes—
“(A) the disruption; and
“(B) any actions necessary to address the concerns of the Secretary relating to the disruption so that inspections or weighings may resume; and
“(3) once the initial report in paragraph (2) has been made, provide daily updates until official inspection or weighing services at the site of disruption have resumed.”.

“(A) the disruption; and
“(B) any actions necessary to address the concerns of the Secretary relating to the disruption so that inspections or weighings may resume; and
“(3) once the initial report in paragraph (2) has been made, provide daily updates until official inspection or weighing services at the site of disruption have resumed.”.

“(3) once the initial report in paragraph (2) has been made, provide daily updates until official inspection or weighing services at the site of disruption have resumed.”.

(b) **OFFICIAL INSPECTION AUTHORITY AND FUNDING.**—

(1) **DELEGATION OF OFFICIAL INSPECTION AUTHORITY.**—Section 7(e)(2) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 79(e)(2)) is amended—

(A) by striking “(2) If the Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(2) **DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO STATE AGENCIES.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Secretary”;

(B) in the first sentence—

(i) by striking “and (A)” and inserting “and (i)”;

(ii) by striking “or (B)(i)” and inserting “or (ii)(I)”;

(iii) by striking “(ii)” and inserting “(II)”;

and
(iv) by striking “(iii)” and inserting “(III)”;

and
(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) **CERTIFICATION.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Every 5 years, the Secretary shall certify that each State agency with a delegation of authority is meeting the criteria described in subsection (f)(1)(A).

“(ii) **PROCESS.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reauthorizations Act of 2015, the Secretary shall establish a process for certification under which the Secretary shall—

“(I) publish in the Federal Register notice of intent to certify a State agency and provide a 30-day period for public comment;

“(II) evaluate the public comments received and, in accordance with paragraph (3), conduct an investigation to determine whether the State agency is qualified;

“(III) make findings based on the public comments received and investigation conducted; and

“(IV) publish in the Federal Register a notice announcing whether the certification has been granted and describing the basis on which the Secretary made the decision.

“(C) **STATE AGENCY REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—If a State agency that has been delegated authority under this paragraph intends to temporarily discontinue official inspection or weighing services for any reason, except in the case of a major disaster, the State agency shall notify the Secretary in writing of the intention of the State agency to do so at least 72 hours in advance of the discontinuation date.

“(ii) **SECRETARIAL CONSIDERATION.**—The Secretary shall consider receipt of a notice described in clause (i) as a factor in administering the delegation of authority under this paragraph.”.

(2) **CONSULTATION.**—Section 7(f)(1) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 79(f)(1)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(xi), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) the Secretary—

“(i) periodically conducts a consultation with the customers of the applicant, in a manner that provides opportunity for protection of the identity of the customer if desired by the customer, to review the performance of the applicant with regard to the provision of official inspection services and other requirements of this Act; and
“(ii) works with the applicant to address any concerns identified during the consultation process.”.

(3) **GEOGRAPHIC BOUNDARIES FOR OFFICIAL AGENCIES.**—

(A) **OFFICIAL INSPECTION AUTHORITY.**—Section 7(f)(2) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 79(f)(2)) is amended by striking “the Secretary may” and all that follows through the end of the paragraph and inserting the following: “the Secretary shall allow a designated official agency to cross boundary lines to carry out inspections in another geographic area if—

“(A) the current designated official agency for that geographic area is unable to provide inspection services in a timely manner;

“(B) a person requesting inspection services in that geographic area requests a probe inspection on a barge-lot basis; or

“(C) the current official agency for that geographic area agrees in writing with the adjacent official agency to waive the current geographic area restriction at the request of the applicant for service.”.

(B) **WEIGHING AUTHORITY.**—Section 7A(i)(2) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 79a(i)(2)) is amended by striking “the Secretary may” and all that follows through the end of the paragraph and inserting the following: “the Secretary shall allow a designated official agency to cross boundary lines to carry out weighing in another geographic area if—

“(A) the current designated official agency for that geographic area is unable to provide weighing services in a timely manner; or

“(B) the current official agency for that geographic area agrees in writing with the adjacent official agency to waive the current geographic area restriction at the request of the applicant for service.”.

(4) **DURATION OF DESIGNATION AUTHORITY.**—Section 7(g)(1) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 79(g)(1)) is amended by striking “triennially” and inserting “every 5 years”.

(5) **FEES.**—Section 7(j) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 79(j)(1)) is amended—

(A) by striking “(j)(1) The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(j) **FEES.**—

“(1) **INSPECTION FEES.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary”;

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) the second sentence, by striking “The fees” and inserting the following:

“(B) **AMOUNT OF FEES.**—The fees”;

(ii) in the third sentence, by striking “Such fees” and inserting the following:

“(C) **USE OF FEES.**—Fees described in this paragraph”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) **EXPORT TONNAGE FEES.**—For an official inspection at an export facility performed by the Secretary, the portion of the fees based on export tonnage shall be based on the rolling 5-year average of export tonnage volumes.”;

(C) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5);

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

“(4) **ADJUSTMENT OF FEES.**—In order to maintain an operating reserve of not less than 3 and not more than 6 months, the Secretary shall adjust the fees described in paragraphs (1) and (2) not less frequently than annually.”; and

(E) in paragraph (5) (as redesignated by subparagraph (C)), in the first sentence, by striking “2015” and inserting “2020”.

(c) **WEIGHING AUTHORITY.**—Section 7A of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 79a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(2), in the last sentence, by striking “subsection (g) of section 7” and inserting “subsections (e) and (g) of section 7”; and

(2) in subsection (1)—

(A) by striking “(1)(1) The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(1) **FEES.**—

“(1) **WEIGHING FEES.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary”;

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) the second sentence, by striking “The fees” and inserting the following:

“(B) **AMOUNT OF FEES.**—The fees”;

(ii) in the third sentence, by striking “Such fees” and inserting the following:

“(C) **USE OF FEES.**—Fees described in this paragraph”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) **EXPORT TONNAGE FEES.**—For an official weighing at an export facility performed by the

Secretary, the portion of the fees based on export tonnage shall be based on the rolling 5-year average of export tonnage volumes.”;

(C) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4);

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

“(3) ADJUSTMENT OF FEES.—In order to maintain an operating reserve of not less than 3 and not more than 6 months, the Secretary shall adjust the fees described in paragraphs (1) and (2) not less frequently than annually.”; and

(E) in paragraph (4) (as redesignated by subparagraph (C)), in the first sentence, by striking “2015” and inserting “2020”.

(d) LIMITATION AND ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPERVISORY COSTS.—Section 7D of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 79d) is amended by striking “2015” and inserting “2020”.

(e) ISSUANCE OF AUTHORIZATION.—Section 8(b) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 84(b)) is amended by striking “triennially” and inserting “every 5 years”.

(f) APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 19 of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 87h) is amended by striking “2015” and inserting “2020”.

(g) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—Section 21(e) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 87j(e)) is amended by striking “2015” and inserting “2020”.

SEC. 302. REPORT ON DISRUPTION IN FEDERAL INSPECTION OF GRAIN EXPORTS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate, the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report that describes—

(1) the specific factors that led to disruption in Federal inspection of grain exports at the Port of Vancouver in the summer of 2014;

(2) any factors that contributed to the disruption referred to in paragraph (1) that were unique to the Port of Vancouver, including a description of the port facility, security needs and available resources for that purpose, and any other significant factors as determined by the Secretary; and

(3) any changes in policy that the Secretary has implemented to ensure that a similar disruption in Federal inspection of grain exports at the Port of Vancouver or any other location does not occur in the future.

SEC. 303. REPORT ON POLICY BARRIERS TO GRAIN PRODUCERS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with the United States Trade Representative, shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives a report that describes—

(1) the policy barriers to United States grain producers in countries the grain of which receives official grading in the United States but which do not offer official grading for United States grain or provide only the lowest designation for United States grain, including an analysis of possible inconsistencies with trade obligations; and

(2) any actions the Executive Branch is taking to remedy the policy barriers so as to put United States grain producers on equal footing with grain producers in countries imposing the barriers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONAWAY. 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 material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 2051, the Agriculture Reauthorizations Act of 2015.

Mr. Speaker, on June 9, the House passed three individual bills: the Mandatory Price Reporting Act of 2015; the United States Grain Standards Reauthorization Act of 2015; and the National Forest Foundation Reauthorization Act of 2015. For each of these, the Committee on Agriculture held hearings and business meetings, and the House acted in a timely manner to ensure the continuation of these critical programs.

I am proud of the fact that the House worked its will in a bipartisan manner following regular order throughout. Just last week the other body worked its will, combining these three bills into a single bill before us.

Though modifications were made that I do not agree with, it is imperative that the House pass this legislation in advance of the authority for price reporting and grain inspection expiring on Wednesday evening. Failure to enact this legislation today will have devastating impacts on our Nation’s meat industries and grain exporters.

I urge the House to adopt this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2051, a bill to reauthorize the Mandatory Price Reporting Act, the United States Grain Standards Act, and the National Forest Foundation Act. Legislative language to reauthorize each of these was introduced, reported by the House Agriculture Committee, and passed by the House on voice vote as standalone measures on June 10th of this year. The first two, the Mandatory Price Reporting Act and the Grain Standards Act authorities are set to expire in just a few days.

As passed by the House, each of these measures enjoyed wide bipartisan support from Members as well as support from each of the impacted industries. Unfortunately, after passing through the other chamber, we are left with bill language that is somewhat less than ideal, but at least maintains these critical program authorities for 5 more years.

In the development of the Mandatory Price Reporting Act and with each of its subsequent reauthorizations, we have asked the impacted industries to work together in a cooperative spirit to develop their legislative proposals and submit only those that are unanimously supported. The meat and livestock industries did just that this past spring. Those proposals

were reviewed in a hearing in the Subcommittee on Livestock and Foreign Agriculture on April 22nd, bill language was introduced in the House, a business meeting was held, and the House unanimously passed the bill. Unfortunately, a demand was made in the other body that the bill be modified to remove language of critical importance to our constituents. Thus, we have before us today a bill that is less than what our constituents requested. Yet if we fail to act, a program of critical importance to the meat and livestock industries would expire leaving these industries in a quandary. It is a shame that politics must interfere with policy on even the simplest measures, but we must move forward.

The United States Grain Standards Act reauthorization faced similar challenges in the other body. As my colleagues will recall, last summer amid an ongoing labor dispute, the Washington State Department of Agriculture (WSDA) discontinued mandatory grain weighing and grading services.

In statements issued at the time, WSDA acknowledged that they withheld inspection services because of their belief that the “continued provision of inspections services appears to have been unhelpful in leading to any foreseeable resolution” of the labor dispute.

Instead of fulfilling their statutory obligation, the leadership of the U.S. Department of Agriculture politicized this situation when the agency declined to fulfill its statutory responsibility to resume inspection and weighing services. Services were eventually restored, but not before significant costs accrued to all parties involved.

We have worked hard to gain access to overseas markets. We are shooting ourselves in the foot when we cannot ship our products to these markets because State and Federal agencies are unable or unwilling to comply with their obligations. To not be able to ship our grain because there are no inspectors at a facility does a disservice to our farmers, and it harms our economy.

To address this situation, the House could have been punitive. In fact, there were some in the industry that would have preferred that. But that is not what we were interested in doing. We simply wanted to develop a safeguard mechanism to avoid this situation being repeated. To do that, we worked with the Washington State delegation, the Washington State Department of Agriculture, labor unions, industry and even the USDA. What we developed was bipartisan consensus on a workable safeguard provision. Nevertheless, the bill as adopted in the other body provides little safeguard against future abuses of discretion. I cannot emphasize this enough—it is imperative that these inspection and weighing services are provided in a reliable, uninterrupted, consistent and cost-effective manner. To ensure that we fulfill this obligation, we must learn the lessons of history or it is doomed to repeat itself.

To this end, the Secretary of Agriculture is instructed to take prompt action to provide for restoration of official grain inspection service as soon as he receives notice or otherwise learns about the impending disruption from a delegated State agency. In this regard, as a way of not allowing the Secretary to sit on his hands after learning that a disruption in official service was imminent, the Secretary is required to:

1. Immediately take such actions as are necessary to address the disruption and resume inspection and weighing services; and

2. Not later than 24 hours after receiving notice or otherwise learning of the impending disruption of such inspection or weighing, or after the start of such disruption in official service, whichever is earlier, submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the disruptions and any actions necessary to address the concerns of the Secretary relating to the disruption so that inspections or weighings may resume.

On a positive note, another critical element of the House bill was retained wherein the Secretary will be obligated to waive official weighing and inspection requirements in both cases of emergency as well as other circumstances as long as the waiver does not impair the underlying objectives of the statute and the buyers and sellers agree and provide documentation of the agreement to the Secretary. This waiver requirement is intended to provide certainty to trading partners as well as U.S. suppliers.

Since its charter in 1993, the National Forest Foundation provides the ability to leverage private and federal dollars to support our Nation's great forests in a variety of ways. In recent years, the Foundation has leveraged funds at over a 4 to 1 ratio and plans to continue on this success to raise at least \$125 million for forest restoration activities. Simply put, the National Forest Foundation works, and this is a common-sense reauthorization.

While I recognize that concessions were made resulting in less than ideal bill text, at the end of the day, H.R. 2051 provides certainty to American agriculture, and I would urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2051. This bipartisan legislation reauthorizes the Mandatory Price Reporting Act, the National Forest Foundation Act, and the U.S. Grain Standards Act. This bill continues the tradition of bipartisan, bicameral work done by the Agriculture Committees.

Important livestock price reporting programs will be continued under the bill's mandatory price reporting provisions. Producers rely on access to transparent, accurate, and timely market information, and H.R. 2051 will provide that certainty.

The National Forest Foundation Act is the type of public-private collaboration we should all be able to support, giving private groups and stakeholders a chance to help in the stewardship and management of our national forests and grasslands. H.R. 2051 will ensure that this partnership can continue.

Finally, the U.S. Grain Standards Reauthorization Act will allow the Federal Grain Inspection Service to continue official weighing and inspection services. Both grain buyers and sellers rely on a gold standard quality assurance, backed by the Federal Government, when conducting business.

Again, this is good, commonsense legislation, a bipartisan bill. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank my colleague, my ranking member, COLLIN PETERSON. Throughout this work, he and all the Members on both sides of the aisle of the committee worked well together. It is a tribute to the way bipartisan work ought to be done in the House, and I am proud of the work the Agriculture Committee has done.

I urge Members to join me in support 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 Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 2051.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3495, WOMEN'S PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT, AND WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-269) on the resolution (H. Res. 444) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3495) to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to allow for greater State flexibility with respect to excluding providers who are involved in abortions, and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 2835, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 2786, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second

electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

BORDER JOBS FOR VETERANS ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2835) to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection officers, 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 Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 0, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 519]

YEAS—410

Abraham	Clarke (NY)	Fitzpatrick
Adams	Clawson (FL)	Fleischmann
Aderholt	Clay	Fleming
Aguilar	Clyburn	Flores
Allen	Coffman	Forbes
Amash	Cohen	Fortenberry
Amodel	Cole	Foster
Ashford	Collins (GA)	Foxx
Babin	Collins (NY)	Frankel (FL)
Barletta	Comstock	Franks (AZ)
Barr	Conaway	Frelinghuysen
Barton	Connolly	Fudge
Bass	Cook	Gabbard
Beatty	Cooper	Gallego
Becerra	Costa	Garamendi
Benishek	Costello (PA)	Garrett
Bera	Courtney	Gibbs
Beyer	Cramer	Gibson
Bilirakis	Crawford	Gohmert
Bishop (GA)	Crenshaw	Goodlatte
Bishop (MI)	Crowley	Gosar
Bishop (UT)	Cuellar	Gowdy
Black	Culberson	Graham
Blackburn	Cummings	Granger
Blum	Curbelo (FL)	Graves (GA)
Bonamici	Davis (CA)	Graves (LA)
Bost	Davis, Danny	Graves (MO)
Boustany	Davis, Rodney	Grayson
Boyle, Brendan	DeFazio	Green, Gene
F.	DeGette	Griffith
Brady (PA)	Delaney	Grijalva
Brady (TX)	DeLauro	Grothman
Brat	DelBene	Guinta
Brooks (AL)	Denham	Guthrie
Brooks (IN)	Dent	Hahn
Brown (FL)	DeSantis	Hanna
Brownley (CA)	DeSaulnier	Hardy
Buchanan	DesJarlais	Harper
Buck	Diaz-Balart	Harris
Bucshon	Dingell	Hastings
Burgess	Doggett	Heck (NV)
Bustos	Dold	Heck (WA)
Butterfield	Donovan	Hensarling
Byrne	Doyle, Michael	Herrera Beutler
Calvert	F.	Hice, Jody B.
Capps	Duckworth	Higgins
Capuano	Duffy	Hill
Cárdenas	Duncan (SC)	Himes
Carney	Duncan (TN)	Hinojosa
Carson (IN)	Edwards	Holding
Carter (GA)	Ellison	Honda
Carter (TX)	Elmers (NC)	Hoyer
Cartwright	Emmer (MN)	Huelskamp
Castor (FL)	Engel	Huffman
Castro (TX)	Eshoo	Huizenga (MI)
Chabot	Esty	Hultgren
Chaffetz	Farenthold	Hunter
Chu, Judy	Farr	Hurd (TX)
Ciциlline	Fattah	Hurt (VA)
Clark (MA)	Fincher	Israel

Issa
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Jenkins (KS)
 Jenkins (WV)
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jolly
 Jones
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Kaptur
 Katko
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kline
 Knight
 Kuster
 Labrador
 LaHood
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latta
 Lawrence
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Love
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lummis
 Lynch
 MacArthur
 Maloney
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Marchant
 Marino
 Massie
 Matsui
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNeerney
 McSally
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Meeks

NOT VOTING—24

Blumenauer
 Bridenstine
 Cleaver
 Conyers
 Deutch
 Green, Al
 Gutiérrez
 Hartzler

□ 1855

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.

Messer
 Mica
 Miller (MI)
 Moonenar
 Mooney (WV)
 Moore
 Moulton
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (FL)
 Murphy (PA)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Neugebauer
 Newhouse
 Noem
 Nolan
 Norcross
 Nugent
 Nunes
 O'Rourke
 Palazzo
 Pallone
 Palmer
 Pascrell
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Perry
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pingree
 Pittenger
 Pitts
 Pocan
 Poe (TX)
 Poliquin
 Polis
 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
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Welch
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Young (IN)
 Zeldin
 Zinke

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CROSS-BORDER RAIL SECURITY ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2786) to require the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to submit a report on cross-border rail security, and for other purposes, 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 gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 0, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 520]
 YEAS—412

Abraham
 Adams
 Aderholt
 Aguilar
 Allen
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Amodei
 Ashford
 Babin
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Benishak
 Bera
 Beyer
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (MI)
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Blum
 Bonamici
 Bost
 Boustany
 Boyle, Brendan
 F.
 Brady (PA)
 Brady (TX)
 Brat
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Buchanan
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Burgess
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cárdenas
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clawson (FL)
 Clay

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
 DeBene
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSantis
 DeSaunier
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Dold
 Donovan
 Doyle, Michael
 F.
 Duckworth
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Ellmers (NC)
 Emmer (MN)
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farenthold
 Farr
 Fattah
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry

Jordan
 Joyce
 Kaptur
 Katko
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kline
 Knight
 Kuster
 Labrador
 LaHood
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latta
 Lawrence
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Love
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lummis
 Lynch
 MacArthur
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Marchant
 Marino
 Massie
 Matsui
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNeerney
 McSally
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Meeks
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (FL)
 Murphy (PA)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Neugebauer
 Newhouse
 Noem
 Nolan
 Norcross
 Nugent
 Nunes
 O'Rourke
 Palazzo
 Pallone
 Palmer
 Pascrell
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Perry
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pingree
 Pittenger
 Pitts
 Pocan
 Poe (TX)
 Poliquin
 Polis
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price (NC)
 Price, Tom
 Quigley
 Rangel
 Ratcliffe
 Reed
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (NY)
 Rice (SC)
 Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rokita
 Rooney (FL)
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Rouzer
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Ruiz
 Ruppberger
 Russell
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanford
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrader
 Schweikert
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin

NOT VOTING—22

Blumenauer
 Cleaver
 Deutch
 Frankel (FL)
 Green, Al
 Gutiérrez
 Hartzler
 Hudson
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kirkpatrick
 Kirksville
 Lee
 Meng
 Miller (FL)
 Olson
 Payne

□ 1904

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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
 Rangel
 Ratcliffe
 Reed
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (NY)
 Rice (SC)
 Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rokita
 Rooney (FL)
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Rouzer
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Ruiz
 Ruppberger
 Russell
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanford
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrader
 Schweikert
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, due to unforeseen circumstances, I missed the following votes: H.R. 2835—Border Jobs for Veterans Act of 2015, as amended. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes” on this bill. H.R. 2786—Cross Border Rail Security Act of 2015. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes” on this bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I attended the funeral of Deputy William B. “Bill” Myers, a law enforcement officer in my district who was killed in the line of duty, and I missed the following rollcall votes: Nos. 519 and 520, today, September 28, 2015. If present I would have voted: rollcall vote No. 519—H.R. 2835—Border Jobs for Veterans Act of 2015, as amended, “aye”; and rollcall vote No. 520—H.R. 2786—Cross-Border Rail Security Act of 2015, “aye.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House Chamber for votes on Monday, September 28, 2015. I would like the record to show that, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall votes 519 and 520.

RICKY'S WHEELS

(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 today in honor of a nonprofit organization in my district that is providing a valuable service to the region.

The organization, Ricky's Wheels, is dedicated to providing electric wheelchairs to those in need.

Rick Worthy and his wife, Diane, created Ricky's Wheels after the death of their son Ricky in 2009, following a brief battle with melanoma.

After donating Ricky's wheelchair to a local couple, Rick and Diane noticed a need across their community, especially since Medicare will not pay for a chair once someone is accepted into hospice.

Since its founding 6 years ago, Ricky's Wheels has grown from a few donated electric wheelchairs in the Worthys' garage to a warehouse filled with mobility assistance devices, along with push chairs, walkers, and baby strollers.

Mr. Speaker, Ricky's Wheels recently was named a local Jefferson Award recipient, after being nominated by the local television station, WJAC. This award, which was created by the American Institute for Public Service, honors ordinary people who do extraordinary things without expectation of recognition.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Rick and Diane are more than worthy of recognition for their efforts.

JEB BUSH SHOULD CONSIDER THE POPE'S CALL TO PRESERVE OUR ENVIRONMENT

(Mr. FOSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have continually reminded us that they are not scientists. We have also heard this from several of the Republican candidates seeking our Nation's highest office.

As a scientist myself, I appreciate their candor. But what I don't as much appreciate is when they use this mantra of “I am not a scientist” to preface statements that are factually wrong. Facts are stubborn things, and they don't only apply to those in the scientific community.

Last week Pope Francis challenged us to take courageous steps to combat climate change, a call to action that made many Republicans uncomfortable. When asked about the Pope's statement, Governor Jeb Bush dismissed it, saying that Pope Francis is “not a scientist, he's a religious leader.” In fact, Pope Francis is a former chemist, and, as such, he has more scientific training than many of our elected officials.

I was hoping that, when the Pope addressed Congress in his remarks, he would have explained to my Republican colleagues the effect of the infrared absorption spectrum of carbon dioxide on the radiation balance and equilibrium temperature of the Earth, but time did not permit.

I encourage Jeb and my colleagues in Congress to consider the Pope's call to preserve our environment.

HONORING OUR FALLEN FIREFIGHTERS

(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, our Nation's firefighters sign up for the job knowing the dangers they will often face in order to keep their communities safe. Tragically, we have seen these first responders give their lives in service to others.

This past Sunday the 2015 Minnesota Fallen Firefighter Memorial Service took place on the State Capitol grounds to honor the 9 Minnesota firefighters—and 216 nationwide—that have passed away in the line of duty this year.

The event honors the sacrifice that these firefighters have made and also provides support for their families who are coping with a profound loss.

As policymakers, it is important that we recognize what our first responders go through on a daily basis and support them. Earlier this year Congress passed my legislation, which is now law, that ensures that survivor benefits for families of those killed in the line of duty are not taxed.

Mr. Speaker, we are blessed that so many men and women sign up to put themselves in harm's way to keep others safe. For those that give their life, we must not forget their sacrifice.

PROSTATE CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of September as Prostate Cancer Awareness Month and as a proud cosponsor of the National Prostate Cancer Plan Act, H.R. 2730.

As the most common cancer in men, prostate cancer is a national epidemic. This year alone one in seven men will be diagnosed and 28,000 men will die from prostate cancer.

Last week, while hosting a community conversation in my district in Whitehall, Ohio, I met with two constituents, Linda and Ray Hoetger, an inspiring husband and wife team who tirelessly dedicate themselves to raising awareness about prostate cancer.

Linda and Ray are members of the national organization ZERO, the End of Prostate Cancer, and are spearheading a campaign to raise awareness of prostate cancer throughout Ohio.

I stand here today to commend their work. As Ray and Linda remind us, many of us have either been personally affected by this disease or have lost a loved one.

So during this Prostate Cancer Awareness Month, let us reaffirm our commitment to increase the quality of care in order to eliminate the pain and suffering once and for all.

HONORING SPEAKER BOEHNER

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise out of respect and admiration for our tremendous Speaker, the incredible leader of our Republican Conference and my friend, JOHN BOEHNER.

He has stayed true to his home State of Ohio for well over 20 years, serving his constituents with pride and integrity. His distinguished career was marked by an honest pursuit of what is best for the American people as well as the inclusion of more folks under the big tent of our GOP.

He has worked in a bipartisan manner to help create jobs and restore America's leadership, all the while maintaining a hard line on the Castros' despotic rule in Cuba, being supportive of our strong relations with Israel, as well as remaining a tough opponent of the weak and dangerous Iran nuclear deal.

JOHN's decorum, grace, and patience are his hallmarks, and they will be greatly missed in our Nation's Capitol. Only in America can the son of a barkeep rise to make a lasting positive contribution to our history as Speaker of the people's House.

I wish JOHN, Debbie, the entire Boehner family, including his new granddaughter Alistair, all the best. Godspeed, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1915

PUGET SOS ACT

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

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, to explain the significance of the Puget Sound in 1 minute is impossible. But I will tell you this: With every 60 seconds that goes by, the Puget Sound is being damaged more than it is being fixed. With every minute that goes by that we fail to collectively do something, we are all losing money.

Puget Sound is a resource, but it is more than that. It is an American treasure. Puget Sound is a body of water that deserves national recognition.

Congressman KILMER and I have brought together numerous stakeholders that agree on very few things to agree on this: We need to do more. The Federal Government needs to step up to the plate to get recovery moving.

The Puget SOS Act is that plan. We do it for the Great Lakes. We do it for the Chesapeake Bay. Now is the time to bring forth this effort for our Puget Sound, the largest estuary in America. Let's clean the Puget Sound up.

Join us in cosponsoring this bill, along with Mr. REICHERT, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. RICK LARSEN, Mr. ADAM SMITH, and Ms. DELBENE. Clean up the Puget Sound.

AMERICAN HERO DR. SIDNEY PHILLIPS, JR.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember an American hero, Dr. Sidney Phillips, Jr., who passed away in Mobile over the weekend at the age of 91.

Dr. Phillips was a veteran of World War II, where he served in the Marine Corps. At the young age of 18, Sid Phillips took part in the famous battle of Guadalcanal in the Pacific.

Dr. Phillips was one of the most well-known and respected veterans in Alabama. His career was profiled in Ken Burns' PBS documentary "The War" and Steven Spielberg's HBO series "The Pacific."

To many of us from the Mobile area, we remember Sid Phillips as a local family doctor, a patriotic family man, and a strong advocate for our Nation's veterans.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all of my constituents in Southwest Alabama, I want to share my condolences with Sid Phillips' family and friends. He embodied the American spirit, and he will be sorely missed.

PUGET SOS ACT

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and cofounder of the Puget Sound Recovery Caucus, Representative HECK, for his partnership on the Puget SOS Act.

As you heard from him, the Puget Sound is truly a gift that we need to restore and protect. Generations have enjoyed the ability to swim, fish, and dig for clams in this iconic body of water. They have built lives and made livelihoods on the Puget Sound.

But for the millions of residents that call Puget Sound home and for future generations, we absolutely have to take action to fight for the Sound.

That is why I invite my colleagues to sponsor the Puget SOS Act. This bill raises the profile of Puget Sound by naming it a nationally significant body of water. It enhances the Federal Government's coordination in addressing these issues. It respects tribal treaty rights. This bill is an important step.

I look forward to continued work for Puget Sound. Our kids, including my two little girls, are counting on us.

CONGRATULATING TROOPER J.D. BERRONG

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate Trooper J.D. Berrong, who recently won the Jimmy K. Ammons North American Inspectors Grand Champion Award.

This is the first time a North Carolina trooper has ever won this competition, which recognizes the Nation's top roadside inspector. Berrong, who resides in the community of Mulberry, competed against 51 other roadside inspectors representing jurisdictions across the United States, Canada, and Mexico.

Trooper Berrong is stationed in Wilkes County and is a 14-year veteran of the North Carolina State Highway Patrol. He is currently assigned to the motor carrier enforcement section, troop F, district 9.

Troopers who perform motor carrier enforcement duties ensure that all modes of travel, including commercial motor vehicles, are consistently monitored in order to improve highway safety.

Congratulations, Trooper Berrong, and thank you for serving the public good and helping maintain the safety of the highways of North Carolina.

A TRIBUTE TO AMELIA BOYNTON ROBINSON, CONGRESSMAN LOUIS STOKES, AND JULIAN BOND

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I am very privileged tonight to lead the Special Order

of the Members of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Let me thank our chairman, Chairman G.K. BUTTERFIELD, for continuing this tradition and for his continued leadership, encouragement, and avocation for Members and for the stories of those who have been such leaders in our Nation and such major issues that we have been able to contribute to for the understanding of our colleagues.

Let me also make mention of my colleagues, Congresswoman KELLY and Congressman PAYNE, who have led us on this Special Order for the Congressional Black Caucus. I thank them for their leadership and service.

A very special thanks to those of you who are watching at home and have often watched at home and have followed the Congressional Black Caucus through social media, social network, and also know that our major issues of criminal justice reform, civil rights, the restoration of the Voting Rights Act, and many others have been to speak to the vulnerable. Tonight we again speak to you, but we speak of those heroes that we have lost over the last couple of months.

Tonight we pay tribute to Amelia Boynton Robinson, Congressman Lou Stokes, and, of course, Julian Bond. Our Nation was built on the values of dealing with the issues of freedom, justice and equality, values and principles that were perfectly embodied by the service and sacrifices of these three leaders.

Mr. Speaker, over the last week we have watched the Pope make his way through a number of American cities and use words that are music to the ears of Members of the Congressional Black Caucus. Let me take just one of many citations that I will utilize to characterize these three individuals:

"The complexities of history," said Pope Francis, "and the reality of human weakness notwithstanding, these men and women, for all their many differences and limitations, were able, by hard work and self-sacrifice, some at the cost of their lives, to build a better future."

I would offer to say that Amelia Boynton Robinson, Congressman Lou Stokes, and Julian Bond, through the sacrifice of their individual families and their lives, were able to make a better future for us.

We know the civil rights activist Amelia Boynton Robinson, 1965, was a leader of the Bloody Sunday march and personified the optimism, determination, and courage that are at the heart of the American spirit. She truly made our lives better.

Known as the matriarch of our Nation's civil rights movement, Ms. Boynton Robinson fought courageously to ensure that every American citizen had the right to vote. Her drive to secure universal voting rights was amazing, and certainly she risked her life when she crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge. In her words, her son said civil rights was her entire life.

We now understand that Congressman Lou Stokes made an amazing and impactful statement legislatively and throughout his life. He was a consummate public servant, a trailblazer who broke down barriers for generations of African Americans.

He was the first African American Congressman from Ohio who served 30 years. Representing a portion of Cleveland, he prioritized the advancement of our Nation's most vulnerable populations.

He advocated for more funding of education, housing, development projects, access to health care. He was one of the fiercest advocates for public housing.

Mr. Stokes was a major proponent and leader that asked the Housing and Urban Development to assess the poor, deleterious, horrible conditions that children were living in as housing impacted their health.

In fact, just recently I presented my housing authority a lead poisoning grant which was instigated, was encouraged, was advocated for by Congressman Lou Stokes. He has saved thousands upon thousands of lives.

I thank him for organizing the Congressional Black Caucus Health Braintrust, and I want to thank him personally for allowing me work for him as a staff member of the Select Committee on Assassinations, which he ultimately chaired. We thank him for his amazing service.

He once said, "I am going to keep on denouncing the inequities of this system, but I am going to work within it. To go outside the system would be to deny myself, to deny my own existence. I have beaten the system. I have proved it can be done. So have a lot of others." This is, of course, the kind of leader that Lou Stokes was.

Our friend, Julian Bond, was a civil rights icon. He was a leader in the fight for equality, freedom, and equal justice and opportunity. He inspired generations of Americans to build a better future for all people.

Julian Bond was considered the young one in the movement with Dr. Martin Luther King. He stood as not only an original, but a fierce advocate of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and the founding president of the Southern Poverty Law Center.

Elected to office, of course, he himself fought against discrimination. He was discriminated himself. When he was refused a seat in the Georgia State Legislature, it did not in any way demean or undermine his courage or inspiration. He went on to be seated and to do great things.

Tonight we are privileged to be able to honor and pay tribute to these three heroes. We are called to follow the example they set, to fight to ensure that all Americans have access to equal opportunity so they will have a fair shot at economic prosperity, have the right to vote, be free from mass incarceration, and do the things that America bestows upon them.

Again, these individuals, at the cost of their lives or their own futures, built a better future for us.

With that, I am delighted to yield to the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, Mr. G.K. BUTTERFIELD, a former high superior court judge—I am calling him all kinds of names—but, in any event, a dynamic leader of the Congressional Black Caucus. Again, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE for her friendship, for her leadership, and I certainly thank her for yielding time tonight.

Let me also thank the other Members who are on the floor this evening to help in honoring the lives of Louis Stokes, Amelia Boynton Robinson, and Julian Bond.

These three are icons, absolute icons, of the civil rights movement, who in their own way paved the way for so many. I had the high honor of calling Lou Stokes and Julian Bond personal friends.

As the first African American to represent Ohio in Congress, Representative Lou Stokes was a pioneer in public service. He broke down numerous barriers for African Americans during his extraordinary career as an elected official on the local, State, and Federal levels.

First elected to Congress in 1969 and serving for 30 long years in the U.S. House, he was a founder of the Congressional Black Caucus and the first African American to serve on the House Appropriations Committee. He was the founder of the CBC Health Braintrust, which remains active today in protecting health, equity, and reducing health disparities.

Congressman Stokes was the embodiment of a public servant. He selflessly used his elected positions to increase opportunities for millions of African Americans.

We will miss our dear friend Lou Stokes. But the impact of his legacy of service and commitment to his constituents and to the African American community will be remembered for generations.

Often referred to as the matriarch of the movement, Amelia Boynton Robinson's role in Bloody Sunday, as you have already heard, and the march from Selma to Montgomery is immortalized in the Oscar-nominated film "Selma."

She also made history in 1964 by becoming the first African American woman from Alabama to run for Congress. In her congressional election that year, Mrs. Boynton Robinson garnered 10 percent of the vote despite the fact that African Americans only made up 1 percent of the voting population in Alabama's Seventh Congressional District.

Forty-six years later the CBC's very own representative, TERRI SEWELL, whom we will hear from in just a few moments, now holds that seat here in Congress.

This year, as we celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, we remember the selfless actions of individuals like Amelia Boynton Robinson who fought against systems of injustice so that future generations would have opportunities that were not possible to generations past. Tonight we honor Mrs. Boynton Robinson for her legacy which continues in each of us.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, tonight we honor Julian Bond, a forefather of America's civil rights movement and one of our country's greatest advocates for freedom and equality and equitable treatment for all people.

From his work as a student leader during the 1960s to his service in the Georgia House of Representatives and the State Senate, Julian Bond was a leader in the fight against racism and segregation.

□ 1930

I first met Julian Bond at the funeral of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in 1968. As the founding president of the Southern Poverty Law Center and chairman of the board of the NAACP, Julian Bond continued his work educating citizens around the world of the struggles of African Americans and the history of civil rights here in America.

Julian Bond spent his lifetime in public service, calling for equal civil and human rights not only for African Americans, but for every American. Until his untimely death, he was an advocate, activist, and dedicated champion who fought for the most vulnerable individuals and communities among us. We celebrate his life and his lasting legacy.

I want to thank Ms. JACKSON LEE for her leadership and thank her for yielding. I thank the Members for coming to the floor this evening.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman for his very thoughtful statement and for leading us off today and setting the tone for the Congressional Black Caucus that we will never forget our icons, but we also know that to pay tribute is the highest honor for all of us because we are here because of all of them. I thank Mr. BUTTERFIELD for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege now to yield to Representative CHARLES RANGEL, who does not need a long introduction. It is important to note that he has led on so many issues. He was not only the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, but also a dear friend of Congressman Lou Stokes and one of the founders of the Congressional Black Caucus. If Congressman RANGEL had not done what he did, we would not be here today. I am delighted to yield to him at this time.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman JACKSON LEE for pulling together this tribute. It is moving and emotional that we do this after the visit to these Chambers by the Pope, who made it abundantly clear how all of us, no matter how ordinary we are,

can do extraordinary things when we make a commitment to do the right thing.

As some of the older Members know, it is almost unbelievable how people that you know on an everyday basis that go through life with their own problems still can find the time to try to improve the quality of life for so many people.

I feel almost awkward looking at the Representative from Selma, Alabama, this evening because, after Bloody Sunday, there was a call all over the world for people to come to Selma. I was one of those called, and I was one of those that did not think that me going to Selma with my bad feet could make a contribution to anything, and this is especially so after seeing what happened on Bloody Sunday.

But I did go down because of JOHN LEWIS and Andrew Young and Martin Luther King and Ralph Bunche, because they said that if I could just come down for the press conference, it would be appreciated. So I dressed up and I went down for the press conference. I had a round trip ticket back to New York. I was dressed pretty well, not ever thinking that I would be going any further than Selma.

It started to rain, and I felt that this would be the appropriate time for me to get a cab and to go to the airport. When I saw these older people like Amelia Robinson putting plastic on their shoes and starting to sing and starting to march, I said, well, maybe I could go a couple of blocks. I did that, except I found out in Selma there weren't any couple of blocks.

There were no television cameras. There was no one that recognized me down there. I marched 54 miles, cussing every step of the way, trying to figure out what the devil I was doing in Selma.

Congresswoman SEWELL, it just proves that if you attempt just to do the right thing, God can push you to do the rest.

I never did believe, like JOHN LEWIS, that that Supreme Court would give us the voting rights and the civil rights. I never thought that President Johnson would ever support these things. Today I tell this very embarrassing story because you don't have to be a hero to be counted on if you just try to start to do the right thing, and just maybe God will push you to go further.

Certainly when a woman like Amelia Boynton Robinson is beaten unconscious and someone like JOHN LEWIS, who constantly put his life on the line, and of course the late Dr. Martin Luther King, who gave up his life, and God doesn't ask us to do these extraordinary things, but I do believe that the courage that these people have, that each of us have just a grain of it that would allow us to contribute, as the Pope said, to show our respect for God, allowing us to inherit this great Earth to try to make the quality of life better.

Of course, when it comes to a young guy going to Morehouse, as Julian

Bond did, dropping out of school, coming from a professional family where education had a higher standard than some of us from the inner cities, it must have broken their heart to know that he was joining a group that would then provide the leadership for our country for people Black and White.

There is nothing that my heart would allow me to say about Lou Stokes. I came to Congress not knowing that in the Congress was a giant of a man from Cleveland, Lou Stokes, who motivated the 13 of us, who led us to form the Congressional Black Caucus. I have walked in the shadows of his giant footsteps since I have been privileged to serve in this House.

Ms. JACKSON LEE and members of the Congressional Black Caucus, it is really extraordinary how God has given us the opportunity to say thank you for the blessings that we have, and I do hope that maybe on both sides of the aisle people can talk about those who allowed this country to be so great, the sacrifices that so many people have made, and you just don't have to be a giant to appreciate the fact that God has blessed us all.

I thank her for her effort at bringing us together, not just tonight, but on every committee, on every bill, and this floor. SHEILA JACKSON LEE is here to continue to inspire all of us. I thank her for that.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, we are so grateful for the special wisdom and insight that Mr. RANGEL brings to all of what we do. I know that the late Lou Stokes, the late Amelia Boynton Robinson, and the late Julian Bond are grateful that they knew him and that he is here to tell his story. Even if he considers it embarrassing, I think it is a wonderful testimony for anybody who has said, "I can't do it." We want him to keep telling us that wonderful statement over and over again. I thank him so very much for what he provides to the Congressional Black Caucus. I thank him for the kind words he mentioned of Representative TERRI SEWELL.

I just say to Ms. SEWELL, I don't know what kind of phone message that she had to the Vatican, but I repeat now the words of Pope Francis, as I yield to her. This is Pope Francis, as he spoke just a few days ago at that very podium:

Here, too, I think of the march which Martin Luther King led from Selma to Montgomery 50 years ago as part of the campaign to fulfill his dream of full civil rights and political rights for African Americans.

Representative SEWELL, let me thank you for bringing and infusing life into the wonderful city of Selma, all the wonderful people there, including your dearly beloved mother and father, and having us walk with you every step of the way.

As I yield to her, let me say that we should make a commitment right here today, as we make changes in leadership, that we commit ourselves to the restoration of section 5 of the Voting

Rights Act, which she is leading on. It is my delight to yield to her at this time.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I thank our leader of the CBC, Congressman BUTTERFIELD, so much for his exemplary leadership and the courage that he exemplifies every day in fighting for the causes that we all hold so dear.

I want to thank Congresswoman JACKSON LEE for those wonderful words. SHEILA JACKSON LEE has not only been an amazing Member of Congress, but she has been a great mentor to me. I want to thank her for all she does for so many of us and the mentoring she continues to provide the younger generation.

What can I say to CHARLIE RANGEL? To even have him know my name is an honor. I know that, but for the remarkable lives of the three people that we celebrate their lives and their legacies today, I would not be in this auspicious Chamber, and but for his leadership and his courage, I would not know how to behave in this Chamber. I thank him for doing such a great job and continuing to serve the great people of Harlem and New York, but also the great people of America—black, white, green, yellow, all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my CBC colleagues in paying tribute to the life and legacy of three great giants in American history: Representative Louis Stokes, Amelia Boynton Robinson, and Julian Bond. Our Nation collectively mourns the loss of each of these trailblazing figures who departed from us way too soon this summer. Their journeys paved the way for myself and so many others serving in this august body. While our hearts are heavy today, we honor them for their historic and notable contributions to this Nation.

Congressman Louis Stokes was the first African American to represent the State of Ohio in Congress, where he served for more than 30 years. He rose to prominence by breaking numerous barriers as the first in so many areas. This included being named the first African American to serve as chairman of the prestigious House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. As an African American who now sits on that committee, I am deeply honored to follow in Louis Stokes' footsteps.

During his tenure on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, he stepped into the national spotlight as a vocal critic of the Reagan administration's foreign policy. He spoke boldly on issues of national security and created a legacy of being a fierce advocate for the homeland. In honoring his memory, we must also commit ourselves collectively to continue the fight to promote diversity within the intelligence community. We must also be committed to supporting policies that promote our national security in the face of growing threats. It was Congressman Lou Stokes who taught us that our Nation deserves nothing less.

Today we also honor an American treasure and one of my personal heroes, the courageous Mrs. Amelia Boynton Robinson. Mrs. Robinson passed away on August 26, 2015, at the age of 110—yes, 110, Mr. Speaker. Mrs. Amelia Boynton Robinson was a key figure in the voting rights movement in Selma, Alabama. She is often remembered for her critical role in Bloody Sunday.

On that solemn day on the Edmund Pettus Bridge, Robinson was savagely beaten. A photo taken of her shortly after she was attacked and posted in *The New York Times* became a powerful symbol of the injustices suffered by those who were attempting simply to vote. Yet this tireless, fearless foot soldier continued her work as a leader on the front lines of securing the right to vote for all Americans.

Amelia is best known as the matriarch of the voting rights movement, and it was her courage, along with JOHN LEWIS and so many other known and unknown foot soldiers which led to the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Amelia was such an integral part of the process that the contents of the bill, the voting rights bill, were drafted on her kitchen table in Selma, Alabama, in 1965.

Ms. Boynton not only trailblazed as a voting rights advocate, she put her money where her mouth was and she, herself, ran for Congress. On May 5, 1964, Amelia Boynton broke yet another barrier, when she became the first woman in the State of Alabama and the first African American woman in the State of Alabama to run for Congress. In 1964, she garnered 10.7 percent of the vote during a time when very few Blacks were registered to vote. Actually, only 1 percent of the registered voters were African Americans at that time.

Her historic run further solidified her impact on the movement for human rights and voting rights in Alabama and in this Nation. Without her courageous campaign for the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama in 1964, I know that my election to this seat in 2010, some 50 years later, would not have been possible.

□ 1945

Her sacrifices paved the way for me to walk the Halls of Congress, and I will carry my love and admiration for her in my heart each and every day, for I get to do what she could not, and that is vote on behalf of the members of the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama. For that, I am eternally grateful.

In fact, one of my most memorable moments in this Chamber is the night that she served as my special guest at the State of the Union on January 20, 2015, this past year. I am grateful for the memories of her greeting President Obama that night. I am so blessed to not only have called her my constituent, but a beloved mentor and friend. As she is remembered, and she

reminds us every day by her life, there is still much work to be done.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to remember the shining legacy of yet another giant figure in the fight for civil and human rights: Mr. Julian Bond. This courageous voice held several titles over the course of his impactful life, but he is most remembered for his service as the NAACP chairman and the cofounder of the Southern Poverty Law Center. He was also one of the original leaders of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, SNCC, while he was a student at Morehouse College. He later served in the Georgia General Assembly for more than 20 years.

He was first elected to the Georgia House of Representatives in 1965. However, because of his longstanding legacy of fighting White supremacy, White statehouse members tried unsuccessfully to block him from taking his seat. This brave spirit was undeterred. He spearheaded efforts to draft landmark legislation that spoke to the need of Blacks in the State of Georgia.

In addition to his time as an eloquent speaker, he was a celebrated writer, poet, television commentator, community advocate, as well as a communication specialist. He did so much for the Southern Poverty Law Center to set it on its course and so much for the lives of so many.

All three of these wonderful giants tell a story, a story of how ordinary people can do extraordinary things. Working collectively, we as a nation can achieve amazing heights, even if we don't think so. As Congressman RANGEL's story best exemplified, if we just take one step, hopefully the Lord will give us the strength to take many, many more towards that fight for justice and equality.

In closing, I am reminded of what Amelia Boynton would often say when I and others would come up to her and say: "We stand on your shoulders. We stand on your shoulders." Well, Ms. Amelia Boynton was so infamously known for saying, after hearing it over and over again: "Get off my shoulders. There is plenty of work to be done." "Do your own work," is what she said.

And so I say to my colleagues gathered here tonight, my colleagues in this wonderful body called the House of Representatives: We have plenty of work to do. We have plenty of work to do. And while we walk in the footsteps of giants such as Amelia Boynton and Louis Stokes and Julian Bond, let us never forget that they, too, had to take a first step. And as we follow in their footsteps, let us all take many steps towards providing justice and liberty for all Americans, especially those that are most vulnerable.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I think we can leave this evening with the words that Congresswoman SEWELL has just said, and we thank her so very much, "do our own work." That message should carry for whether we are Republicans or Democrats or Independents.

Congresswoman SEWELL, we look forward to doing our own work on the restoration of the Voting Rights Act, section 5, which you are leading and all of us have signed onto. We thank you so much for that eloquent statement and that statement of passion.

Speaking of passion, it is my privilege to introduce a Member who has her own storied civil rights history, someone who has served as the Commissioner on the EEOC, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and someone who has been in the trenches in civil rights, dealing with voting rights cases, dealing with the right to vote in her own District of Columbia. I think she will be the Florence Nightingale, she will be the champion battler; because I believe that this Delegate, Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, will be successful as we fight for the voting rights of the District through her leadership.

I yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I thank my good friend, Representative SHEILA JACKSON LEE, first, for her kind and generous words, but especially today for her leadership of this Special Order, which is characteristic of her leadership in this Congress. I am so pleased that our chair Rep. G.K. BUTTERFIELD has been here and spoken and that we have heard from several other Members.

I just want to say a few words about this troika of African Americans who have written their signatures across our time. You have heard their biographies. I don't want to recount their extraordinary bios, because that is not the only reason we are honoring them with this Special Order. I just want to say something about what they meant to me.

Two of them I knew personally: Representative Louis Stokes, whose many years in the Congress happened to overlap with my first years here; and, of course, Julian Bond, whom I knew best.

I was not fortunate to know Amelia Boynton. She may have been the most courageous woman in the movement of the 1960s, who insisted upon facing death, if necessary, in that march from Selma to Montgomery, and nearly lost her life. I was privileged to be in her presence, as so many Members of Congress were, when we went to Selma this past summer. That was a privilege in and of itself.

I was fortunate to know Congressman Louis Stokes, who was a founder of the Congressional Black Caucus long before I served. This was a man of great accomplishment. Yes, he can speak about his firsts, and much more.

He is the first African American to serve in Congress from his hometown of Cleveland, as one of the two famous Stokes brothers—his brother, Carl, the first African American mayor. There is something about the way those men were raised and showed themselves in public life. But it is Rep. Stokes' career in Congress that stands out for me.

I am not certain there has ever been a more distinguished Member of this body. It looks as if when they were trying to ask somebody to do something hard, they looked to Louis Stokes.

He was the first African American to serve on the Appropriations Committee. My heavens. And then look at the committees he has chaired—hard ones—the Ethics Committee, the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. Then they needed someone to do something else that was difficult, and that was to serve on the Iran Contra Committee, and House Select Committee on Assassinations, nothing was more difficult than that.

If you were looking for a Member whom the public would trust and who this body would trust, who do you go to? They went to Louis Stokes. So if you are trying to find out how to serve, recall the life of Representative Louis Stokes.

In the District, we recall his life and his work. Much of his work was done in the field of health. The Howard University Louis Stokes Health Science Library is named for him here in the District of Columbia at Howard University. So we will never forget him.

Of the three, the one I knew best, of course, was my colleague and friend in the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, later a client of sorts, and then finally—for 25 years, a constituent.

I met Julian several years after he founded, along with a handful of other students, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. You have got to understand that that group was as different from any student group since. They were not an offshoot of the civil rights movement. They were a group that stood on its own.

I would go down in the summers. I was in law school. SNCC was the equivalent of major civil rights organizations, every single one, right alongside them. That is why JOHN LEWIS got to speak on the March on Washington.

The reason that SNCC stood out is the quality of its leadership in those early years. Julian became the spokesman. The reason he was the spokesman was his way with words. He was a poet and a writer, and he could explain what we were doing.

He served a most valuable role in these early years. So no one should be surprised that he went after the zenith of the civil rights movement to serve in the Georgia House of Representatives. What you may be surprised to learn is that when he moved on to the senate, the Georgia Senate, they refused to seat him because he had endorsed a SNCC statement opposing the Vietnam war. Imagine denying a seat to a member duly elected because of a statement he had made on an issue of great moment.

This case was taken all the way to the Supreme Court. At that point, I was a constitutional lawyer working for the American Civil Liberties Union in New York. I got to write the amicus

brief. We took very few amicus briefs to the Supreme Court, but this one seemed to have the makings of a landmark case. Indeed, it did become a landmark case. You do not see anybody denying anyone else the right to sit in his seat—or her seat, today—because of that person's views. The Julian Bond case settled the matter.

What was Julian Bond to do with the rest of his life? First of all, SNCC broke a fair number of people. And though they gave much to the movement, you may not have heard about many of them since. What Julian did was to give the rest of his life to the movement. For every single day of his life as a man, after he left public service in the Georgia Legislature, he was devoted to the civil rights movement he had entered as a very young man.

He moved to the District of Columbia with his wife, taught at American University and the University of Virginia, and became—and this is a matter that makes me chuckle—became the chairman of the NAACP.

At SNCC we thought the NAACP was way too conservative for us, the young and foolish. It tells you how Julian grew. He grew to be the long-time and devoted chairman of the NAACP.

He carried out his devotion to civil rights magnificently. Throughout his entire life, he remained a major spokesman for the civil rights movement and for progressive causes, his entire life speaking all around the country, carrying the message.

When he moved here, I had a Black Caucus event with Julian and with JOHN LEWIS simply discussing their lives as young men in the civil rights movement. That was to be one of the most memorable moments since I have been in Congress.

Just last February, during Black History Month, I asked Julian to come to Howard University, where he and I engaged in an intergenerational conversation with Howard students about the police shootings in Ferguson, Missouri, and New York City and what they meant to this generation and how this generation had to have its own issues and move in its own direction.

One of the things we indicated was that for all of the work of the youth of the civil rights movement of our day, we never touched racial profiling. It remained alive and kicking for a new generation, which has taken it on.

I am, finally, particularly grateful that when Julian moved to the District of Columbia, he really became a part of this city, lending his civil rights celebrity to the great cause of this city for full citizenship, for D.C. voting rights, yes, and for statehood for the District of Columbia.

If you came into the District by taxis a few years ago, there was an advertisement. Julian was speaking in a cab, informing you that you were coming to the District of Columbia, where the residents were trying to get their full citizenship.

Wherever he was, he had a way of touching upon the issue of freedom of

the day and of the people around him. I will always miss him. This country will always miss him. We are grateful for the life he led. We are grateful, especially, for this Congressional Black Caucus evening devoted to his life and to the lives of two others, very divergent lives but, in other ways, very similar.

I thank my good friend, Representative JACKSON LEE, again, for her leadership here.

□ 2000

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank my good friend, Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, for giving these three legends the vitality and vibrance of a personal story.

And to just add to his coming to students at Howard University, I want you to know that, at the University of Virginia, where he was, he was the most popular professor with people standing in line because the students sensed his passion and commitment, but they sensed his realness.

Thank you so very much for that very vibrant and informative presentation.

Mr. Speaker, as I introduce this next gentleman, who has his own history, let me quote, again, as I indicated, Pope Francis from last week, which captures all of what we are saying tonight: to respond in a way which is always humane, just and fraternal. We need to avoid a common temptation nowadays to disregard whatever proves troublesome. Let us remember the Golden Rule: Do unto others as you would have them do unto you.

The gentleman that I am going to yield to, Mr. BOBBY SCOTT, is a former chairman of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, now the ranking member on the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and has led his professional, at least his Congressional life, as I have known it, to be a champion for criminal justice reform, but, more importantly, has been one who has said to us over and over again that: We must do unto others as we would like them to do unto us. We must change this criminal justice system to have it be a fair monitoring of how we inspire and restore people's lives.

I yield now to the gentleman from Virginia, Congressman BOBBY SCOTT.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in honor of the lives of three civil rights luminaries. I thank the gentlewoman from Houston for giving us this opportunity to honor their lives: Congressman Louis Stokes, statesman and educator Julian Bond, both of whom I knew personally, and activist Amelia Robinson.

These champions of social and economic justice lived their lives just as Pope Francis challenged Members of Congress to do.

Specifically, the Pope reminded us of the Golden Rule—do unto others as you would have them do unto you—and that that rule points us in the right direction. He specifically reminded Congress that, if we want opportunities,

then let us provide opportunities. The lives we honor today are the personification of the Pope's call.

Congressman Stokes, the beloved son of the State of Ohio, was affectionately called "Lou" when I served with him in the House. His motto was to aim high, which he did even before he was a Member of Congress when he argued the Supreme Court case challenging the abusive stop-and-frisk policies and practices in the Terry v. Ohio case.

Lou's integrity was why he was selected to serve on the House Select Committee on Assassinations of President Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and the House investigation of the illegal arm sales during the Iran-contra affair and, of course, his service on the Ethics Committee.

His strive for social and economic justice was on full display when he became the first African American to serve on the House Appropriations Committee. There he directed Federal dollars to eradicate injustice and inequities by funding programs such as healthcare facilities for veterans, supporting the National Science Foundation, and creating the first office of minority health at the National Institutes of Health.

Statesman and educator Julian Bond dedicated his entire life to this cause of social justice and equity. As a founding member of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, or SNCC, he led protests against segregation.

In 1965, Julian Bond was elected to the Georgia House of Representatives, but was denied a seat at the State House because of his opposition to the Vietnam war. In 1966, the Supreme Court ruled 9-0 that the Georgia House's refusal to seat Julian Bond violated the United States Constitution.

He was subsequently elected for several terms, including service in the Georgia Senate, despite efforts to redraw his district.

He was also the first African American nominated at a major-party convention as a candidate for Vice President of the United States.

Beginning in the 1980s, Julian Bond taught at several universities, including Harvard, Drexel, University of Virginia, and American University.

For more than 20 years at UVA and American University, he taught thousands of students about the role of the civil rights movement as a seminal part of America's history.

He stated that the "humanity of all Americans is diminished when any group is denied rights granted to others."

He served as chairman of the NAACP from 1998 to 2009. At the 2009 commencement at Virginia State University, he told the graduates that, "We all hope that you do well, but I also hope that you do good."

Activist Amelia Robinson was among the many foot soldiers who fought for civil rights. As a girl, she championed the right to vote for women. As an

adult, she opened her home to Martin Luther King and James Bevel and members of SNCC and others to help organize and strategize for civil rights and the right to vote.

Despite the brutal beating she endured during the march for voting rights in Selma, Alabama, 50 years ago, she was unwavering in her fight to end segregation and achieve full voting rights for all.

Reflecting on her life as an activist, she stated that, "I have been called rabble-rouser, agitator. But because of my fighting, I was able to hand to the entire country the right for people to vote."

These three American giants—the legislator, the educator, the activist—were all driven to push towards a more just and equal society. I am honored to recognize their lives and the gifts they gave to our Nation.

Again, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Houston for organizing this Special Order so that we could pay appropriate tribute to these fine Americans.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for citing, in particular, the case law that Julian Bond particularly generated from the horrific denial of his right to be seated.

Let me also indicate the importance of members of the Congressional Black Caucus sharing the history of these icons, which I hope my colleagues will appreciate these giants, for many times the history is not remembered or it is not understood.

Certainly, it is my privilege to now yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio, who has firsthand knowledge because she can say that she comes from the State of which Lou Stokes and Carl Stokes were native sons.

She is, of course, an inspirational leader for her district in Columbus, but, more importantly, someone who brings a wealth of experience from her previous service in the Ohio State Legislature and someone who has a passion for the improvement of lives of all people. I believe, as Lou Stokes has said, she understands the value and importance of improving the health of African Americans and all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield to the gentlewoman from Columbus, Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY).

Mrs. BEATTY. Thank you so much, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Mr. Speaker, tonight the Congressional Black Caucus honors the life and legacy of three civil rights leaders, Congressman Lou Stokes, Amelia Boynton Robinson, and Julian Bond, who dedicated their lives to making our Nation a better place.

Countless more follow in their footsteps and continue to push for civil rights and voting rights today.

We have come to these chambers tonight, Mr. Speaker, to continue their work as members of the Congressional Black Caucus. We call on Congress to immediately pass the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2015. The Amer-

ican people deserve to have real voting rights.

Thank you, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE, not only for your leadership tonight, but for being a leader, for walking in their shoes, and for hosting the Congressional Black Caucus Special Order honoring three giants.

This year is the 50th anniversary of the Voting Rights Act. Leaders espoused words in 1965 that still hold true today, words because of the work of these three giants, works like:

We have proved that great progress is possible. We know how much still remains to be done. And if our efforts continue, if our will is strong, if our hearts are right, and if courage remains our constant companion, then my fellow Americans, I am confident we shall overcome. Our objective must be to assure that all Americans play by the same rules, and all Americans play against the same odds. Who amongst us would claim that that is true today?

Just last week His Holiness, Pope Francis, delivered a historic, profound, provocative address to the Joint Session of Congress. This address reminded us that the nation is "considered great" when "it fosters a culture which enables people to dream of full rights for all their brothers and sisters."

At the White House, he quoted from Martin Luther King, to use a telling phrase of the Reverend Martin Luther King: "We can say that we have defaulted on a promissory note, and now is the time to honor it."

These three individuals we honor tonight tirelessly contributed to this culture of full rights and equality we are committed to achieving.

Tonight's roll call: Congressman Lou Stokes.

I am honored to be the third African American from Ohio to follow in his footsteps, following my mentor and dear friend, Stephanie Tubbs Jones, my colleague, mentor and friend, Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE, who said at his footsteps: I don't salute or get excited about a one hit wonder because Lou Stokes was far from that.

Lou Stokes loved people. He loved the law. He loved the legislative process. He loved his family. And he loved Cleveland, Ohio.

You have heard so much about him, I won't repeat it. I will submit it for the RECORD, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE, if that is okay.

But I will forever be grateful for his encouragement, his friendship, his wisdom, and his leadership. I can't think of a time or a decision in my life that I didn't pick up the phone and call Lou Stokes.

Love you, Lou Stokes.

Let me just briefly say we also salute Amelia Boynton Robinson, and much has been said about her. I stand on her shoulders.

And then Julian Bond, another great civil rights icon, whose passion and dedication to equality and justice propelled him to the Georgia Legislature, the NAACP, and the Southern Poverty Law Center, which he co-founded.

His commitment to ending discrimination and injustice continues to inspire us, and his legacy will guide us and the next generation of civil rights leaders and activists to greatness.

He, like the other individuals we pay tribute to tonight, helped change this country for the better.

Thank you, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE. Thank you to all my colleagues with the Congressional Black Caucus for capturing and reflecting on the lives of three great civil warriors as we took a walk in their footsteps of greatness.

Tonight the Congressional Black Caucus honors the life and legacy of three Civil Rights leaders—Congressman Louis Stokes, Amelia Boynton Robinson and Julian Bond who dedicated their lives to making our nation a better place.

Countless more follow in their footsteps and continue to push for civil rights and voting rights today.

We have come to these chambers to continue their work as Members of the Congressional Black Caucus; we call on Congress to immediately pass the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2015.

The American people deserve to have real voting rights now.

Thank you Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE for hosting the CBC's Special Order Hour paying tribute to Congressman Louis Stokes, Amelia Boynton Robinson, and Julian Bond.

This year is the 50th Anniversary of Voting Rights Act. Leaders . . . espoused words in 1965 that still hold true today. Words like:

We have proved that great progress is possible. We know how much still remains to be done. And if our efforts continue, and if our will is strong, and if our hearts are right, and if courage remains our constant companion, then my fellow Americans, I am confident, we shall overcome. Our objective must be to assure that all Americans play by the same rules, and all Americans play against the same odds. Who among us would claim that that is true today?

Just last week, His Holiness Pope Francis delivered a historic, profound, and provocative address to a Joint Session of Congress.

This address reminded us that a nation is "considered great" when "it fosters a culture which enables people to dream of full rights for all their brothers and sisters."

At the White House, he quoted words from MLK . . . to use a telling phrase of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. . . . we can say that we have defaulted on a promissory note and now is the time to honor it.

The three individuals we honor tonight tirelessly contributed to this culture of full rights and equality we are committed to achieving.

CONGRESSMAN STOKES

I am honored to be the third African-American from Ohio to follow Congressman Louis Stokes who served for 30 years in Congress. I am forever grateful for his encouragement, friendship, wisdom, and leadership.

He earned a seat on the powerful House Appropriations Committee, the first person of color to ever do so, and focused on improving housing and urban development for veterans, seniors, and the poor.

In 1971, along with our esteemed Dean of the House, Congressman JOHN CONYERS, Congressman Stokes helped found the Con-

gressional Black Caucus to promote economic, educational, and social issues important to African Americans: this is a purpose the CBC continues to fulfill to this day, and a purpose I am honored to advance.

His indelible mark in history will continue to live on.

AMELIA BOYNTON ROBINSON

It is also an honor to pay tribute to Amelia Boynton Robinson—the matriarch of the voting rights movement.

As an African-American female serving in the U.S. Congress, I stand on the shoulders of Mrs. Boynton Robinson.

Mrs. Boynton Robinson helped organize the Selma-to-Montgomery marches, and walked at the front of the line that fateful day on March 7, 1965, which we now know as "Bloody Sunday".

On August 6, 1965, she was the guest of honor at the White House when President Johnson signed the Voting Rights Act of 1965 into law.

I had the privilege to join Mrs. Boynton Robinson this past March, as thousands of Americans marched once again over the Edmund Pettus Bridge, remembering the struggles and recommitting ourselves to restoring voting rights protections, equality, and justice.

JULIAN BOND

Julian Bond was a civil rights icon whose passion and dedication to equality and justice propelled him to the Georgia legislature, the NAACP, and the Southern Poverty Law Center, which he co-founded.

His commitment to ending discrimination and injustice continues to inspire us and his legacy will guide the next generation of civil rights leaders and activists to greatness.

He, like the other individuals we pay tribute to tonight, helped changed this country for the better.

Thank you CBC for capturing and reflecting on the lives of three great civil rights warriors as we took a walk in their footsteps of greatness.

Ms. JACKSON LEE, Congresswoman BEATTY, thank you for letting us know whose footsteps we walk in and for that celebratory statement.

Mr. Speaker, it is certainly my pleasure to yield to the gentlewoman from the U.S. Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT), who has come with the expertise of a renowned and trained lawyer, one who is a collaborator.

Ms. PLASKETT. Thank you so much to my colleague, SHEILA JACKSON LEE. I want to thank you and the Congressional Black Caucus for this Special Order Hour, a special tribute to the lives and legacy of Representative Louis Stokes, Amelia Boynton Robinson, and Julian Bond.

Thank you, Ms. JACKSON LEE, for your work here in Congress, your tireless efforts to raise awareness to issues which many Americans may have forgotten or not given thought to.

Thank you for your mentorship to us younger members here and your tireless efforts to support not only the people of Houston, but the people of America.

Thank you for allowing us this most important opportunity to pay tribute to these remarkable individuals.

Mr. Speaker, today we gather in reverence and in solemn reflection to

honor the lives and legacies of some exceptional people, some exceptional Americans, who we have lost in these recent months.

These were civil rights activists, statesmen and women, trailblazers, members of a great generation of individuals who gave so much of themselves to the Civil Rights Movement and to the advancement of minorities in our country.

They are former Congressman Louis Stokes, former chairman of the NAACP and Georgia State Senator Julian Bond, and civil rights icon Mrs. Amelia Boynton Robinson.

A centenarian—Mrs. Robinson's 110 years of life, that in itself is a great honor—she was dedicated to education, fighting state-sanctioned discriminatory practices against African Americans, and voter disenfranchisement.

□ 2015

One can make the argument that her role in Selma's civil rights demonstrations, including the infamous march on Bloody Sunday where she was beaten unconscious by State police, paved the way, through the subsequent passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, for both Congressman Stokes and State Representative Bond to serve in elected office.

As the first African American elected to Congress from the State of Ohio, Congressman Stokes was a founding member of the Congressional Black Caucus and spent his 30-year career in Congress advocating issues of importance to Ohioans and to African Americans across the country.

Julian Bond, that great statesman from Georgia, was one of 11 African Americans elected to the Georgia House of Representatives after the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Bond served 20 years in both legislative chambers in the State of Georgia and served as the first president of the Southern Poverty Law Center. He also served as chairman of the NAACP.

These individuals have impacted the lives of so many African Americans and have undoubtedly advanced the rights and interests of minorities in both our States' and our Nation's governments.

Similarly, I would like to just take a moment to recognize two individuals from my own home district of the Virgin Islands who, like Congressman Stokes, Julian Bond, and Amelia Robinson, have changed the landscape of the Virgin Islands through their advocacy and education.

I would like to recognize a former judge and Lieutenant Governor of the Virgin Islands, the late Julio A. Brady, who, like Julian Bond and Congressman Stokes, used his training as an attorney to contribute to his community outside of the courtroom. As a U.S. attorney, judge, and attorney general, Judge Brady fought to remove barriers of injustice. He was laid to rest this week. Like Congressman Stokes and

Amelia Robinson, Judge Brady's legacy of service will carry on.

Ursula Krigger was also a centenarian, like Amelia Robinson, and, at age 113 was the oldest living Virgin Islander until her passing this month. She was a griot, an educator whose longevity afforded a unique perspective of witnessing the modern advancement of our territory.

The lives and legacies of these individuals are etched in the annals of our history and their impact forever ingrained in the minds and hearts of the many lives they touched. I am a better person; and, indeed, we are a better nation through the work of these individuals.

I have listened to my colleagues tonight speak about Representative Louis Stokes, Amelia Boynton Robinson, and Julian Bond and the personal impact these individuals had on the work of my colleagues with whom they served and have known personally.

Understand, that while many like myself may not have had the great honor and pleasure of toiling and working with them shoulder to shoulder in the struggle for civil rights and the advancement of minorities in our country, Americans like myself understand and appreciate their sacrifice, and we understand the work that must still be done. We will continue their legacy here today and in Congress in the future.

Thank you so much, Congressional Black Caucus, for this time. And thank you again to my colleague from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, for the time that I have been afforded to speak on behalf of these great Americans.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Congresswoman PLASKETT, thank you so very much for laying the groundwork for those who now step into those footsteps, and you have done so with such leadership and certainly such passion. Thank you so very much.

Mr. Speaker, what is my time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL). The gentlewoman from Texas has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me conclude by thanking the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus and my colleagues. It is so important for the Congressional Black Caucus to be able to talk to America—Representative BUTTERFIELD, Representative RANGEL, Representative SEWELL, Delegate HOLMES NORTON, Representative BOBBY SCOTT, Representative JOYCE BEATTY, and, of course, Congresswoman PLASKETT—to be able to give life to why we are here representing all of America. We have those special people that, without our voices, would not be able to be heard.

I simply want to add these words of the Pope, again, to be able to remind everyone why these icons that we are speaking of tonight in the Congressional Black Caucus—46 of us, along with Senator BOOKER—have a vital role in this place. As the Pope indicated, I

would encourage you to keep in mind all those people around us who are trapped in the cycle of poverty. They, too, need to be given hope. The fight against poverty and hunger must be fought constantly on many fronts, especially in its causes.

I know that Americans today, as in the past, are working to deal with this problem. That is the essence of Julian Bond, who never stopped giving; that is the essence of Amelia Boynton Robinson, who continued to fight for civil rights up until her death at the age of 104 on August 6, 2015; that is the essence of Congressman Lou Stokes, a legislative giant, the chairman of an appropriations subcommittee, a person who went to public housing and places where children were and told America that your children are dying because they are living in substandard housing, lead poisoning was killing them, which gave me the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, to give a grant to my public housing just this past week on helping with lead poisoning.

I worked for Lou Stokes, and I am very glad to note that, working for him, I can say, truly a gentleman, truly a leader.

To this Congress, I beg of you, let us look at these icons and celebrate not only their lives, but commit to the passion and justice of their lives, and, as well, the words of Pope Francis that tell us to do unto others as we would like them to do unto us.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to again thank the members of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to speak in praise of Louis Stokes, one of the greatest and most respected Members ever to serve in this body, who died on Tuesday, August 18, 2015, at his home near Cleveland, Ohio at the age of 90.

It is not unusual in these days for commentators and politicians to talk of something called "American Exceptionalism."

But what is meant by the term?

Mr. Speaker, one way to understand the term: America is exceptional because it produces and finds persons like Louis Stokes and affords them the opportunity to utilize their talents to the fullest in the service of their community and their country.

Think about it: in what other nation does a little African American boy born in 1925 on the east side of Cleveland and raised in the Outhwaite Homes housing project by a mother who worked as a domestic go on to become a lawyer who argues and wins a landmark criminal justice reform case (Terry v. Ohio, 392 U.S. 1 (1968)) in the United States Supreme Court; become the first African American elected to Congress; is selected to chair the powerful Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, the Select Committee on Assassinations, and an Appropriations Subcommittee responsible for more than \$90 billion annually in federal outlays?

Yes, America is an exceptional nation and Louis Stokes was an exceptional human being.

Mr. Speaker, Louis Stokes was born on February 23, 1925, in Cleveland, Ohio, to

Charles and Louise Cinthy (nee Stone) Stokes.

When he was three years old, his father, who worked in a laundromat, died leaving young Louis and his younger brother, Carl, to be raised by their mother, who worked as a domestic for affluent families in the wealthy Cleveland suburbs.

Louis Stokes' maternal grandmother played a critical role in his life because she took care of the Stokes boys while their mother was at work and instilled in them "the idea that work with your hands is the hard way of doing things" and encouraged them over and over "to learn to use their heads."

Louis Stokes took the advice to heart so after attending Cleveland's Central High School and serving in the U.S. Army during World War II, he returned home to attend what is now Case Western Reserve University on the G.I. Bill at night while working during the day for the Veterans Administration and the Department of the Treasury.

After graduating from college in two years where he excelled as a student, Louis Stokes was accepted for admission to Cleveland Marshall School of Law, from which he graduated in 1953; three years later, his brother Carl would also graduate from Cleveland Marshall School of Law and the two of them would go on to form the law firm of Stokes & Stokes specializing in the areas of civil rights and criminal law.

In 1964, the Supreme Court decided the landmark case of Reynolds v. Sims, 377 U.S. 533 (1964), which established the principle of "one person, one vote" governing the reapportionment of legislative boundaries.

The following year, working on behalf of the local branch of the NAACP, Louis Stokes led the legal challenge to the Ohio legislature's congressional redistricting, which had the effect of diluting African American voting strength in Cleveland.

The challenge was unsuccessful in the federal district court but undeterred, Louis Stokes, joined by Charles Lucas, an African American Republican, successfully appealed the decision to the U.S. Supreme Court, which in an order handed down in 1967 ruled the redistricting plan unconstitutional and ordered it redrawn, resulting in the creation of Ohio's first majority-black district, the 21st Congressional District of Ohio.

Ironically, Louis Stokes would defeat his one-time ally Charles Lucas to win that seat in November 1968, capturing 75% of the vote, the closest of his 15 successful elections to the U.S. House of Representatives.

For the next 30 years, from 1969 to 1999, Congressman Stokes tirelessly fought for his constituents in Cleveland and for the best interests of the people of Ohio and the United States.

Louis Stokes, a founding member and Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus from 1972–74, was the epitome of a public servant.

In his second term in Congress, he won appointment to the powerful House Appropriations Committee, where he served for 28 years, later becoming the second African American "Cardinal" in history when he was selected to chair the VA, HUD, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

Because of the esteem in which he was held by his colleagues and the leadership, Louis Stokes would also later be selected to Chair the House Permanent Select Committee

on Intelligence and the Select Committee charged with investigating the assassinations of President Kennedy and the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

As Chairman of the House Ethics Committee and a person of unquestioned integrity, Louis Stokes oversaw the committee's investigation of the corruption scandal known as ABCAM in 1979–80, which eventually led to convictions of a senator and six House members.

Mr. Speaker, Louis Stokes perhaps is best known for the national attention he attracted in 1987 as a member of the House Select Committee to Investigate Covert Arms Transactions with Iran/("Iran-Contra"), the scandal involving the illegal sale of military weapons to the Ayatollah Khomeini's Iran to generate money to fund the illegal contra war in Nicaragua.

In response to the claim by Colonel Oliver North that he acted out of patriotism in engineering the illegal weapons sales and diverting the proceeds to fund the contras, a stern Louis Stokes lectured the misguided Colonel North on the rule of law, the true meaning of patriotism, and, in the process American exceptionalism:

"I suppose that what has been most disturbing to me about your testimony is the ugly part. In fact, it has been more than ugly. It has been chilling, and, in fact, frightening. I'm not just talking about your part in this, but the entire scenario, about government officials who plotted and conspired, who set up a straw man, a fall guy. Officials who lied, misrepresented and deceived. Officials who planned to superimpose upon our government a layer outside of our government, shrouded in secrecy and only accountable to the conspirators.

"Colonel, as I sit here this morning looking at you in your uniform, I cannot help but remember that I wore the uniform of this country in World War II in a segregated Army. I wore it as proudly as you do, even though our government required black and white soldiers in the same Army to live, sleep, eat and travel separate and apart, while fighting and dying for our country. But because of the rule of law, today's servicemen in America suffer no such indignity.

"My mother, a widow, raised two boys. She had an eighth-grade education. She was a domestic worker who scrubbed floors. One son became the first black mayor of a major American city. The other sits today as chairman of a House intelligence committee. Only in America, Col. North. Only in America. And while I admire your love for America, I hope that you will never forget that others too love America just as much as you do and that others will die for America, just as quick as you will."

Louis Stokes never wavered in his belief that America could fulfill the promise of its Founders or his dedication to the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, stating:

"I'm going to keep on denouncing the inequities of this system, but I'm going to work within it. To go outside the system would be to deny myself—to deny my own existence. I've beaten the system. I've proved it can be done—so have a lot of others.

"But the problem is that a black man has to be extra special to win in this system. Why should you have to be a super black to get someplace? That's what's wrong in the society. The ordinary black man doesn't have the same chance as the ordinary white man does."

Mr. Speaker, Louis Stokes' commitment to fairness and equal treatment started long before he was elected to Congress.

As a lawyer for the NAACP, he brought anti-discrimination lawsuits, represented demonstrators arrested in antidiscrimination marches and sit-ins, and took the cases of poor persons charged with crimes.

One of those criminal cases he took is known to every lawyer in America and appreciated by every person who cherishes the protections guaranteed by the 4th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

I am speaking of the famous case of *Terry v. Ohio*, 392 U.S. 1 (1968) won by Louis Stokes in which the Supreme Court held that a police officer could "stop and frisk" an individual only where he could articulate a reasonable basis that the person was, or was about to be, engaged in criminal activity.

As a result of *Terry v. Ohio*, a police officer has the right to stop, frisk, and question an individual he reasonably suspects to be engaged in criminal activity, but cannot seize items from that person if the pat down of the suspect's outer clothing does not reveal any weapons posing a threat to the officer's safety.

Because of Louis Stokes' exceptional advocacy in *Terry v. Ohio*, the right of every individual to secure from unreasonable searches and seizures was preserved while at the same not impeding the ability of law enforcement officers to perform their duties safely.

Mr. Speaker, every citizen benefits from this ruling and communities that have a history of being harassed by law enforcement protected by the Constitution from arbitrary and abusive treatment by law enforcement.

But the fight for a criminal justice system that respects the rights of all persons is not over.

That is why I am proud to be the Ranking Member of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations and a leader in the effort to reform the criminal justice system so that all persons receive fair and equal treatment regardless of their race, gender, religion, or national origin.

Louis Stokes fought tirelessly to fulfill the promise of the 14th Amendment that "no state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

It is a fight I am proud to continue today.

Mr. Speaker, Louis Stokes will be mourned by friends and colleagues on both sides of the aisle who had the privilege to serve alongside him.

He was a mentor to me and I will always remember his commanding presence and cherish the assistance he provided me and the example he set for new Members to follow.

My thoughts and prayers are with his Jay, Louis' beloved wife of 55 years; to his children, Shelly, Louis, Angela, and Lorene; his grandchildren; and the untold thousands of persons who touched and whose lives were touched by one of Cleveland's greatest sons.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to observe a moment of silence in memory of Louis Stokes, an exceptional American, and the gentleman from Ohio who served in this chamber for three decades with honor, integrity, and distinction.

[From cleveland.com]

LOU STOKES PUT HEALTH IMPACTS OF SUBSTANDARD HOUSING ON THE NATIONAL AGENDA, AND IN CLEVELAND: TERRY ALLAN, DORR DEARBORN AND DAVE JACOBS (OPINION)

In this file photo from 2012, Timothy Benner, then 8, looks outside from his Maurice Avenue home in Cleveland. After Timothy and some of his siblings tested positive for lead poisoning, traced to the soil around their home, their mother restricted their outdoor play time. U.S. Rep. Lou Stokes, who died earlier this month, championed national attention and funding to address the problem of lead poisoning in inner-city children.

Recent stories and opinion pieces have eulogized the many accomplishments of the late U.S. Rep. Louis Stokes, from civil-rights champion to accomplished litigator, statesman and lawmaker. We believe that Louis Stokes should also be recognized as a national leader who clearly understood the connection between substandard housing and health, and acted to address the problem, at a time when very few did.

Back in the 1980s, the scope and magnitude of the childhood lead-poisoning problem and its impact on our nation's children was not fully recognized or well understood.

Subsequent efforts to increase blood screening in early childhood revealed that Greater Cleveland had among the highest rates of lead poisoning in the country, adding to the compounding disadvantages of children living in poverty in our community and across the United States.

Some of us have vivid memories from 1991, when Congressman Stokes held up a Newsweek magazine cover story on threats posed to children by lead paint, passionately advocating for the voiceless in our society while educating the community about this silent epidemic. He wanted all of us to understand the debilitating consequences of childhood lead exposure in the home environment and its impact on the life trajectory of these vulnerable kids.

Congressman Stokes turned that message into action, by using his formidable legislative acumen to establish the first Healthy Homes program in the country within the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

When he recognized in 1998 that young infants in his district were suffering from sometimes fatal lung bleeding associated with water-damaged, moldy homes, he asked HUD to address the impact of inner-city homes on children's health. He understood that houses are systems, and that independently addressing lead paint problems, moisture intrusion and mold, injury risks and other housing hazards was inefficient and costly. He also had the vision to recognize that treating children at the hospital, only to release them back into the same substandard home that made them sick, created a vicious circle with major public health consequences. He knew these homes needed to be fixed.

The HUD Office of Lead Hazard Control had shown interest in applying the experience of lead-poisoning prevention to include other health hazards in the home, such as plumbing problems and leaky basements, but lacked the authority.

Through his vision, the Congressman invited us and others to testify at the House Subcommittee on HUD appropriations to see what could be done. Lou Stokes convinced his fellow committee members to provide the very first appropriation of \$10 million to HUD for 'Healthy Homes' prevention programs in low-income housing. His legacy has resulted in millions of homes that are safer and healthier as a direct result of that investment in our children. Since that time,

the HUD Office of Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes has provided more than \$175 million in competitively awarded grants to communities across the nation to investigate and address health hazards in homes.

The asthma home-visit program in Cleveland that decreases the hospitalization rate of children with asthma, highlighted in The Plain Dealer in June, is a direct outgrowth of Congressman Stokes' work.

In 2012, HUD created the Louis Stokes Healthy Homes Award and presented the first one to him at the City Club of Cleveland. When he received the award, he pointed out that much has been achieved and that much more remains to be done. He also said that he really didn't know what all the fuss was about, as he was just a kid who grew up in public housing, who wanted to do the right thing for our children.

He was an inspiration to us all.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to speak in praise of Julian Bond, one of the leading lights of the Civil Rights Movement, who died on Saturday, August 15, 2015, at the age of 75.

While Julian lost his battle to the illness that claimed his life, it is the struggle for civil rights and human dignity he helped to win that he will forever be remembered and revered.

Horace Julian Bond was born January 14, 1940 in Nashville, Tennessee to Julia Agnes and Horace Mann Bond.

Julian's father was the first African-American President of Lincoln University of Pennsylvania, the same institution attended by Thurgood Marshall and Langston Hughes who would both go on to make substantial contributions to the Civil Rights Movement and the advancement of African-Americans.

Julian's father later became president of Atlanta University and Julian decided to attend Morehouse College, one of the leading black colleges in the nation.

Julian Bond, who came from a long line of educators, determined at an early age to put his journalistic and organizing talents in service of the cause of civil rights and racial equality.

While a student at Morehouse College, Julian helped found *The Pegasus*, a literary magazine, and led nonviolent student protests against segregation in Atlanta parks, restaurants, and movie theaters.

Mr. Speaker, today it is difficult to imagine there once was a time in our country when blacks and whites could not eat together in public restaurants, use the same public restrooms, stay at the same hotels, or attend the same schools.

Julian Bond answered the call to action and put his studies on hold to devote all of his energies and efforts to ending segregation and racial discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, it is not unusual these days for us to think of a champion as someone who receives the highest accolades in sports.

Julian Bond was a champion of the people. His success is measured not in the numbers of trophies, medals, ribbons, and championship banners, but in the number of doors and opportunities he helped to open for those who had been neglected, marginalized, and disenfranchised.

Julian Bond knew that to bring about non-violent social change it was necessary to organize so he co-founded the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC).

SNCC, which organized and mobilized the participation of students and young people in

the Civil Rights Movement, conceived the Freedom Rides that challenged the practice of racial segregation in interstate transportation and the Mississippi Freedom Summer project that undertook the dangerous work of helping African Americans register to vote in the state most committed to maintaining White supremacy by any means necessary.

SNCC was not the first leadership role history and circumstance would call upon Julian Bond to assume; nor would it be the last.

In 1965, after passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, Julian Bond was elected to represent the residents of the 32nd district in Georgia House of Representatives.

But on January 10, 1966, his white colleagues in the Georgia House voted 184-12 not to seat him because he had publicly expressed his opposition to the Vietnam War.

Julian Bond challenged the refusal of the Georgia House to seat him and took his case all the way to the United States Supreme Court, which ruled in the unanimous decision of *Bond v. Floyd*, 385 U.S. 116 (1966), that expressing opposition to the Vietnam War was speech protected by the First Amendment and directed that he be seated as a duly elected member of the state legislature.

Julian Bond would go on to serve three more terms in the Georgia House, where he co-founded the Georgia Legislative Black Caucus, and six terms in the Georgia State Senate.

In 1971, Julian Bond co-founded and served as president of the Southern Poverty Law Center that tracks the actions of hate groups to better inform and prepare communities about the dangers these groups pose.

Julian Bond consistently identified issues of civil inequality and provided solutions by gathering groups of community leaders, professionals, and educators to protect what the laws and policies would not, our basic civil rights.

In 1998, Julian Bond's commitment to justice and equality led him to answer the call to serve and accept the position of Chairman of the NAACP, a post he held until 2010.

Julian Bond was able to bring the earnest fight to achieve equality into the modern era as he watched African-Americans achieve the highest awards in their professions and continued to break down barriers.

In November 2008, Julian Bond witnessed the election of the first African American President of the United States, a feat thought impossible just a decade earlier.

Mr. Speaker, because of trailblazers like Julian Bond millions of Americans gained access to opportunities previously denied to members of their communities.

Julian Bond spent 5 years with SNCC, 8 years as president of the Southern Poverty Law Center, 12 years as the president of NAACP, 20 years as a state representative, and 75 years as an unwavering champion of civil rights for all people, including the LGBT community.

My thoughts and prayers are with Julian's beloved wife Pamela, his children and grandchildren; and the untold millions of persons whose lives were touched by one of America's greatest sons.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to observe a moment of silence in memory of Julian Bond, a tireless and eloquent voice for justice, equality, and human dignity who did so much to

close the gap between the promise of America's founding ideals and the reality of people's lives.

CIVIL RIGHTS GIANT JULIAN BOND NEVER STOPPED GIVING

(Posted By Edna Kane-Williams on August 31, 2015)

President Obama described him as a "hero" who "helped change this country for the better." The Rev. Jesse Jackson called him a "leader with strength, character." NAACP Chairman Roslyn Brock said he "inspired a generation of civil rights leaders." Teresa Sullivan, president of the University of Virginia, where he taught history for many years, called him a beloved retired professor who "shaped the course of history through his life and work."

How ever you choose to describe Julian Bond, one thing is for sure: He taught us all how to stand for what we believe. And he believed in freedom, justice and equality.

For me, one of the most remarkable attributes of this civil rights giant is the fact that he never stopped giving. Even at the time of his brief illness and death on Aug. 15 at the age of 75, he was still serving faithfully as chairman emeritus on the NAACP board. Even after he retired from the professorship at the University of Virginia, he continued to mentor and remained a role model for students and others.

A writer, poet, television commentator, lecturer and college teacher—and as a former politician—Julian Bond was one of those rare people whose work became legendary while he was still doing it. In fact, the Library of Congress once called him a "living legend."

And because of the magnitude of his work, he leaves many treasures that will simply keep on giving. UVA, where his papers are housed, has announced its goal to establish a Julian Bond Professorship in Civil Rights and Social Justice, which "will continue Bond's scholarly legacy." There will certainly be many more designations in honor of his life's work.

And surely some will rise, seeking to follow in his footsteps. Mr. Bond believed in young people's ability to take the civil rights and social justice baton and run with it. Earlier this year, he told a group of Howard University students, "I think you know what the problems are. You know what the solutions are, and I'm sure we will be glad to help. But don't depend on us to tell you what to do. Just go out and do it."

Well, he left an amazing road map. From his pioneering civil rights work as a co-founder of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee to all of his work and contributions thereafter, Julian Bond was a model for anyone who aims to make an impact and leave the world a better place.

In that regard, he was a role model for us all. What a life. What a legacy.

Amelia Boynton was born on August 18, 1911, in Savannah, Georgia. Her early activism included holding black voter registration drives in Selma. Boynton spent her first two years of college at Georgia State College (now Savannah State University), then transferred to the Tuskegee Institute (now Tuskegee University) in Alabama. She graduated from Tuskegee with a home economics degree before further pursuing her education at Tennessee State University, Virginia State University and Temple University.

In the 1930's, Boynton Robinson began her activist career by registering African Americans to vote. In 1964, she ran for Congress to represent Alabama. She was the first woman to have run for this Democratic seat, and although she did not win, she received 10% of

votes. As the civil rights movement picked up, Boynton asked Martin Luther King Jr., who had witnessed her arrest in January 1965 for seeking to register Black voters, to visit Selma and empower the community. King accepted, and joined Boynton Robinson and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference in planning the march from Selma to Montgomery on March 17th, 1965.

As approximately 600 marchers walked across the Edmund Pettus Bridge, they were confronted by 200 state troopers and Alabama policemen, who shot teargas and beat the non-violent protesters. This horrific event came to be known as Bloody Sunday.

At least 17 protesters were sent to the hospital, including Boynton Robinson. A picture of her unconscious body lying on the ground after an officer shot tear gas into her throat spread through every news media outlet across the globe, and quickly became a symbol for race relations in the United States at the time.

The Selma to Montgomery march was a pivotal demonstration in the civil rights movement, leading to future victories such as the Voting Rights Acts of 1965 signed by President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Amelia Boynton Robinson was an incredible activist, leader, and woman, and is remembered for her courage and strength throughout the civil rights movement. She worked for equality for all until her last day on this earth.

[From the Two-Way, Aug. 26, 2015]

(By Bill Chappell)

AMELIA BOYNTON ROBINSON, SURVIVOR OF 'BLOODY SUNDAY,' DIES AT 104

Amelia Boynton Robinson, who went from being beaten on a bridge in Selma, Ala., in 1965 to being pushed across the bridge in a wheelchair alongside the president of the United States, has died at age 104.

Her daughter, Germaine Bowser, confirmed to Troy Public Radio's Kyle Gassiot that Boynton Robinson died early Wednesday morning. She had been hospitalized after suffering several strokes this summer.

Born in Savannah, Ga., Boynton Robinson was a pioneer in the voting rights movement who took part in the event that came to be known as "Bloody Sunday," when she and other activists were attacked by state troopers as they tried to march across the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

Along with Rep. John Lewis, D-Ga., Boynton Robinson held hands with President Obama as the men walked across the bridge this past March, marking the 50th anniversary of the march in Selma.

The Montgomery Advertiser reports:

"Boynton Robinson asked Martin Luther King Jr. to come to Selma to mobilize the local community in the civil rights movement. She worked with the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and helped plan the Selma to Montgomery march. Her role in the event was recaptured in the movie "Selma," where she was portrayed by actress Lorraine Toussaint. She was invited as a guest of honor to attend the signing of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 by President Lyndon B. Johnson."

Boynton Robinson also "made history in 1964 as the first African-American to run for Congress in Alabama." Alabama Public Radio reported earlier this year, when the civil rights legend attended Obama's 2015 State of the Union address in Washington, DC. She was the guest of Rep. Terri Sewell, Alabama's first elected African-American congresswoman.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 leg-

islative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order. What a grand opportunity to cite these great Americans: Amelia Boynton Robinson, Congressman Lou Stokes, and Julian Bond.

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

There was no objection.

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Amelia Boynton Robinson was an American hero who devoted her entire life to the fight for equal rights for all. She was a child suffragette, who alongside her mother, advocated for the women's vote and then as a young woman fought for the right of blacks to have their say at the ballot box. After bold run to represent Alabama in Congress, Mrs. Robinson helped organize the Bloody Sunday March from Selma to Montgomery. She was hospitalized after being knocked unconscious by a white officer on that perilous day, which left her undaunted and even more determined to fight for the African-American vote. It was my honor to nominate her for a Congressional Black Caucus Foundation Phoenix Award earlier this year, but sadly, she died before I could present it to her. Thankfully, however, Mrs. Robinson was able to share enough stories about her courageous experiences to fill a history book and resonate for generations to come.

CHRISTIANS UNDER ATTACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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, I come before this honorable House with an issue that has been rather heart-breaking for so many of us for so long now:

In The Middle East, the cradle of Christianity, where it started 2,000 years ago based on the Judeo principles from thousands of years before that, there has been a massive onslaught. Against Jews, it has been going on for some time; but especially in the last several years, it has become untenable for Christians.

In an article by Debra Heine, September 20, my sister's birthday, she wrote about "2,000 Years of Christian Civilization Destroyed on Obama's Watch."

It says this in the article: "The Islamic State has managed to destroy two thousand years of Christian civilizations in the Middle East in just a couple of years, Lt. Col. Ralph Peters noted on 'The O'Reilly Factor' last week. And he placed the blame squarely on President Obama's . . . policy.

"ISIS has been spreading across the Middle East like a plague of locusts, and as they have spread, they have targeted religious minorities, particularly Christians, for destruction. In Syria, tens of thousands of Assyrian Christians have been attacked and displaced.

"They are forgotten refugees."

Mr. Speaker, I have met with Christians and Christian leaders from Syria, and the stories they tell and the horrors they talk about, the inhumanity to man that is being inflicted upon Christians in that area is just untenable. It is unconscionable. Women—talk about a war on women. If they are Christian women, it is absolutely horrendous.

I ran into the same problem in meeting with family members in Nigeria of girls that were kidnapped by radical Islamists, Boko Haram. That was in Nigeria.

I would be interested to talk to the President of Togo tomorrow. I have been to his country before. I have seen the poverty, and I have seen the affliction.

But in the Middle East, Christians are not even allowed to be in the area where the Apostle Paul walked. The Apostle Paul planted churches where Christian missionaries were, along the times right after Jesus resurrected. Right in the early days of the church, churches were planted. And now, while the United States is said to be the sole superpower, Christians are being persecuted in greater numbers around the world than ever in history.

If there is a God who loves Christians, loves all people but has an affinity for Jews and Christians, then there would have to be a price for any nation that allows this to go on.

This article goes on: A Catholic priest who visited Kurdish Iraq last fall described the wounded souls of the Christians who had taken refuge there. They had been forced from their homes in northern Iraq in the summer of 2014.

"Without question, we are talking about genocide here. Genocide is not only when the people are killed, but also when the soul of a people is destroyed. And that is what is happening in Iraq now," said Fr. Andrzej Halemba, head of Aid to the Church in Need's Middle East section, said October 28. "It is the most tragic thing that I have ever experienced."

This is from the priest. The priest goes on: "I have seen people who have been deeply wounded in their soul. In the various crises in this world, I have often seen people who have lost everything. But in Iraq, there are Christians who have had to leave everything and take flight three or four times. They can see no light at the end of the tunnel."

"Last spring, hundreds of Assyrian Christians fled to Lebanon after ISIS jihadists stormed their villages in Syria's northeastern province of Hasakeh.

"Members of Lebanon's Assyrian community did their best to welcome the new refugees, but the displacement had left them traumatized.

"The villages of Khabor are empty now, there is no one left except some fighters," lamented Chorbishop Yatron Kolianna, as he oversaw the distribution at his diocese."

Mr. Speaker, this is tragic. Christian villages 2,000 years old, destroyed. Nothing left but some people trying to fight for just the ground that they are fighting on that once was their home.

“Our people have experienced a great tragedy in Syria” . . . “They are depressed. Some of them have chronic illnesses. Their lives are difficult.”

“How can we be comfortable living on aid?” asked 50-year-old Simaan, who fled his village Tal Hormuz.

“He railed against what he called international indifference to the plight of Assyrians under attack by ISIS in Syria and neighboring Iraq.

“The whole world, from the U.N. to the United States and Russia, is responsible” . . . “They”—talking about ISIS—“have destroyed our whole civilization . . . and the world is watching.”

□ 2030

We hear so many sad stories. Christians are being persecuted on our watch, and we are not talking enough about it. The President certainly isn't. He tells us that we need to take tens or hundreds of thousands of more Muslim refugees. What about the Christians and the massive extermination of churches in the Middle East under this administration? We get it. The Constitution gives the President wide authority and wide latitude on foreign policy. Congress has some say because we can appropriate or defund what the President is doing—if we have leadership with courage to do that.

This article goes on: “In July, 4,000 more Assyrian Christian families were among the 120,000 people who fled Hasakah to escape ISIS forces who had entered the city looking to carry out a mass ethno-religious slaughter.

“Fleeing Muslim persecution, Christian refugees are often targeted and persecuted anew by fleeing Muslim refugees.”

The International Business Times reported: “Italian police have arrested 15 Muslim immigrants in Palermo, for allegedly having thrown Christian refugees off the rubber boat that was taking them to Italy after a fight for ‘religious reasons,’ according to media reports.

“Those arrested—from Mali, Guinea and Ivory Coast—were part of a group of 100 that were rescued off the Libyan coast by the Italian coast guard.

“The Archbishop of Canterbury, recently warned British Prime Minister David Cameron that his government's refugee policy was discriminating against Christians because Christians are not among the refugees being helped in U.N. camps. They are not in the U.N. camps because they fear persecution from radicalized Muslim refugees.

“The Most Reverend Justin Welby reportedly met the Prime Minister earlier this month with concerns that Christians in Syria will be largely excluded from the 20,000 refugees due to come to the U.K. over the next 5 years.

“The government, in line with European Union policy, is committed to taking in refugees from U.N. camps in

Syria and neighboring countries. It cannot discriminate in favor of any one religious group. But the Archbishop has raised concerns that Christians have avoided refugee camps because of fears of persecution from rogue Islamist groups operating inside refugee camps.

“In a speech in the House of Lords last Monday, Archbishop Welby said that, ‘within the camps there is significant intimidation and radicalization, and many particularly of the Christian population who have been forced to flee are unable to be in the camps.’

“He went on: ‘What is the government's policy of reaching out to those who are not actually in the camps?’”

Lord Carey, who wrote in the Telegraph about his concern of the plight of Christians, wrote:

“The frustration for those of us who have been calling for compassion for Syrian victims for many months is that the Christian community is yet again left at the bottom of the heap.”

“Mr. Cameron's policy inadvertently discriminates against the very Christian communities most victimized by the inhuman butchers of the so-called Islamic State.”

“Christians are not to be found in the U.N. camps, because they have been attacked and targeted by Islamists and driven from them. They are seeking refuge in private homes, church buildings, and with neighbors and family.”

“Refugees who want to come to the United States will also be required to apply through the U.N.

“A combination of European cowardice and awful American foreign policy has led to a mass Muslim migration that will affect the whole world.”

“Lt. Col. Ralph Peters disagreed somewhat with that assessment.”

He said, “I think you were much, much too soft on President Obama and a bit too hard on the E.U.” . . . “If America doesn't lead, it doesn't happen.”

He went on to say: “Just look at a map of the Middle East . . . on George W. Bush's last day in office. There is broad peace across the Middle East and North Africa, Iraq was finally convalescing, and . . . Obama promptly, to please his America-hating base, abandons Iraq, backs the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt, gets rid of Qaddafi without a plan for what goes after, threatens Assad . . . then does nothing, doesn't listen to the intelligence community when for years they are telling him about the Islamic State coming—then tries to blame the intelligence community, and launches feckless airstrikes. The combination of his fecklessness and cowardice, his rhetorical bravado and utter incompetence are responsible.”

He goes on: “No. Listen to this. Two thousand years of Christian civilization destroyed on his watch . . . That's on Obama. When America doesn't lead, nothing happens.”

Well, it is not just on President Obama. I am sure he is mainly responsible for our foreign policy, but we need to stand up to the President. When Iran

is out there saying, as they have in the last couple of weeks, that with the \$100 billion, \$150 billion that President Obama is going to see to Iran getting quickly, and the hundreds of billions of dollars that will flow in subsequent years, they were already announcing they are going to increase their support for Hamas and Hezbollah as they kill Americans, continue to kill Christians, and continue to kill moderate Muslims who are not radicalized, at what point is Congress responsible for not standing up to the President?

Mr. Speaker, I would submit that one very important point has come, and right now it is up to the United States Senate to have a backbone on behalf of the millions that stand to be persecuted and killed by the money that they are going to allow to go to Iran by failing to do what they could to stop this world atrocity.

There is no question in reasonable, intelligent minds that the Iran deal is a treaty. It is a treaty as anticipated by the Founders. It is a treaty as referred to in the Constitution, article II, section 2, second paragraph, and it requires a vote of two-thirds of the Senate present to go along with it in order for it to be effective.

Yes, the Corker bill tried to amend the Constitution. Legislation can't amend the Constitution. Once it is clear—as it is—that the Iran deal is a treaty, then we need desperately to have people in the Senate stand up—some of them have—make clear this is a treaty; it requires two-thirds in order to approve it or it is not ratified, it is not effective, and the President is not allowed to release the 100-plus billion, \$150 billion to Iran that will be used for atrocities, especially toward America, toward Christians, toward moderate nonradicalized Muslims, toward Jews, and toward Israel. There is a real responsibility here. It may take courage—I am sure it will—for the Senate to stand up and the Senate majority leader to stand up and say: Sorry, Mr. President, the Iran deal is a treaty. We have listed in our letter to the majority leader in the Senate some of the bases, it is spelled out in our resolution that we filed and talked about here on the floor, it is clearly a treaty.

The end of John Quincy Adams' oral argument that capped a couple of days of oral argument in the case can be found online. He was afraid that if he did not do an adequate job as a lawyer, those Africans that he was representing that had been captured by other Africans and sold into slavery, sent to the Caribbean, and then put on the Spanish ship the Amistad, they were able to overtake and overpower the Spanish and take charge of the ship. They landed in America. The lawsuit was over whether or not they were free Africans or whether they were property of the Spanish.

I can understand the fear that John Quincy Adams must have had as he stood downstairs in the Old Supreme Court Chamber. One of the Justices had died one night during oral argument, not while he was actually arguing. That final day he knew if he didn't do an adequate job, his clients would wear chains and their children would wear chains all because he didn't do an adequate job as their lawyer.

So he finished his oral argument by calling the names of Justices of the Supreme Court who had been on the Supreme Court but had passed away. Chief Justice, Justices, he knew them. He called their names: The Justice that started this case, where is he? Where are all these Justices? Where is the Solicitor General that argued before me?

This is around 1821. This is in the late 1830s. He is now arguing in the Supreme Court in their Chamber downstairs.

After going through all the Supreme Court Justices that had passed away, he finishes basically by saying they have gone to meet their Judge, and the biggest question is when they met their Maker, their Judge, did they hear the words: "Well done, good and faithful servant?"

It is very clear, send a message to the Supreme Court. Think about it, Justices. If you died tonight like the other Judge just died in the last couple of nights and you go to meet your Maker, do you want the last thing you did to be having sent wonderful African people out in chains that they would wear and their children would wear—possibly their children and their children—all because you didn't do the right thing as a judge? He won the case, as well he should.

I can't help but wonder if John Quincy Adams were here today arguing on behalf of Christian communities all over the Middle East that have been destroyed, refugees that have been sent running, Jews that can no longer populate the area because of threats and violence upon them, and he saw that the United States that he had been President of and was in the House of Representatives after having been President, if he would not be mortified, if he would not challenge us today: Do we want to meet our Maker, our Judge, and we saw and heard about the plight of Christians, Jews, and moderate Muslims around the Middle East and North Africa just being slaughtered, women being raped and torn apart, brutalized in unthinkable ways, and we turned a blind eye to that and said that we are going to bring in massive numbers of refugees who are Muslim, 72 percent of which are male, and we have been told by radicals that they are going to make sure that there are people that want to kill and destroy more Christians, more Jews, more of America, and we are going to bring them in without proper vetting—because you can't vet them properly—all while Christians, Jews, and moderate Muslims are being slaughtered and overrun all through

the Middle East as we are credited with being the superpower in the world?

□ 2045

Yet, also, these last few days, the U.N.—where we pay far more than anybody even comes close to in order to keep it going as they continue to become more and more anti-Semitic, anti-Israeli, and anti-American—they entertain the largest supporter of terrorism in the world, the leader of Iran. And he says this in part, the leader of Iran, the President Rouhani:

If we did not have U.S. military invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq and the United States' unwarranted support for the inhumane actions of the Zionist regime against the oppressed nation of Palestine, today the terrorists would not have an excuse for the justification of their crimes.

I am taking this from an article by Julian Hatttem, 9-28-15, which is interesting. We have heard that throughout the United States, if we just hadn't gone into Iraq, if we hadn't gone into Afghanistan, if we hadn't gone into Afghanistan with the 300 Americans that we embedded—about 300—we embedded and let the Afghans destroy the Taliban by February of 2002, then we became an overwhelming occupying force in Afghanistan—but at least by February of 2002, if we hadn't gone in and helped them, the Taliban would still be completely controlling Afghanistan. That is the way it is.

Now, we went astray when we became occupiers, and this President has only tripled the number of deaths in Afghanistan, even though the war is supposedly over. Over tripled the number of American deaths, even though the real war was during President Bush, because of this President's rules of engagement and disastrous foreign policy.

But think about it. This is the head, the President of Iran. He is telling the UN and the world that, if it weren't for the United States' invasion in Afghanistan and in Iraq, there wouldn't be any American terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, why in the world should the U.N. listen to a man that is this big a liar or is this stupid? Because you don't have to be all that bright to understand September 11 of 2001 happened before we sent 300 or so into Afghanistan to help them destroy the Taliban and before we went in and took out a brutal dictator in Iraq.

In fact, the planning of 9-11-2001 happened during the Clinton administration on President Clinton's watch. And for people that are fools or liars like Rouhani and they don't know or are just lying about it, during the Clinton administration, President Clinton's policies were to run and help persecuted Muslims whenever we found them around the world.

And while we were busy helping Muslims, Western Asia, Eastern Europe, wherever we could help them, they were planning the attack on New York City and Washington, D.C., and hoping

to wipe out the entire American government here in Washington, D.C. And but for the heroic act of people on a plane that took it down in Pennsylvania, they may well have.

We don't need to hear any of these lies about, oh, if America just hadn't invaded Afghanistan and Iraq, regardless of whether you agree with what President Bush ordered with Iraq, the fact is 9/11 was a terrorist attack before and so was the attack on the USS Cole and so were the attacks on our embassies around the world during the 1990s and so was the first World Trade Center attack in 1993 that apparently had some planning back during the former President Bush's administration.

And that was an administration that stopped a brutal dictator, Saddam Hussein, who had raided another Muslim country, and we went in and helped Kuwait get their country back. We went to help the Muslims. And how do they reward us? To plan an attack to try to take down the World Trade Centers in '93.

It is very clear Christianity, Judaism, Israel, all were under attack and so was America. And our enemies can't believe how stupid Americans are because we are going to reward the biggest supporter of terrorism in the world—Iran—with \$100 to \$150 billion that they are already saying they are going to use to help Hamas and Hezbollah kill more Christians, more Jews, help wipe out Israel, help the attack against the Great Satan, the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for people in the United States Government to stand up and help correct the wayward policies of this administration. We start by having the United States Senate in one voice say the Iranian deal is a treaty and we are taking a vote on it and closure is set aside with 51 votes.

And they won't get the two-thirds to ratify it. It will not become effective against the United States. And thank God we will then have stopped the continued persecution of Christians, moderate Muslims, Jews, Israelis, and the United States, instead of rewarding them and helping them take us out.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members to avoid engaging in personalities toward the President.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HUDSON (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and the balance of the week on account of family reasons.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today through October 1 on account of a family emergency.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of unforeseen circumstances.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 261. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 200 NW 4th Street in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, as the William J. Holloway, Jr. United States Courthouse.

S. 994. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1 Walter Hammond Place in Waldwick, New Jersey, as the "Staff Sergeant Joseph D'Augustine Post Office Building".

S. 1707. An act to designate the Federal building located at 617 Walnut Street in Helena, Arkansas, as the "Jacob Trieber Federal Building, United States Post Office, and United States Court House".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 29, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2061. A bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate, and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. 114-268). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 444. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3495) to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to allow for greater State flexibility with respect to excluding providers who are involved in abortions, and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. 114-269). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. MARINO (for himself and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 3620. A bill to amend the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area Improvement Act to provide access to certain vehicles serving residents of municipalities adjacent to the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California):

H.R. 3621. A bill to ensure that Social Security contributions made by workers are

available to pay all benefits which they have earned; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 3622. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for the expansion of manufacturing in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARCHANT (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 3623. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount allowed as a deduction for interest on education loans paid by married couples; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCK:

H.R. 3624. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prevent fraudulent joinder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 3625. A bill to ensure that claims for benefits under the Black Lung Benefits Act are processed in a fair and timely manner, to better protect miners from pneumoconiosis (commonly known as "black lung disease"), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. JONES, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. LATTA):

H.R. 3626. A bill to prohibit funding for the Environmental Protection Agency to be used to implement or enforce a cap-and-trade program for greenhouse gases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KIND, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Ms. BASS):

H.R. 3627. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to exclude from eligibility for the generalized system of preferences any country that fails to effectively enforce its environmental laws or meet its international environmental obligations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 3628. A bill making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a Government shutdown; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself and Mr. COFFMAN):

H.R. 3629. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide that Federal law shall not preempt State law; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. HECK of Washington (for himself, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. NEWHOUSE):

H.R. 3630. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide assistance for programs and activities to protect the water quality of Puget Sound, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. JOLLY, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MENG, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 3631. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to repeal the sunset of the special immigrant nonminister religious worker program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HONDA, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 3632. A bill to prohibit drilling in the Arctic Ocean; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3633. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to make local funds of the District of Columbia available for use by the District during any portion of a fiscal year in which no Federal law appropriating local funds for the fiscal year is in effect, at the rates of operation provided under the local budget act for the fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 3634. A bill to establish student loan borrowers' rights to basic consumer protections, reasonable and flexible repayment options, access to earned credentials, and effective loan cancellation in exchange for public service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Miss RICE of New York):

H. Res. 445. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that corporations should commit to utilizing the benefits of gender diversity in boards of directors and other senior management positions; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan):

H. Res. 446. A resolution expressing support for designation of October 2 as "National Manufacturing Day"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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. MARINO:

H.R. 3620.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for

carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 3621.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to “provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.”

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 3622.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 3623.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution Art. I Sec. 8 cl. 1, under the “Power To lay and collect Taxes”;

Amd. 16, under the “power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration”;

Art. I Sec. 8 cl. 18, under the power “To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. BUCK:

H.R. 3624.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this legislation is based is found in article I, section 8, clause 9; article III, section 1, clause I; and article III section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution, which grant Congress authority over the federal courts.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3625.

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. POE of Texas:

H.R. 3626.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 7, Article 1 and Clause 7, Section 9, Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 3627.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution that grants Congress the authority, “To regulate Commerce with Foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 3628.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: “No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .” In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: “The Con-

gress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . .” Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 3629.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment X to the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. HECK of Washington:

H.R. 3630.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 3631.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the US Constitution

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 3632.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3633.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 3634.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (the Commerce Clause)

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (the Necessary and Proper Clause)

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 169: Mr. STEWART.
 H.R. 225: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H.R. 292: Mr. POLIQUIN.
 H.R. 482: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
 H.R. 539: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. ROUZER, and Ms. SINEMA.
 H.R. 592: Mr. ROONEY of Florida and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.
 H.R. 699: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
 H.R. 711: Mr. FLORES.
 H.R. 775: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina and Mr. PERRY.
 H.R. 799: Mr. KATKO.
 H.R. 829: Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H.R. 865: Mr. OLSON and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
 H.R. 902: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 920: Mr. PIERLUISI.
 H.R. 932: Mr. AGUILAR.
 H.R. 940: Mr. STUTZMAN and Mr. GUTHRIE.
 H.R. 957: Mr. JOLLY.
 H.R. 985: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
 H.R. 1031: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
 H.R. 1062: Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 1188: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 1218: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
 H.R. 1221: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico and Ms. SPEIER.
 H.R. 1270: Mr. BABIN.
 H.R. 1288: Mr. COSTA.
 H.R. 1309: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
 H.R. 1312: Mr. BOST.
 H.R. 1356: Mr. LYNCH.
 H.R. 1422: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 1423: Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 1459: Mr. BEYER and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
 H.R. 1475: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BARR, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 1594: Mr. LANCE, Mr. BOST, Mr. TONKO, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. WESTERMAN.
 H.R. 1603: Mr. WENSTRUP.
 H.R. 1610: Mr. BEYER and Ms. ESTY.
 H.R. 1624: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
 H.R. 1660: Mr. WALZ.
 H.R. 1737: Mr. CRAMER.
 H.R. 1769: Mr. GIBSON.
 H.R. 1786: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GALLEGRO, and Mr. MEEHAN.
 H.R. 1814: Mr. FATTAH, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1843: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
 H.R. 1858: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H.R. 1859: Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 1873: Mr. ASHFORD.
 H.R. 2016: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 2017: Mr. POMPEO.
 H.R. 2050: Mr. RICHMOND.
 H.R. 2061: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 2096: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H.R. 2260: Mrs. NOEM.
 H.R. 2405: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 2429: Ms. MATSUI.
 H.R. 2446: Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 2449: Mr. SABLON.
 H.R. 2458: Mr. FLEMING.
 H.R. 2460: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
 H.R. 2603: Mr. PAULSEN.
 H.R. 2631: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 2646: Mr. MCHENRY and Mr. PIERLUISI.
 H.R. 2712: Mr. RENACCI.
 H.R. 2726: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H.R. 2738: Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 2739: Mr. MULLIN and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 2759: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 2764: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
 H.R. 2769: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
 H.R. 2799: Mr. CUELLAR and Mrs. WALORSKI.
 H.R. 2835: Mr. GIBSON.
 H.R. 2853: Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H.R. 2858: Mr. LEWIS and Mr. CARNEY.
 H.R. 2903: Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 2911: Mrs. TORRES, Mr. DOLD, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
 H.R. 2944: Mr. POLIQUIN.
 H.R. 2956: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 2987: Mr. MESSER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. KATKO, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. DOLD, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. Donovan, and Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 2992: Mr. COSTA.
 H.R. 2999: Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 3024: Miss RICE of New York and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
 H.R. 3126: Mr. ROUZER.
 H.R. 3137: Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 3144: Mr. KATKO.
 H.R. 3151: Mr. OLSON and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 3187: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 3197: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
 H.R. 3198: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
 H.R. 3225: Mr. STEWART.
 H.R. 3229: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. NUNES.
 H.R. 3250: Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 3299: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. MULLIN.
 H.R. 3309: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
 H.R. 3316: Mrs. BEATTY.
 H.R. 3326: Mr. POMPEO.
 H.R. 3338: Mr. BLUM and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 3381: Mr. BARTON, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOLD, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 3412: Mr. AGUILAR and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 3423: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 3442: Mr. OLSON and Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 3457: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. TROTT, and Mr. KLINE.
 H.R. 3459: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. YODER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. BRAT.
 H.R. 3495: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. LATTA, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. BRADY of Texas.
 H.R. 3502: Ms. MOORE and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
 H.R. 3510: Mr. RATCLIFFE.
 H.R. 3513: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 3514: Ms. FUDGE.
 H.R. 3516: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BARR, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. OLSON, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 3518: Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 3521: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.R. 3522: Mr. COHEN and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
 H.R. 3532: Mr. GROTHMAN.
 H.R. 3535: Ms. KAPTUR.
 H.R. 3556: Mr. BEYER.
 H.R. 3569: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H.R. 3573: Mr. OLSON and Mr. LAMALFA.
 H.R. 3594: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. FOXX, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MESSER, Mr. BYRNE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. GROTHMAN, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KLINE, Mr. BARLETTA, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
 H.R. 3611: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DOLD, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LONG, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HARPER, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. COLE, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. REED, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. BOUSTANY.
 H.J. Res. 50: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
 H.J. Res. 59: Mr. LUCAS, Mrs. LUMMIS, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. STEWART, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. WALKER.
 H. Con. Res. 65: Mr. WELCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. RANGEL.
 H. Con. Res. 78: Mr. ABRAHAM, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. ROHRBACHER.
 H. Res. 28: Mr. KILDEE.
 H. Res. 286: Mr. KILDEE.
 H. Res. 309: Mr. CONNOLLY.
 H. Res. 416: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
 H. Res. 426: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. VELA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HONDA,

Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Ms. MATSUI.
 H. Res. 428: Mr. CICILLINE.
 H. Res. 429: Ms. ESTY, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. WALZ, Mr. ASHFORD, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
 H. Res. 431: Mr. BUCHANAN.
 H. Res. 443: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

The provisions of H.R. 3457 (Justice for Victims of Iranian Terrorism Act) that warranted a referral to the Committee on Foreign Affairs do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. UPTON

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in H.R. 3495 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. SHUSTER

H.R. 3614 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.