



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 6, 2015

No. 146

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 6, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ADRIAN SMITH 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.

GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, on the campus of Umpqua Community College in Roseburg, Oregon, nine innocent men and women lost their lives. They were killed, as so many have been this year in communities across our country, because a person with evil in their heart was able to get his hands on a gun.

This horrific event was the 294th mass shooting that we have seen in

2015, more than any other country in the world. So far this year, we have mourned nine parishioners who were killed during Bible study at their church in Charleston, South Carolina; two women who were killed and nine others who were injured at a movie theater in Lafayette, Louisiana; and a local television reporter and her cameraman who died covering a story outside Lynchburg, Virginia.

But there were thousands of other victims of gun violence. Their deaths have garnered less media attention, but they too deserve to have their stories told.

In the United States this year, more than 10,000 people have died and more than 20,000 have been injured during an incident that involved a gun. Each day an average of 92 Americans are killed in an incident involving a gun.

Yesterday the victims included the supervisor of a food market in Houston who was killed by a disgruntled employee; a 21-year-old father of two in Louisville; and a 23-year-old man and an 18-year-old woman who were killed outside New Orleans during a drive-by shooting. Altogether, nearly 1.5 million Americans have lost their lives to gun violence since the year 1970.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that every one of my colleagues in this Chamber has spent much of the last few days thinking about and praying for the victims in Oregon and their families. I know I have.

But to put it bluntly, our thoughts and prayers aren't good enough, not for those who have already been killed and not for the 92 Americans who are going to lose their lives today, tomorrow, and every day until we do something.

Thoughts and prayers won't bring back the innocent men, women, and children who have been killed or heal the families that have been torn apart. Thoughts and prayers are no excuse for inaction and cowardice in the face of powerful special interests.

It is on all of us to do better than thoughts and prayers. It is long past time to take actions to reduce the threat of gun violence and to do all we can to protect our constituents from the ravages of this epidemic.

Earlier this year I introduced a package of three bills to get to the core of our country's problem with gun violence by focusing on keeping guns from children, criminals, and those who are severely mentally ill such that possession of a firearm would pose a threat to themselves or others.

The End Purchase of Firearms by Dangerous Individuals Act, H.R. 2917, requires that States provide information to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System on individuals who are committed to a mental institution or make a threat of violence to a mental health professional that demonstrates that this individual would present a danger to himself or others if armed with a gun.

The Fire Sale Loophole Closing Act, H.R. 2916, ends the practice by which Federally licensed gun dealers who lose their licenses for misconduct can convert their entire inventory to a "personal collection" in order to liquidate it without conducting background checks on their customers. Under the law, such dealers could transfer their inventory only to other properly licensed Federal gun dealers.

I also introduced a resolution, H. Con. Res. 59, to support the goals of National ASK Day, which falls on June 21 each year. National ASK Day encourages parents to ask other parents whether their children are playing in a house with an unlocked gun.

In the United States, 1.7 million children are in homes with loaded, unlocked guns. This initiative is supported by Head Start, the American Public Health Association, and the American Academy of Pediatrics.

In addition to these measures that I have introduced, I have also co-sponsored the Large Capacity Ammunition

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.

H6797

Feeding Device Act to ban the sale of large-capacity magazines and Denying Firearms and Explosives to Dangerous Terrorists Act to prohibit individuals suspected of ties to terrorist organizations from purchasing a gun, and H.R. 2380 and H.R. 3411, which fix our broken background check system.

Any of these bills would immediately improve public safety in this country, a country that sees its citizens die at the hands of a loaded gun 297 times more than in Japan, 49 times more than in France, and 33 times more than in Israel.

Any one of these rational, common-sense proposals would immediately make life safer for men, women, and children in cities and towns across America; yet, we are going to sit on our hands because Republican leaders would rather genuflect before the National Rifle Association than do anything that could help save the lives of thousands of Americans.

The last time this institution passed a major bill to prevent gun violence was November 10, 1993, when the House approved the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act and President Clinton signed it into law.

Mr. Speaker, I will end by saying I do not know what it will take for us to finally take action. But I do know what I will do. I will continue speaking out every week on the floor of this Chamber until we get something done that makes our communities safer and honors the lives of all the victims who have lost their lives in this country to gun violence.

AMERICA MUST STAND FIRM

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

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I just wrote on the board that it has been 1,510 days since the President said that Syria's Bashar Assad must go. He is still in office.

It is 767 days since the President drew the red line in the sand that said, if Bashar Assad used chemical weapons on his own people, he must go. He is still in office.

What we are seeing in Syria—the refugees' humanitarian crisis, a bloody civil war, the rise of ISIS—is a direct response to this administration's ineptness to handle these problems.

Now we have Russia's Putin on the floor of the U.N.—on U.S. soil—saying America is weak. But we didn't need Putin to tell us that by his words. He has done it by his actions. He invaded Crimea in Ukraine because he knew that this administration would draw another red line, but do nothing about it.

America is losing her standing in the world because we would rather appease our enemies than show strength. This administration still has no strategy handling ISIS, no tangible plan to handle the Syrian problem or defeating

Assad, and certainly no plan to deal with Russia's new very powerful aggression in many areas of the world.

Assad must go. ISIS must be defeated. America must stand firm and show the world that we are a force to be reckoned with, not to be trampled on.

CELEBRATING THE LIVES OF BEN KUROKI AND SUSUMU "SUS" ITO

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 lives of two trailblazers for the Asian American community, Ben Kuroki and Susumu "Sus" Ito.

After the bombing of Pearl Harbor, Kuroki and his brother were one of the first Japanese Americans to enlist in the United States Air Force during World War II at a time when over 100,000 other Japanese Americans were forced into incarceration camps without due process under the law.

The need for aerial gunners was high; so, Kuroki applied for the job, was approved, and was sent to a 2-week course in Britain. Kuroki received on-the-job training. His maiden flight was on December 13, 1942.

During this time of heavy discrimination against Japanese Americans, Kuroki's flight crew was instrumental in protecting him from the sneers and abuse by his fellow soldiers.

Kuroki received three Distinguished Flying Cross medals for volunteering to fly 25 combat missions against Germany and 28 missions in the Pacific. He was the only Japanese American to serve as an aerial gunner in the Asia-Pacific theater during World War II.

The son of Japanese immigrant farmers, Kuroki was born on May 16, 1917, in Gaithersburg, Nebraska.

After his many missions in Europe, Kuroki visited other Japanese Americans behind barbed wire to promote the military and asked other Japanese Americans to join what would soon become the 442nd Regimental Combat Team of the 100th Infantry Battalion.

Ben Kuroki exemplified the embodiment of patriotism and service above self. He often said, "I had to fight for the right to fight for my own country, and now I feel vindication."

Today I rise to share Ben Kuroki's tremendous accomplishments and dedicated public service with the House of Representatives. Ben Kuroki was the definition of an American hero.

I would also like to take this time to recognize another extraordinary trailblazer for the Japanese American community, Susumu "Sus" Ito.

Ito, the oldest and only son of Japanese immigrants, was drafted into the military in 1940. After Pearl Harbor, his parents and his sister were sent to the incarceration camp in Rohwer, Arkansas. During this time, he volunteered to become a forward observer for the 442nd Infantry Battalion, one of the

most dangerous positions in the battalion.

Known as mischievous, he brought with him to Europe an Agfa Memo, a contraband 35-millimeter camera that fit right in the palm of his hand. Ito spent his deployment in Europe, starting in 1944 until the war ended, taking pictures of his surroundings.

From playing chess during downtime to posing with the Colosseum during their trek into Rome, he spent the war revealing the daily lives of this little known mostly Japanese American unit.

However, many of Ito's pictures also accurately depicted the brazenness of war. The 442nd was one of the first battalions to reach the Dachau Concentration Camp, and Ito took pictures of dazed prisoners leaving the camp for the very first time. He also captured the despair of his fellow soldiers as they rescued the Lost Battalion.

After World War II and through the GI Bill, he started an extraordinary career as a cellular biologist and became a researcher and professor at Harvard Medical School, where he worked for over 50 years.

Ito donated his vast collection, thousands of images, to the Japanese American Museum in Los Angeles, as part of their Before They Were Heroes: Sus Ito's World War II Images collection.

In August, I had the opportunity to tour this exhibit. The images he captured constantly reminded me of the courage of our Japanese American GIs who fought valiantly for our country while their families remained behind barbed wire.

Today I rise to share Sus Ito's tremendous accomplishments and dedicated public service with the House of Representatives.

□ 1215

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND REAUTHORIZATION

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

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Nation saw a very important program expire, the Land and Water Conservation Fund. I rise today to encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join with me and call for a vote on a full and continued permanent reauthorization of the LWCF.

For 50 years, this critical fund has added value to my district and to so many across the Nation. Last week, inaction by Congress led to the expiration of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and I believe it is critical that we renew our commitment to the fund.

The fund helps our communities protect critical lands by providing State and local governments with necessary funding and flexibility to develop and improve the very land on display for

everyone to enjoy. Nowhere is it more critical than in my home State of Pennsylvania.

Over the past 50 years, Pennsylvania has received approximately \$300 million in land and water conservation funding for protection in many areas of national significance, such as Gettysburg National Military Park, the Paoli Battlefield, the Brandywine Battlefield, Valley Forge National Historical Park, and John Heinz National Wildlife Refuge.

Not only have we seen the LWCF at work on the State level, we have also seen its benefits at the local level, including the Birdsboro Waters Forest Legacy Project, protecting critical woodlands at the East Coventry Wineberry Estates, expanding Shaw's Bridge Park in East Bradford Township, and enhancing the Pottstown Borough Memorial Park with a new dog park, pavilions, restrooms, ballfields, and walking trails.

The outdoor recreation industry, Governors, mayors, sportsmen, small-business owners, conservation leaders, landowners, ranchers, farmers, and millions of Americans are united in a push for permanent reauthorization and full funding of the Land and Water Conservation Fund because it provides an economic benefit to our region and across the country. The LWCF gives a boost to the \$646 billion recreation economy and serves to protect our national parks and other public lands from being destroyed.

Indeed, in one such study, the Outdoor Industry Association has found that outdoor active recreation generates \$21.5 billion annually in consumer spending in Pennsylvania alone. Outdoor recreation supports over 219,000 jobs across the State and generates \$7.2 billion in wages and salaries. It also produces \$1.6 billion annually in State and local tax revenue.

Outdoor recreation benefits the Pennsylvania economy. The U.S. Census Bureau reports that each year over 5.4 million people participated in hunting, fishing, and wildlife watching in Pennsylvania, contributing \$5.4 billion to the State economy.

Additionally, the Land and Water Conservation Fund State Assistance Program provides matching grants to help States and local communities protect parks and recreation resources. Nationwide, the LWCF has benefited countless counties in America, supporting over 41,000 projects.

The State assistance 50-50 matching program acts as the primary investment tool to ensure that all can enjoy hiking, biking, running trails, community parks, and playgrounds. Approximately \$4 billion in LWCF grants have been awarded to States, including \$4.27 million for 34 total projects in Berks County, \$4.78 million for 30 total projects in Chester County, \$2.8 million for 49 total projects in Montgomery County, and over \$800,000 for 11 projects in Lebanon County. These are all counties in my congressional district.

Our public lands and outdoor recreation areas are an integral part of our heritage, civic identity, and local community. I believe the Land and Water Conservation Fund is one of our most important conservation programs and an excellent example of a bipartisan commitment to the safeguard of our natural resources and cultural heritage, and we must reauthorize it.

As an original cosponsor of H.R. 1814 to permanently reauthorize the LWCF, I look forward to working with my colleagues to preserve our public lands so that current and future generations may continue to enjoy and appreciate them year-round.

I respectfully call upon my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to work for a bipartisan solution to reauthorize this very important program.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of Hispanic Heritage Month, I would like to recognize the great achievement of Latinos within their communities.

America has been home to countless numbers of outstanding Latinos over time who reflect the best of our community: activists like Cesar Chavez and Joan Baez; artists like Selena and Carlos Santana; the brave women and men who have served in our armed services; and, of course, today's ambitious young DREAMers.

Latinos, like all Americans, are committed to building a better and stronger future for our country and within our communities. We strive to instill a culture of hard work, of healthy living, and of academic success.

Latino families recognize the importance of attaining an education in today's society. In the past decade, Latinos have worked to cut their dropout rate in half, while tripling enrollment in 2- and 4-year colleges.

The top degrees that we earn speak to our involvement in community: our liberal arts degrees, to help the less fortunate; to heal the sick with our healthcare degrees; to create employment with our business diplomas.

In regards to health care, with the landmark Affordable Care Act, a record 2.6 million new Latinos are signed up for health care, and they are on track to leading healthier lives.

But, Mr. Speaker, even with these great advances in our communities, there is still so much work to be done. Although our dropout rate is lower, we still have the highest dropout rate among all ethnic groups. Latinos have increased their scores in math and science, but we are still below the national average. And while our communities have made massive strides in putting our children in college, still only 15 percent of college degrees are in the hands of Latinos, again, the

smallest percentage of any ethnic group.

And even while 2½ million new Latinos signed up for health care, 25 percent of Latinos have no healthcare plan, and we battle high obesity and diabetes.

So I have seen these issues firsthand in my district and in California and, as a whole, have seen and have worked to improve our condition.

This Congress, I introduced the All-Year ACCESS Act, which would restore Pell grants for both full-time and part-time students, giving access to postsecondary education all year-round. Back in my home district, I relaunched Enroll OC, adding an additional 2,000 people this year, Latinos in my district, to health care.

So while we make these incredible strides in wellness and education, the Latino community still has so many issues to address. I will tell you this: the problems are not just Latino problems; they are problems for the United States because, you see, America is a family. It is a familia, and we have to address these issues together because, for the first time in my beautiful home State of California, the largest majority ethnic group is now Latino.

And you know what? This should not frighten people, Mr. Speaker. I think it is actually pretty exciting because the Latino community is so embedded in the success of the American Dream, and the American Dream is so embedded in us. We are not aliens, Mr. Speaker. We are doctors, lawyers, community leaders, social workers, laborers, and DREAMers. But more importantly, we are sons, daughters, parents, siblings, and we are neighbors.

It is time for the United States as a whole to embrace the power and the potential of the Latino community and to realize that we share the common goal of furthering the greatness of this Nation. I believe as soon as we realize Latinos yearn to share the same American values and aspirations as so many descendants of other immigrant groups—of Italian Americans and Irish Americans and German Americans and Asian Americans and all Americans—certainly America will thrive.

Latinos are finding their voice, and America needs to listen.

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 24 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. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Holy and compassionate God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As they return from their constituent visits, bless the Members of the people's House. Amid so many political pushes and pulls, give them perseverance and wisdom to address those most pressing needs for the benefit of our Nation.

In the aftermath of severe storms, bless those recovering from floods and storms this past week, and bless those emergency workers who have placed themselves in danger's path in service to their brothers and sisters in need.

May we all be inspired by their heroic example and moved to step forward in those times when we might be called upon as well.

May all that is done today 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

ADMINISTRATION'S ROLE IN
RUSSIAN RISE

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, today, I note with great concern the divisive involvement of Russian forces in Syria. Due to the failure of this administration to articulate a strategy, Russia has now stepped in to conduct its own strategy, including airstrikes.

United States adversaries have picked up on the administration's lack of a well-articulated strategy in Syria. Sources say that Russian forces are launching deliberate airstrikes on Syrian groups backed by the CIA. While conducting these contentious attacks, Russia has violated Turkish airspace.

NATO has warned President Putin to halt the airstrikes, but where is President Obama with his warnings? If sources are accurate, the administration has abandoned CIA-backed fighters. President Obama is fearful of taking the necessary steps. But given his failings in the region, is anyone surprised by Russia's actions?

This unrest contributes to the growing refugee crisis, putting a strain on our own country and others to manage the influx of refugees fleeing the turmoil that this administration has helped to create.

As warned in Proverbs 28:19, "Where there is no vision, the people perish."

REPUBLICANS' CALENDAR OF
CHAOS

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, well, last week 151 Republicans, a majority of the Republicans in Congress, voted to shut down the Federal Government. This week, another entry into this calendar of chaos and dysfunction. We are coming up on several crucial deadlines, and so far the Republican leadership in Congress has presented no clear plan, no path forward.

As we approach another debt limit, there are questions as to whether the United States Government will default on its obligations. There is another highway funding expiration, another government funding deadline of December 11, and lack of the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank, which is costing the United States jobs—thousands of jobs.

The American people are frustrated, and rightfully so.

We may not agree on this floor, we may not agree with the majority, but there is no excuse for not getting your job done. That is what I hear from the people back home, from the American people, a simple question: Why can't Congress just do its work, just do its job?

We stand ready to work with Republicans. We need a willing partner. There is a lot of work to do for the American people. Let's get down to business.

SYRIAN REFUGEES AND THE OFFICE OF REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, recently Secretary Kerry pledged that the United States would accept 185,000 refugees from the war-torn Syrian area. This would be over 2 years.

America has been a generous, welcoming country; but I have to tell you, while we have compassion for these refugees, Secretary Kerry's pledge leaves us with some grave concerns.

The first is security. How can we verify these refugees do not present a threat to our national security? Syria has proven to be a fertile recruiting ground for Islamic extremists and terrorists.

Second, the Office of Refugee Resettlement has not been transparent and accountable enough to handle the transfers. Over the past year, I have been investigating ORR and found that they have not been filing annual reports on their activities as required by law. In addition, there is evidence of widespread abuse of refugees, including children, who are improperly handled by the ORR. In many instances, a failure to refer the abuse to the FBI has allowed child abusers to walk free.

The curtain must be pulled back completely on the ORR's operations before we can trust it with a responsibility as serious as settling Syrian refugees in the U.S. We must find the delicate balance and protect our safety and security.

SUPPLEMENTARY AGREEMENT
AMENDING THE AGREEMENT ON
SOCIAL SECURITY BETWEEN THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
AND THE CZECH REPUBLIC—
MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT
OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC.
NO. 114-64)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act, as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1977 (Public Law 95-216, 42 U.S.C. 433(e)(1)), I transmit herewith the Supplementary Agreement Amending the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Czech Republic (the "Supplementary Agreement"). The Supplementary Agreement, signed at Prague on September 23, 2013, is intended to modify a certain provision of the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Czech Republic, with Administrative Arrangement, signed at Prague on September 7, 2007, and entered into force January 1, 2009 (the "U.S.-Czech Social Security Agreement").

The U.S.-Czech Social Security Agreement as amended by the Supplementary Agreement is similar in objective to the social security agreements already in force with most European Union countries, Australia, Canada, Chile, Japan, Norway, and the Republic of Korea. Such bilateral agreements provide for limited coordination between the United States and foreign social security systems to eliminate dual social security coverage and taxation, and to help prevent the lost benefit

protection that can occur when workers divide their careers between two countries.

The Supplementary Agreement amends the U.S.-Czech Social Security Agreement to account for a new Czech domestic health insurance law, which was enacted subsequent to the signing of the U.S.-Czech Social Security Agreement in 2007. By including the health insurance law within the scope of the U.S.-Czech Social Security Agreement, this amendment will exempt U.S. citizen workers and multinational companies from contributing to the Czech health insurance system, when such workers otherwise meet all of the ordinary criteria for such an exemption.

The U.S.-Czech Social Security Agreement, as amended, will continue to contain all provisions mandated by section 233 of the Social Security Act and other provisions that I deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of section 233, pursuant to section 233(c)(4) of the Social Security Act.

I also transmit for the information of the Congress a report required by section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act on the estimated number of individuals who will be affected by the Supplementary Agreement and its estimated cost effect. The Department of State and the Social Security Administration have recommended the Supplementary Agreement and related documents to me.

I commend the Supplementary Agreement to the U.S.-Czech Social Security Agreement and related documents.

BARACK OBAMA,
THE WHITE HOUSE, October 6, 2015.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1601

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS) at 4 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

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, October 6, 2015.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representa-

tives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 6, 2015 at 2:59 p.m.:

Appointment:
Social Security Advisory Board.
With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

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.

CHILD SUPPORT ASSISTANCE ACT
OF 2015

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2091) to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to clarify the ability to request consumer reports in certain cases to establish and enforce child support payments and awards.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2091

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 "Child Support Assistance Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. REQUESTS FOR CONSUMER REPORTS BY STATE OR LOCAL CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES.

Paragraph (4) of section 604(a) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681b(a)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking "or determining the appropriate level of such payments" and inserting "; determining the appropriate level of such payments, or enforcing a child support order, award, agreement, or judgment";

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking "paternity" and inserting "parentage"; and

(B) by adding "and" at the end;

(3) by striking subparagraph (C); and

(4) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. 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 this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2091. My friend and colleague, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN), has worked hard to build significant bipartisan support for this commonsense legislation. It passed out of the Committee on Financial Services with a vote of 56-2.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to remember that most child support payments are collected from noncustodial parents through income withholding. In order to verify income, assets, and debt for purposes of establishing or enforcing child support obligations, State and local child support agencies and courts often request consumer reports from the consumer reporting agencies.

State and local child support agencies argue that the 10-day notice provision provides obligors with an opportunity to hide savings and other assets, run up credit card debt, and take other financial or employment actions to avoid or reduce child support payments.

This bill authorizes a consumer reporting agency to furnish a consumer report in response to a request by the head of a State or local child support enforcement agency if the requestor certifies that the report is needed for enforcing a child support order, award, agreement, or judgment. The bill also repeals the requirement of 10 days' prior notice to a consumer whose report is requested.

Mr. Speaker, this is a commonsense piece of legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I support H.R. 2091, the Child Support Assistance Act, because it will help child support enforcement agencies do their job and will make child support payments more efficient.

When a State child support enforcement agency wants to locate a parent who is delinquent on his or her child support payment, the agency requests the parent's consumer report from one of the consumer reporting agencies. This allows the agency to verify the parent's employment and income, which are key factors for child support payments.

Current law, however, requires the agency to provide the delinquent parent 10 days' notice before it can even request the consumer report from the credit bureaus. This 10-day head start serves no legitimate policy purpose. In fact, the only thing it does is give delinquent parents time to manipulate their financial position to evade paying their child support obligations.

The consequences of this 10-day notice requirement is that some delinquent parents who should be paying child support are not paying all they owe and the money they do pay isn't

getting to the families as quickly as it should.

This bill would eliminate this loophole by doing away with the 10-day notice requirement. Providing 10 days' notice before pulling someone's consumer report might make sense in some circumstances, but in this situation, it only slows down the wheels of justice and gives delinquent parents an opportunity to further avoid paying their child support obligations.

I support this bill that was reported out almost unanimously, with only two people voting against it. I would like to thank the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN) as well as Mr. ELLISON on the Democratic side for their hard work on this commonsense bill.

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN). He has worked tirelessly on this piece of legislation. I appreciate his efforts.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I am thrilled to stand before the House today as the author of the Child Support Assistance Act, H.R. 2091.

Across America today we have 17 million kids coast to coast who benefit from the child support program. In our great State of Maine alone, there are some 57,000 kids who need our help. As a single parent myself, I believe that the most important job in the world is taking care of our kids. Unfortunately, not every parent believes that.

After a court determines that a non-custodial parent owes financial support for his or her children, there currently is, as Mrs. MALONEY stated, a 10-day waiting period between the time when the court determines that money is owed for the kids and when the State agencies can start collecting that money. As a result, here across America there is about \$100 billion in unpaid child support. In the State of Maine alone, there is over \$500 million that is owed our kids.

This bill, H.R. 2091, the Child Support Assistance Act, fixes a technical part of this law that is a commonsense fix. As Mrs. MALONEY stated, it removes this 10-day waiting period.

Now, what that simply means is that a parent who is supposed to be responsible for his or her children will have less of an opportunity, less time to shift those assets or hide those assets, put them in the name of someone else or maybe even quit his or her job and be paid under the table.

That is not right, and that is certainly not fair. We need in this Chamber Republicans and Democrats to stand up and be compassionate and to help those 17 million kids across our country that need this support.

As a single parent myself, I know what it is like to work a demanding full-time job and to care for a child. In my case, it was one child, my son. I know what it is like to pick up my son after school and then to rush off to the

grocery store to do our shopping and get home quickly so I can start dinner and he can start working on his homework. When that is done, we have to clean up and I expect Sammy to do his reading or I read to him and then it is a bath and to bed.

Then while you are working on peanut butter and jelly sandwiches for the next day and thinking about what you have to do with your own job, you get a few hours' sleep after that before you have to do it all over again.

I cannot imagine, Mr. Speaker, what it must be like for a single mom or dad to do this with two, three, or four kids. The last thing our single parents need is to worry about child support payments that they are rightly owed, that the court says they are due, to help their kids have food on the table or buy a new pair of winter boots or to make sure there is lunch money the next day.

In this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, we speak about a lot of things—debt and spending and national security issues—but this bill is so close to the ground that it directly and immediately will help our kids and our single parents who are trying to raise our kids under very difficult circumstances for a lot of them.

I am thrilled to offer this bill, Mr. Speaker. I am greatly appreciative of the tremendous bipartisan support. I do thank Mr. ELLISON for all of his hard work on this bill. I encourage everybody to please support the Child Support Assistance Act.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I just urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bill that Mr. POLIQUIN pointed out can make a real difference in the lives of single parents and their children. Again, I thank him for his leadership on it and his very eloquent statement today on the floor.

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO).

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, too many children grow up in today's society without basic essentials: food, clothing, proper shelter. Many times this is the result of a lack of child support payments from an estranged parent.

I have a young boy, and I can tell you he takes a lot of energy out of my wife and me. We do everything we can to support him to our fullest with love and all the basic essentials, but not all children are that lucky. Some are due child support payments that they don't receive.

I know our local district attorneys do a lot in furtherance and sheriff's departments do a lot in furtherance of collecting those child support payments, but Congressman POLIQUIN's commonsense measure here, the Child Support Assistance Act, is going to help State and local enforcement agencies aid families in collecting child support payments in a timely manner.

How is that going to happen? It is going to allow enforcement agencies to obtain consumer reports on negligent parents in a more expeditious manner. Consequently, that is going to streamline the process and better enforce the collection of child support payments.

I believe Representative POLIQUIN stated it very eloquently just a moment ago. This is something that we can all get behind. It is for the good of this country. It is for the good of children across America. Let's be proud as we ensure that our children have the resources to succeed, with this legislation being a positive step in the right direction.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

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. NEUGEBAUER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2091.

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.

SMALL BANK EXAM CYCLE REFORM ACT OF 2015

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1553) to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to specify which smaller institutions may qualify for an 18-month examination cycle.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1553

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Small Bank Exam Cycle Reform Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. SMALLER INSTITUTIONS QUALIFYING FOR 18-MONTH EXAMINATION CYCLE.

Section 10(d) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1820(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking "\$500,000,000" and inserting "\$1,000,000,000"; and

(B) in subparagraph (C)(ii), by striking "\$100,000,000" and inserting "\$200,000,000"; and

(2) in paragraph (10)—

(A) by striking "\$100,000,000" and inserting "\$200,000,000"; and

(B) by striking "\$500,000,000" and inserting "\$1,000,000,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

□ 1615

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. 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.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Representative TIPTON for his hard work in advocating for community bank regulatory relief. This is a commonsense regulatory relief measure that has earned significant bipartisan support. It was reported out of the Financial Services Committee by a vote of 58-0.

This legislation is designed to allow additional well-managed financial institutions to qualify for an 18-month exam cycle. The longer exam cycle permits community banks to focus their time and resources on the surrounding community rather than on the exam process. This bill also allows bank examiners to spend their resources working with banks that need additional attention instead of with banks that are already considered well managed.

To qualify, an institution must have total assets of less than \$1 billion, and at its most recent examination, it must have earned an "outstanding" or "good" rating under the Uniform Financial Institutions Rating System, or CAMELS. So only smaller, well-financed, well-rated financial institutions who pose very little risk would qualify for extended exam cycles.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 1553, the Small Bank Exam Cycle Reform Act. This bill allows more small banks to qualify for a longer, 18-month exam cycle. This means that these banks would only have a full, onsite examination every 18 months, rather than every 12 months.

The logic behind this bill is simple: small community banks that are both well capitalized and well managed do not need as much regulatory scrutiny as larger, more complex banks. In addition, regulators need the ability to focus their limited resources on the banks that present bigger risks. That is why we have long allowed well-run small banks to have less frequent examinations than larger, more complex banks.

This bill simply increases the threshold for banks that qualify for the 18-month cycle from \$500 million to \$1 billion. Onsite examinations are time-consuming endeavors both for the regulator and the bank, and if the regulator is conducting exams of these well-run banks more frequently than he really needs to, then he is wasting precious government resources. In addition, he is also wasting the bank's resources, because the frequent exams require the time and attention of the bank's execu-

tives and staff, and it is costly. Therefore, banks with assets between \$500 million and \$1 billion that are well capitalized and well managed will receive real, meaningful regulatory relief as a result of this bill.

Not only is this bill supported by small banks, it is also supported by the regulators. The OCC has in fact advocated for this change for some time now.

I am very glad that we are moving this bill through the House today, and I hope that the Senate will act quickly on the bill as well so that we can get regulatory relief to some very deserving community banks. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I congratulate my colleague, LACY CLAY, for also being the lead Democrat and working very hard on this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON).

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, community banks are a crucial source of credit for many across the Nation, but these banks are currently facing an ever-increasing regulatory burden that they can no longer shoulder. These misguided regulations are resulting in a devastating impact on small banks, forcing consolidation or failure and stifling creation of new banks in communities that need access to credit.

In rural areas, such as my district in western Colorado, oftentimes the only access to credit for small businesses is a community bank. Unfortunately, rising compliance costs and complicated regulatory requirements have dried up bank credit for those in need of it most.

For these reasons, I introduced, along with Representative LACY CLAY and Representative BARR, the Small Bank Exam Cycle Reform Act, a targeted relief effort designed to allow additional well-managed financial institutions to qualify for an 18-month exam cycle.

Full-scope, onsite examinations of insured depository institutions are a rigorous event for banks of all sizes, especially small banks that may not have dedicated compliance staff. These examinations require significant preparation leading up to the examination, as well as attention to the onsite examiner during the exam itself.

Whereas larger banks can absorb the work hours and compliance costs associated with these onsite examinations, community banks, much smaller institutions, do not have the economy of scale to deflect the burden. However, a longer exam cycle permits well-run community banks to focus their time and resources on the surrounding community rather than on the exam process, opening up opportunities for sustainable economic growth in towns across the United States.

The Small Bank Exam Cycle Reform Act amends the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to increase the qualifying

asset threshold from \$500 million to \$1 billion for small banks. This relief measure is only for well-managed community banks that did not cause the financial crisis but are now living with regulatory blowback.

As part of the examination process, financial regulators rate financial institutions on several criteria, including safety and soundness and their compliance with legal and regulatory requirements. To qualify for the 18-month exam cycle, an institution must have earned an outstanding or good rating on their most recent examination. Only smaller, well-rated banks, those which pose little risk, can qualify for extended exam cycles.

The banking regulators also support an increase in the qualifying asset threshold. In February, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency sent draft legislative ideas for regulatory relief to the House Financial Services Committee, including a proposal that is the framework for H.R. 1553. The Comptroller of the Currency, Thomas Curry, publicly stated such a change would reduce burdens on well-managed community institutions. It also was applauded by the FDIC and the OCC during committee hearings earlier this spring.

Not only will this legislation provide relief for community banks, it will also allow examiners to focus their resources, working with banks that need the additional attention or present supervisory concerns.

This bipartisan legislation enjoys the support of the American Bankers Association, the Independent Community Bankers Association, the Conference of State Bank Supervisors, the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Council, as well as 19 bipartisan cosponsors. The legislation was voted out of the Financial Services Committee with a unanimous 58-0 vote.

Congress last raised the threshold for outstanding-rated institutions in 2006 and granted agencies discretion to increase the threshold for good-rated institutions in 2007. It is time again to raise the threshold in statute so these small banks can continue to serve their important purpose in our communities: providing capital for small business growth and banking products for their local communities.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY), who is also the ranking member on the Financial Institutions Subcommittee and the lead Democrat on this bill.

Mr. CLAY. Let me thank my colleague from New York for yielding.

I, too, rise today to support H.R. 1553, the Small Bank Exam Cycle Reform Act. I would also like to commend the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) as well as Mr. BARR for their leadership on this important issue.

The overwhelming majority of banks in this country are community banks with less than \$1 billion in assets. As

the regulatory landscape has evolved for the Nation's financial institutions since the financial crisis, I have worked with my colleagues on the Financial Services Committee to ensure that our community banks are not unduly burdened. H.R. 1553 is a part of that effort, as it will extend much-needed relief to Main Street banks by allowing well-managed, well-capitalized community banks an opportunity to take advantage of an extended 18-month examination cycle.

While bank examinations are vital to the safety and soundness of the American banking system, the time and resources that banks put into preparing for and responding to examinations can be extremely time consuming, particularly for smaller banks with limited staff and resources that cannot afford to divert key personnel away from their core business in order to prepare for examinations.

H.R. 1553 also allows banking regulators to better allocate their resources to financial institutions that warrant additional attention and away from community banks that have otherwise demonstrated that they are soundly managed and well capitalized.

I have heard from community bankers in Missouri and from across the country that straightforward, bipartisan, commonsense regulatory relief proposals like H.R. 1553 can contribute significantly to community banks' ability to lend to Main Street businesses and reinvest in our communities.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I yield the gentleman such time as he may consume.

Mr. CLAY. I look forward to working with Mr. TIPTON and my other colleagues on the Financial Services Committee to find additional opportunities to enact targeted relief for our community banks, and I would urge my colleagues to adopt H.R. 1553.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, this is a commonsense piece of legislation. You talk about bipartisan; when it passes out of your committee with no opposition, that is bipartisan support. I think that says a lot about how important community banks are to America and how important this Congress thinks community banks are.

The fact is these organizations that are well managed and have good ratings will only have to get an examination every 18 months. So I encourage support for 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. NEUGEBAUER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1553. 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. NEUGEBAUER. 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.

DISCLOSURE MODERNIZATION AND SIMPLIFICATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1525) to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to make certain improvements to form 10-K and regulation S-K, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1525

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 "Disclosure Modernization and Simplification Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. SUMMARY PAGE FOR FORM 10-K.

Not later than the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall issue regulations to permit issuers to submit a summary page on form 10-K (17 C.F.R. 249.310), but only if each item on such summary page includes a cross-reference (by electronic link or otherwise) to the material contained in form 10-K to which such item relates.

SEC. 3. IMPROVEMENT OF REGULATION S-K.

Not later than the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall take all such actions to revise regulation S-K (17 C.F.R. 229.10 et seq.)—

(1) to further scale or eliminate requirements of regulation S-K, in order to reduce the burden on emerging growth companies, accelerated filers, smaller reporting companies, and other smaller issuers, while still providing all material information to investors;

(2) to eliminate provisions of regulation S-K, required for all issuers, that are duplicative, overlapping, outdated, or unnecessary; and

(3) for which the Commission determines that no further study under section 4 is necessary to determine the efficacy of such revisions to regulation S-K.

SEC. 4. STUDY ON MODERNIZATION AND SIMPLIFICATION OF REGULATION S-K.

(a) STUDY.—The Securities and Exchange Commission shall carry out a study of the requirements contained in regulation S-K (17 C.F.R. 229.10 et seq.). Such study shall—

(1) determine how best to modernize and simplify such requirements in a manner that reduces the costs and burdens on issuers while still providing all material information;

(2) emphasize a company by company approach that allows relevant and material information to be disseminated to investors without boilerplate language or static requirements while preserving completeness and comparability of information across registrants; and

(3) evaluate methods of information delivery and presentation and explore methods for discouraging repetition and the disclosure of immaterial information.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study required under subsection (a), the Commission shall consult with the Investor

Advisory Committee and the Advisory Committee on Small and Emerging Companies.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than the end of the 360-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall issue a report to the Congress containing—

(1) all findings and determinations made in carrying out the study required under subsection (a);

(2) specific and detailed recommendations on modernizing and simplifying the requirements in regulation S-K in a manner that reduces the costs and burdens on companies while still providing all material information; and

(3) specific and detailed recommendations on ways to improve the readability and navigability of disclosure documents and to discourage repetition and the disclosure of immaterial information.

(d) RULEMAKING.—Not later than the end of the 360-day period beginning on the date that the report is issued to the Congress under subsection (c), the Commission shall issue a proposed rule to implement the recommendations of the report issued under subsection (c).

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Revisions made to regulation S-K by the Commission under section 3 shall not be construed as satisfying the rulemaking requirements under this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARRETT. 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 this bill.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1630

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the chairman of the Financial Services Committee—that would be the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING)—for his leadership in helping to bring a number of bills, as we have just seen, to the floor today.

I would also like to thank all of my colleagues on the Financial Services Committee from both sides of the aisle—obviously, both sides—because they have voted unanimously, voted the Disclosure Modernization and Simplification Act out of committee not just once, but twice, when you include passage last year as well.

I would also like to add this legislation passed the House of Representatives by voice vote in December of 2014.

So you ask what is the purpose of this bill, and why is it necessary.

Well, Mr. Speaker, look, if you step back about eight decades ago, Congress made the monumental decision in this country that disclosure, opening up, and transparency would be the centerpiece of our Nation's securities law.

See, instead of carving out or creating a merit review system where the Federal Government determined which companies we were allowed to put our money into, Congress wisely went down the other road and decided that those decisions would be best made where?

Left in the hands of the people, in the hands of the investors themselves, so long as they were provided with a sufficient level of disclosure from publicly traded companies.

Unfortunately, over the last eight decades since the securities laws were first put in place, the quarterly and annual reports filed by the public companies have grown, and they have grown in size tremendously, larger and more complex than ever, to the point where now the most sophisticated of investors have trouble understanding even the most basic operations and risks of these companies. This has come to be known as the phenomenon of information overload.

So to put this in perspective, a recent article in the Wall Street Journal noted that the average annual report from public companies is now 42,000 words, a 40 percent increase just from the year 2000 alone and even longer than the entire Sarbanes-Oxley bill that passed Congress in 2002.

Another recent report out of Stanford University found that only 38 percent of institutional investors view disclosures about executive compensation as “easy to understand.”

So, if you think about it, if the majority of institutional investors can't understand the disclosure, what chance does the little guy, the mom-and-pop investor, have to understand all this?

They, of course, have very little chance and can even be harmed by the disclosures that too voluminous and complex reports show.

As then-SEC Commissioner Troy Paredes put it way back in 2013, “If investors are overloaded, more disclosure actually can result in less transparency and worse decisions, in which case capital is allocated less efficiently and market discipline is compromised.”

So what would our bill do today? It would rectify the situation.

How? One, it would require that the SEC eliminate any outdated or duplicative disclosure requirements that are not material to investors and, furthermore, to scale disclosures for emerging growth companies and small issuers.

Two, it will allow issuers to file a summary page of their annual report that will include simply cross-references to the material already included.

Three, it would require the SEC to produce a broad study on how best to, amongst all the other things, utilize technology in order to improve delivery and presentation systems for disclosure and, also, a requirement that the SEC commence a rulemaking in order to implement some of these ideas that come out of the study.

You see, these provisions will help our disclosure regime of the 21st century while at the very same time address the issue of information overload that I mentioned before.

If you go back, as part of the JOBS Act, Congress directed the SEC to review its existing disclosure requirements, and it was told to identify ways to make our current disclosure regime less burdensome for issuers and for people as investors.

While the SEC produced a report a few years ago—2013—that identified a number of obsolete things and duplicative requirements that could be addressed, unfortunately, the agency has yet to act upon them, this despite an ongoing disclosure effectiveness review that has so far only produced a concept release.

So, at the end, it is important that this Congress come here today and act on behalf of all the American investors, all the people in this country, in order to keep the original intent of our securities laws relevant today and ensure that the effective disclosure remains this very centerpiece of the capital markets.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of this bill. I thank Mr. GARRETT for his hard work. We worked together on this in the last Congress, and I added an amendment to improve the bill in the markup last year.

Markets are constantly evolving, and so too must our regulatory regime. This is especially true when it comes to reporting requirements for small public companies.

The process of scaling and streamlining the reporting requirements for these small companies is something that, in order to keep pace with the ever-evolving marketplace, has historically been revisited roughly once every 10 years. It requires vigilance by the SEC and, also, by Congress.

The Disclosure Modernization and Simplification Act directs the SEC to simplify the reporting requirements for small companies in regulation S-K.

First, the SEC would be required to revise regulation S-K to take care of any low-hanging fruit, that is, make any improvements to regulation S-K that they have already identified as helpful for small companies.

Next, the SEC would conduct a study of the best way to simplify and modernize the disclosure requirements in regulation S-K while still providing all the necessary information to investors and to also make specific detailed recommendations to Congress for how to achieve this.

Finally, the bill allows companies to submit a summary page on their form 10-K annual reports in order to make these annual reports easier to understand by investors.

In testimony before the Financial Services Committee last year, Colom-

bia Professor John Coffee called the idea “simple and unobjectionable” and said that he “didn't see how anyone could be opposed to it.”

I agree that this is a commonsense idea that could make lengthy annual reports, which are often hundreds of pages long and difficult to navigate, significantly more investor-friendly.

So I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I thank my colleague, Mr. GARRETT, for his leadership. He has worked on this for several Congresses.

Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers.

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

I thank the gentlewoman from New York for working with us today and also working with us over the last several years as well, trying to move this along. As you have said and I have said, this is one of those proverbial commonsense pieces of legislation.

If anyone got confused by all the technical terms that you and I used here, at the end of the day, it means, whether you are a sophisticated institutional investor or whether you are a mom-and-pop-type investor or if you are something in between, you just want to have clarity, you just want to understand what all these voluminous, hundreds-of-pages annual reports and quarterly reports are.

That is what our bill does. It just makes it a little bit simpler and then directs the SEC to go even the step further to develop other ways to do so as well.

So I look forward to passing this out of this House now for the third time, I believe, send it over to the Senate and, hopefully, get some action in the Senate and put it on the President's desk.

I encourage Members from both sides of the aisle, once again, out of the House and to the Senate.

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 New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1525.

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.

REFORMING ACCESS FOR INVESTMENTS IN STARTUP ENTERPRISES ACT OF 2015

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1839) to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to exempt certain transactions involving purchases by accredited investors, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1839

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 “Reforming Access for Investments in Startup Enterprises Act of 2015” or the “RAISE Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. EXEMPTED TRANSACTIONS.

(a) EXEMPTED TRANSACTIONS.—Section 4 of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(7) transactions meeting the requirements of subsection (d).”;

(2) by redesignating the second subsection (b) (relating to securities offered and sold in compliance with Rule 506 of Regulation D) as subsection (c); and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) CERTAIN ACCREDITED INVESTOR TRANSACTIONS.—The transactions referred to in subsection (a)(7) are transactions meeting the following requirements:

“(1) ACCREDITED INVESTOR REQUIREMENT.—Each purchaser is an accredited investor, as that term is defined in section 230.501(a) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation).

“(2) PROHIBITION ON GENERAL SOLICITATION OR ADVERTISING.—Neither the seller, nor any person acting on the seller’s behalf, offers or sells securities by any form of general solicitation or general advertising.

“(3) INFORMATION REQUIREMENT.—In the case of a transaction involving the securities of an issuer that is neither subject to section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m; 78o(d)), nor exempt from reporting pursuant to section 240.12g3-2(b) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, nor a foreign government (as defined in section 230.405 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations) eligible to register securities under Schedule B, the seller and a prospective purchaser designated by the seller obtain from the issuer, upon request of the seller, and the seller in all cases makes available to a prospective purchaser, the following information (which shall be reasonably current in relation to the date of resale under this section):

“(A) The exact name of the issuer and the issuer’s predecessor (if any).

“(B) The address of the issuer’s principal executive offices.

“(C) The exact title and class of the security.

“(D) The par or stated value of the security.

“(E) The number of shares or total amount of the securities outstanding as of the end of the issuer’s most recent fiscal year.

“(F) The name and address of the transfer agent, corporate secretary, or other person responsible for transferring shares and stock certificates.

“(G) A statement of the nature of the business of the issuer and the products and services it offers, which shall be presumed reasonably current if the statement is as of 12 months before the transaction date.

“(H) The names of the officers and directors of the issuer.

“(I) The names of any persons registered as a broker, dealer, or agent that shall be paid or given, directly or indirectly, any commission or remuneration for such person’s participation in the offer or sale of the securities.

“(J) The issuer’s most recent balance sheet and profit and loss statement and similar financial statements, which shall—

“(i) be for such part of the two preceding fiscal years as the issuer has been in operation;

“(ii) be prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles or, in the case of a foreign private issuer, be prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles or the International Financial Reporting Standards issued by the International Accounting Standards Board;

“(iii) be presumed reasonably current if—

“(1) with respect to the balance sheet, the balance sheet is as of a date less than 16 months before the transaction date; and

“(II) with respect to the profit and loss statement, such statement is for the 12 months preceding the date of the issuer’s balance sheet; and

“(iv) if the balance sheet is not as of a date less than 6 months before the transaction date, be accompanied by additional statements of profit and loss for the period from the date of such balance sheet to a date less than 6 months before the transaction date.

“(K) To the extent that the seller is a control person with respect to the issuer, a brief statement regarding the nature of the affiliation, and a statement certified by such seller that they have no reasonable grounds to believe that the issuer is in violation of the securities laws or regulations.

“(4) ISSUERS DISQUALIFIED.—The transaction is not for the sale of a security where the seller is an issuer or a subsidiary, either directly or indirectly, of the issuer.

“(5) BAD ACTOR PROHIBITION.—Neither the seller, nor any person that has been or will be paid (directly or indirectly) remuneration or a commission for their participation in the offer or sale of the securities, including solicitation of purchasers for the seller is subject to an event that would disqualify an issuer or other covered person under Rule 506(d)(1) of Regulation D (17 C.F.R. 230.506(d)(1)) or is subject to a statutory disqualification described under section 3(a)(39) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

“(6) BUSINESS REQUIREMENT.—The issuer is engaged in business, is not in the organizational stage or in bankruptcy or receivership, and is not a blank check, blind pool, or shell company that has no specific business plan or purpose or has indicated that the issuer’s primary business plan is to engage in a merger or combination of the business with, or an acquisition of, an unidentified person.

“(7) UNDERWRITER PROHIBITION.—The transaction is not with respect to a security that constitutes the whole or part of an unsold allotment to, or a subscription or participation by, a broker or dealer as an underwriter of the security or a redistribution.

“(8) OUTSTANDING CLASS REQUIREMENT.—The transaction is with respect to a security of a class that has been authorized and outstanding for at least 90 days prior to the date of the transaction.

“(e) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to an exempted transaction described under subsection (a)(7):

“(A) Securities acquired in such transaction shall be deemed to have been acquired in a transaction not involving any public offering.

“(B) Such transaction shall be deemed not to be a distribution for purposes of section 2(a)(11).

“(C) Securities involved in such transaction shall be deemed to be restricted securities within the meaning of Rule 144 (17 C.F.R. 230.144).

“(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The exemption provided by subsection (a)(7) shall not be the exclusive means for establishing an exemption from the registration requirements of section 5.”

(b) EXEMPTION IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN EXEMPT OFFERINGS.—Section 18(b)(4) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77r(b)(4)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating the second subparagraph (D) and subparagraph (E) as subparagraphs (E) and (F), respectively;

(2) in subparagraph (E), as so redesignated, by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;

(3) in subparagraph (F), as so redesignated, by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(G) section 4(a)(7).”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to again commend the sponsor of this bill, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), who just joined us, for all of his work on this bill and the earlier bills as well and for his continued work on capital formation issues.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the JOBS Act of 2012 has been a tremendous success, a huge success, for the American public and the public marketplace.

The number of companies that have gone public has risen dramatically ever since the barriers to capital formation that existed for several years have been lifted, if you will, helping to make our capital markets more attractive to companies and investors in the United States and all around the world as well.

But the JOBS Act also did something else, somewhat ironically. It included a number of provisions that helped companies to stay private for a longer period of time.

You see, these provisions have allowed pre-IPO companies to expand their investor base, if you will, and have allowed them to open up the doors to capital that were previously shut out to them.

But, you see, as these companies raise more capital and as these companies issue more shares to investors, it can become even more difficult and even more costly for shareholders to find a willing buyer or to exit their position in that company.

That is what this bill is all about. That is where H.R. 1839, the RAISE Act, would come in. The RAISE Act would build upon the success of the JOBS Act of 2012 by creating an environment, if you will, where restricted securities of pre-IPO companies can be traded in a more liquid secondary market, which then could ultimately have the effect of lowering the cost of capital for businesses.

So the RAISE Act does this how? By codifying the longstanding exemption developed by the courts, the SEC, and the securities laws that would provide a means for the resale, if you will, of these private restricted securities.

Now, for those just listening here, this sounds a little bit technical. Maybe it sounds a lot technical to be effective. But, really, it is a simple fix

that could ultimately have the effect of helping literally thousands of businesses all across this country to do what? To raise more capital and put it to use, put it to use to innovating or to hiring more employees.

That is at the end of the day exactly the type of bipartisan solution our constituents are calling on Congress to implement. I urge all of my colleagues, again, on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of the underlying bill.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 1839, which is an excellent example of bipartisan compromise that I think we should do more of in this body.

I would like to thank Mr. MCHENRY and Ranking Member WATERS for all of their work on this bill on which I am pleased to be the lead Democrat.

This bill codifies a longstanding rule that has been recognized in the securities law, known informally as rule 4(1)(½), which allows investors to resell private restricted securities without registering with the SEC.

Rule 4(1)(½) has long been recognized by the SEC and has been recognized by the Federal courts on numerous occasions as well.

But no one has ever bothered to codify this rule, even though everyone is okay with it and supports it, with investors relying on this informal rule.

The reason that the SEC and the courts have long recognized this rule is that it fully complies with the spirit of the Securities Act of 1933. These sales are really just transactions between two sophisticated investors.

As a result, different law firms have different interpretations of what rule 4(1)(½) requires and the market has become very fragmented.

So I think it is a very good idea to finally codify rule 4(1)(½) so that everyone knows the rules of the road and investors can have confidence that they are complying with the law when they resell private securities to other sophisticated investors.

But this bill doesn't just codify rule 4(1)(½). It actually improves upon it by establishing minimum standards for disclosure, marketing, and a holding period that will protect investors, foster transparency, and make this market even stronger.

□ 1645

This bill addresses several concerns that we heard from investor groups and regulators:

First, it requires that the seller provide the buyer with some basic information about the company, which ensures that buyers have the standard information they need before making an investment decision.

Second, it prohibits bad actors, such as people who have been banned from the securities industry, from taking advantage of the rule.

Third, it prohibits the securities of shell companies from being sold under this new rule, 4(1)(½).

So I am pleased that we were able to work together with the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) on this bill and that we were able to add these important investor protections because now we have a bill that will enjoy strong bipartisan support.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Again, I thank the gentlewoman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), the chairman of the Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises Subcommittee, for yielding time.

I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), the ranking member of the subcommittee, for working with me on the provisions of the bill we are talking about this afternoon.

I also want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the ranking member of the full committee, for working with us to craft this compromise we have on the floor here today.

I have joined together with my colleagues from across the aisle to offer a Federal exemption from registering for the resale of private company securities, which is vital for adding liquidity to the secondary markets and driving economic growth.

Today private growth companies are not only disrupting existing industries, but are creating entirely new markets. Thanks to private markets, in particular, the advancement in American technology and entrepreneurship is thriving.

Funding the growth of these private companies, however, has created a paradigm shift. This shift requires our regulatory framework to achieve a balance between encouraging innovation and growth while ensuring that shareholders and investors are protected, and those investor protections need to remain strong.

Unfortunately, as successful entrepreneurs and startup employees look to sell their private shares in the secondary markets, they encounter a regulatory framework that is inefficient. That inefficiency is costly and dries up the liquidity of these securities and is harmful to economic growth.

Most private secondary transactions rely on a broadly accepted exemption known as section 4(1)(½). While widely known and applied, section 4(1)(½) has never been formally codified into securities law. The result has been a disjointed collection of case law and non-action SEC letters that have shaped these private secondary transactions.

Our bill attempts to fix this problem. The bill would provide an exemption

for these types of transactions, allowing startup employees the ability to execute trades in a way that is consistent, clear, and certain.

That is why we have Federal securities laws, for that certainty, that clarity, and that consistency. It would allow for private companies to find a much better way to raise capital by opening up the secondary markets.

Although the bill is a technical fix, we have worked hard to seek compromise and find commonsense solutions to this complicated exemption.

While we have negotiated in good faith on this bill, as has the party across the aisle, my goal is to ensure that the language and operation of this compromise will work in the real world.

Further improvements to the bill may be necessary to fully codify existing uses of that authority, and I am committed to working with my colleagues across the aisle as well as folks in the Senate to clarify the intent here.

I look forward to continuing to work with our ranking member of the full Committee on Financial Services, as necessary, to ensure that the law is a useful tool and serves as an example of how policy can meet the demands of a changing marketplace.

The bottom line is this bill is a sensible way forward. This bill will lower costs and provide transparent standards for the issues that are important in the private and secondary transactions. Additionally, the bill will give today's private growth companies a foundation on which they can confidently plan their trajectory through the capital markets, both private and public.

Ultimately, codifying this exemption will ensure the United States remains the best market in the world for the world's innovators to build their businesses here and employ Americans and grow our economy.

I am pleased that this legislation enjoys bipartisan support, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers on the floor. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Again I thank the gentlewoman from New York for her support on this and the prior legislation, and I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

When the gentleman from North Carolina makes a reference to the regulations of 4(1)(½), then you know there is something wrong out there that there are just too many obscure regulations that are holding back and being impediments to our capital markets.

The gentleman from North Carolina also came up with the right summation of this. It is a technical bill to deal with all of these absurdities and technicalities just to make it easier for

people to be able to start a business, grow a business, sell a business, hire employees, grow capital formation and the number of employees in this country as well.

With that being said, I look forward to strong, bipartisan support, as we have seen in the past on this type of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1839, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. GARRETT. 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.

UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2078) to reauthorize the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2078

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 “United States Commission on International Religious Freedom Reauthorization Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of the Congress that the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom—

(1) was created by Congress to independently assess and to accurately and unflinchingly describe threats to religious freedom around the world; and

(2) in carrying out its prescribed duties, should use its authorized powers to ensure that efforts by the United States to advance religious freedom abroad are timely, appropriate to the circumstances, prudent, and effective.

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.

Section 209 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6436) is amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2019”.

SEC. 4. STRATEGIC PLAN.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(C) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(D) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) COMMISSION.—The term “Commission” means the United States Commission on

International Religious Freedom established under section 201 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6431).

(3) COMMISSIONER.—The term “Commissioner” means a member of the Commission.

(4) VICE CHAIR.—The term “Vice Chair” means the Vice Chair of the Commission who was appointed to such position by an elected official from the political party that is different from the political party of the elected official who appointed the Chair of the Commission.

(b) STRATEGIC POLICY AND ORGANIZATIONAL REVIEW PLANNING PROCESS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than biennially thereafter, the Chair and Vice Chair of the Commission, in coordination with the Commissioners, the Ambassador-at-Large for International Religious Freedom, Commission staff, and others jointly selected by the Chair and Vice Chair, shall carry out a strategic policy and organizational review planning process that includes—

(1) a review of the duties set forth in section 202 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6432) and the powers set forth in section 203 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 6432a);

(2) the preparation of a written description of prioritized actions that the Commission is required to complete to fulfill the strategic plan required under subsection (d);

(3) a review of the scope, content, and timing of the Commission’s annual report and any required changes; and

(4) a review of the personnel policies set forth in section 204 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6432b) and any required changes to such policies.

(c) UNANIMOUS AGREEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To the greatest extent possible, the Chair, Vice Chair, and all of the Commissioners shall ensure that this section is implemented in a manner that results in unanimous agreement among the Commissioners with regard to—

(A) the strategic policy and organizational review planning process required under subsection (b); and

(B) the strategic plan required under subsection (d).

(2) ALTERNATIVE APPROVAL PROCESS.—If unanimous agreement under paragraph (1) is not possible, items for inclusion in the strategic plan may, at the joint discretion of the Chair and Vice Chair, be approved by an affirmative vote of—

(A) a majority of Commissioners appointed by an elected official from the political party of the President; and

(B) a majority of Commissioners appointed by an elected official from the political party that is not the party of the President.

(d) SUBMISSION OF STRATEGIC PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Act, and not less frequently than biennially thereafter, the Chair and Vice Chair of the Commission shall jointly submit, to the appropriate congressional committees, a written strategic plan that includes—

(1) a description of prioritized actions for the Commission for a period of time to be specified by the Commissioners;

(2) a description of any changes the Commission considers necessary with regard to the scope, content, and timing of the Commission’s annual report;

(3) a description of any changes the Commission considers necessary with regard to personnel matters; and

(4) the Commission’s funding requirements for the period covered by the strategic plan.

(e) PENDING ISSUES.—The strategic plan required under subsection (d) may identify any issues or proposals that have not yet been resolved by the Commission.

(f) IMPLEMENTATION OF PERSONNEL PROVISIONS AND ANNUAL REPORT.—Notwithstanding section 204(a) and 205(a) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6432b(a) and 6533(a)), the Commission is authorized to implement provisions related to personnel and the Commission’s annual report that are included in the strategic plan submitted pursuant to this section.

(g) CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT.—Upon request, the Commission shall—

(1) make available for inspection any information and documents requested by the appropriate congressional committees; and

(2) respond to any requests to provide testimony before the appropriate congressional committees.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 207 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6435) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 207. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission \$3,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 2016 to 2019 to carry out the provisions of this Act and section 4 of the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom Reauthorization Act of 2015.

“(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a) shall remain available until the earlier of—

“(1) the date on which they have been expended; or

“(2) the date on which the Commission is terminated under section 209.

“(c) LIMITATION.—In each fiscal year, the Commission shall only be authorized to expend amounts that have been appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) if the Commission—

“(1) complies with the requirements set forth in section 4 of the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom Reauthorization Act of 2015; and

“(2) submits the annual financial report required under section 208(e) to the appropriate congressional committees.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) each will control 20 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days to revise and extend and to include any extraneous material in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, tragically, religious persecution around the world continues. I thought I would give one example that we heard in our committee last week, the Foreign Affairs Committee, from “Bozi,” who is a young 20-year-old Yazidi woman from Iraq. She told us the story.

She very bravely recounted her brutal captivity and the abuse she faced at the hands of ISIS. As we are talking about religious freedom, she explained that, in her village, the 700 men and boys were killed, including several of

her brothers. One small brother survived because he had a bullet in his head and they thought he was dead. But, other than that, her family is all gone.

She was bought by an American who had been recruited to ISIS about 4 years prior, she said. He bought 10 of the girls, sold 9, and kept her as a concubine.

She recounted how he explained to her that, because she was a Yazidi, she was an infidel, in his mind, and she was a Pagan, in his mind; and, therefore, he had the right to enslave and rape and sell Yazidi women and children, and he does this.

After about a year, she escaped. But she reported that there were about 3,000 girls and women in ISIS captivity, Yazidis, who faced the same fate that she faced while she was in that captivity.

These crimes are just the latest outrage against people of faith which continues in so many parts of the world, whether it be against Yazidis or Christian minorities in the Middle East or the Baha'i in Iran or religious communities attempting to worship without official supervision by repressive regimes, for example, in Burma or in North Korea. Anti-Semitism also is on the rise, including in Europe.

This legislation, which was passed unanimously by the Senate last week, will continue the good work of the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom. Congress created this Commission as an independent Federal entity back in 1998.

The reason it was created was because, while the fundamental freedom of religion was under siege around the world, it did not receive enough attention in U.S. foreign policy circles.

This Commission is a body of experts who speak out on behalf of persecuted believers of any faith and push for accountability, accountability beyond what the State Department or the White House may view as diplomatically feasible.

The Commission's independent voice remains critical today, as the State Department too often pushes religious freedom to the side. For example, the State Department's Ambassador at Large for religious freedom sat vacant for 2 years during the start of this administration and again for another 10 months before the appointment of the current Ambassador, Rabbi David Saperstein.

And this year, after a 3-year lapse, the Department finally made the legally required designation of "Countries of Particular Concern" for religious freedom, 3 years of the State Department shirking its legal responsibility.

But, as the Commission has found, another eight countries should also be placed on that list and were not placed on the list. Those countries include Vietnam, whose recent so-called amnesty of more than 18,000 prisoners included convicted murderers, convicted drug dealers, human traffickers.

But what it did not include was prisoners of religious conscience, such as the Venerable Thich Quang Do of the Unified Buddhist Church of Vietnam. I have visited him under house arrest. They did not include Father Nguyen Van Ly, the Catholic priest who has been repeatedly beaten. These were not the people released. No. It was the human traffickers and the murderers.

So this Commission is critical in calling out these abuses.

This bill extends the authorization of the Commission for 4 more years and includes new strategic planning and transparency improvements in the act. This should ensure that the Commission's important work remains strongly bipartisan and represents the diverse American consensus on the importance of our first freedom: religious liberty.

I want to thank Senators CORKER and CARDIN and their colleagues who worked to craft this bill, which received unanimous support in the other body.

I also want to recognize the important work of the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the author of the House side reauthorization bill, who has been a legislative leader on religious freedom issues throughout his career.

And, as always, I appreciate the cooperation of the ranking member, Mr. ELIOT ENGEL of New York, and the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) in bringing this legislation to the floor today.

So this bill, which has the unanimous support of the Senate and all nine current Commissioners, deserves our support also. With its passage, it goes to the President's desk. With his signature, it will ensure that freedom of religion under continuous threat from extremists and authoritarian governments remains front and center.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1700

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in strong support of S. 2078.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will reauthorize the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom, what we call USCIRF, and it deserves this body's strong support.

I want to begin by thanking Senator CORKER, Senator CARDIN, and Senator DURBIN for the work that they did in pushing this bill on the Senate side. I want to thank our chairman, Chairman ROYCE, and Representative CHRIS SMITH for his strong leadership here in the House on matters dealing with religious freedom.

This bill, which has been endorsed by all nine of the current Commissioners, would reauthorize the Commission for 4 years and require that the Commission agree on a bipartisan strategic plan to be submitted to Congress within 180 days. Moreover, the Commission

will also be required to reach bipartisan agreement on personnel policies, which I hope they will see as an opportunity, as an organization dedicated to promoting freedom and tolerance, to include strong nondiscrimination protections for religion, gender, gender identity, and sexual orientation, as well as the other federally protected classes.

The right to practice religion and worship freely is a bedrock principle of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and, of course, of our own Constitution. This Commission on International Religious Freedom does so much to defend that liberty, whether through invaluable research, analysis, and reporting or efforts to guide lawmakers from the United States and elsewhere on the importance of this issue. Yet every day, religious communities around the world endure violence, persecution, and discrimination—and the problem, sadly, is escalating.

In Nigeria, Christian and Muslim communities live in fear of the fanatical terrorist group Boko Haram. In Iran, the regime continues to persecute members of the Baha'i faith. In Vietnam, Christians are arrested and beaten by police. Pakistan has fallen down on the job of prosecuting violence against religious minorities, while at the same time convicting religious minorities for blasphemy. And, of course, people of all faiths are being massacred by ISIL as it attempts to wipe out any beliefs that don't align with its perversion of Islam.

Mr. Speaker, this sort of intolerance has no place in the 21st century. Governments are obligated to respect the religious freedom of all citizens. It is the right thing to do, and it is also in their own interests. After all, when societies are more open, they become more prosperous. When citizens live freely without fear of persecution, they contribute more and help drive growth and stability.

So the United States wants to see religious freedom thrive around the world. That is why we established the Commission on International Religious Freedom, and that is why we should vote today to support the Commission's vital continued work.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting S. 2078.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH). He worked on the original authorization of the Religious Freedom Act, and he is the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the chairman for his leadership and for his commitment to human rights, particularly religious freedom, and I want to thank Senator CORKER for helping to shepherd this legislation through the

Senate when there were some contentious issues.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom was created as part of the landmark International Religious Freedom Act of 1998, originally authored by my good friend and former colleague Frank Wolf, who provided exemplary service and leadership in this House.

The creation of USCIRF made the promotion and protection of religious freedom a priority of U.S. foreign policy; and believe me, before the passage of this law, it was not. Since its inception, USCIRF has been a valuable, independent, and bipartisan source of information and policy recommendations for the Congress, U.S. Government, and the American people.

Mr. Speaker, USCIRF gives voice to persecuted religious groups and raises prisoner cases, individual cases, at the highest levels of the U.S. Government. USCIRF's annual report—and I encourage Members to read it—often provides a fuller view of violations of religious freedom than the State Department's International Religious Freedom Report. As an independent body, USCIRF has the political freedom to report the facts and provide critical insight and recommendations on countries like Vietnam, Pakistan, India, Cuba, or China, countries where the U.S. Government may be hesitant to draw attention to religious rights violations because it is concerned about upsetting foreign governments.

It needs to be noted that in the beginning, the Clinton administration actively opposed passage of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998. I know because I chaired the hearings. We heard from people like Assistant Secretary John Shattuck, who said it would create a hierarchy of human rights, which it did not. It put religious freedom in its rightful place. Of course, years later, people from the administration pointed out that none of that happened and it was a very important addition to our work. I also want to note that a very broad coalition supported and continued to support IRFA in general and USCIRF in particular. In the end, President Clinton did sign the legislation into law.

The U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops endorses USCIRF's reauthorization, as do over 80 different non-governmental organizations and religious groups, part of the International Religious Freedom Roundtable. These groups sent a letter to every Member of Congress and said, in pertinent part, "while there is very little we agree on theologically, or politically, we all agree on the importance of religious freedom."

Mr. Speaker, bipartisan cooperation is critically important at a time when religious freedom is under siege through the world. Anti-Semitism, pervasive in most of the Middle East, has spread like a cancer to parts of Europe. The increase in violence perpetrated against Christians, Muslims, and other

religious minorities has reached staggering proportions, including disturbing reports of torture, rape, imprisonment, forced exile, and murder.

Mr. Speaker, the world faces a deepening crisis of religious freedom restrictions and abuses by governments. The Pew Foundation estimates that over 75 percent of the world's population lives in countries where severe religious freedom abuses are commonplace. Ancient Christian communities in Iraq and Syria are on the verge of extinction, and other religious minorities in the Middle East face a constant assault from ISIS. ISIS, as we all know, has committed and is committing genocide, mass atrocities, and war crimes.

China continues to suppress religious practice broadly and with impunity. It has been another punishing year for the Tibetan Buddhists, Uighur Muslims, Christians, as well as Falun Gong practitioners who face restrictions, imprisonment, and torture.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Burma is a problem; Rohingya Muslims face problems. In Pakistan, as we all know, there are problems; in Iran, not just with the Baha'i who are persecuted again and have been facing that with unrelenting pressure, but also other Christians who live there and other Muslims.

Mr. Speaker, the need for USCIRF is clear, and I hope all Members will support this important human rights legislation.

I thank the Chair, and I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I do not have any more speakers, so I yield myself the balance of my time.

First, again, I want to thank our chairman, ED ROYCE, and our ranking member ELIOT ENGEL for, once again, the bipartisan way in which the work of the Foreign Affairs Committee is conducted, evidenced again today with strong bipartisan support for this bill. I also want to acknowledge the great leadership of Congressman SMITH, who has worked in this area for a very long time.

Mr. Speaker, my home State, Rhode Island, was founded by ROGER WILLIAMS, searching for a place that respects religious freedom. Rhode Island is home to the oldest synagogue in America, the Touro Synagogue, where President Washington famously wrote to the Hebrew congregation at Touro Synagogue to reassure them that this new, young Nation will be a place that respects religious freedom of all its citizens. It is this Commission that continues to promote that work around the world, to ensure that religious freedom is respected everywhere in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Before I close, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the chairman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, religious liberty is the first right in our Bill of Rights, and it is in the First Amendment. There are five rights in the First Amendment. Religious liberty is the first of those five rights. That is not by accident. Our ancestors believed in the right of religious liberty.

In fact, throughout the world today, religious freedom is the most important personal right for many, many people of all religious faiths—the right to practice one's religion free of persecution regardless of what that religion is.

Mr. Speaker, Saddique Azam was promoted as the headmaster of an elementary school in Pakistan a few months ago. Three Muslim teachers didn't like the fact that they had a Christian as their boss. So, yesterday, about 7:45 in the morning, they stormed his office and demanded that he resign because he was a Christian. He refused. They beat him up until he was rescued by some other staff members.

Curricula in schools throughout the world are teaching religious intolerance. The Saudi school curriculum openly vilifies other faiths, including Jews and Christians. Not too long ago, there was a 14-year-old boy by the name of Ayman Nabil Labib, a Christian in Egypt, a Coptic Christian. He went to school. The teacher of his class, a non-Christian, saw that he had a cross on his wrist. Coptic Christians I understand have a tattoo of a cross. He was told to cover up the cross. He did not. In fact, he pulled out a cross from underneath his shirt and displayed it as well. The teacher grabbed him around the neck and started choking him and asked the other students: What are you going to do about this? And they beat him to death—a 14-year-old Coptic Christian in Egypt.

Persecution happens to all faiths throughout the world.

It is the most important, in my opinion, human right, natural right, to practice one's faith, religion, and belief freely without persecution by government especially. This legislation helps protect that right worldwide. It is an important right here, but, as I said, it is a natural right, and it should be protected. I support this legislation because it protects the basic right of religious freedom.

And that is just the way it is.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressmen CHRIS SMITH, DAVID CICILLINE, and Judge TED POE.

Two weeks ago, we were all here on the floor of the House, and we heard

Pope Francis charged with those listening to his remarks of the important responsibility of safeguarding religious freedom. He stated at the White House that that freedom remains one of America's most precious possessions. Of course, that freedom is not only an American possession, and it is not only enjoyed by certain religions. That freedom flows from the inherent dignity of every human person and should be protected wherever it is threatened.

The United States Commission on International Religious Freedom remains a strong, independent, and authoritative voice on behalf of religious believers everywhere. This measure will ensure that it continues to pursue the Commission's nonpartisan mission of promoting around the world the right of religious liberty that we hold so dear as a nation. It deserves our unanimous support.

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support a commission which embodies the highest of our democratic principles: independence, bipartisanship, transparency and the defense of our fundamental freedoms.

The United States Commission on International Religious Freedom was created from a landmark piece of legislation, the 1998 International Religious Freedom Act (IRFA).

How that bill came about is a story in its own right, and a demonstration of how a diverse set of our nation's leaders can come together to protect a foundational freedom.

One of the best ways to expose attacks on religious freedom is meticulous chronicling of such abuses and then proclaiming them loud and clear to a watching world.

The importance of USCIRF's mission of monitoring, recording and publishing attacks on religious belief—or any belief at all—cannot be overestimated.

Their annual report is an invaluable reference for my colleagues and me and our staffs.

Like the TIP report which monitors countries' records on human trafficking, the USCIRF annual report exposes lawbreakers and violators of human rights—and recommends what actions should be taken.

And we have seen how across the world religious minorities are under attack.

Christians made up 20 percent of the Middle East population at the start of the 20th century.

Given a sustained attack in recent years on Christian belief and practice, that number is now around 5 percent and declining.

In fact, less than 1 percent of the world's more than 2 billion Christians live in the Middle East—the birthplace of the religion.

Other religions and belief systems have suffered under sustained persecution.

Yazidis in Iraq and Syria have been systematically targeted by ISIS for slavery and execution.

Just this week, news reports have revealed Yazidi women have taken their own lives out of despair after repeated rapes and assaults.

USCIRF has documented ethnic cleansing of Muslims and sectarian violence in the Central African Republic, and urged the State Department designate it as a Country of Particular Concern.

In Russia, "serious violations of freedom of religion or belief continue."

China has taken further steps to "consolidate" its "authoritarian monopoly" over the lives of its citizens.

This has led to "unprecedented violence" against Uigher Muslims, Tibetan Buddhists, Catholics, Protestants, and Falun Gong practitioners.

And the list goes on and on.

An attack on the religious belief of one is an attack on all of us.

USCIRF is a unique, independent voice calling the world to pay attention and act, especially when this freedom can take a backseat in foreign affairs.

The world forgets that the chilling of religious belief is the first step toward totalitarian control over all areas of life.

All other freedoms flow from religious liberty.

Without the freedom to believe what your conscience tells you, and live that belief out without fear of violence or other persecution, all other freedoms are meaningless.

USCIRF recognizes this reality, and acts in defense of all peoples everywhere.

I urge the House and reauthorize this important commission, and continue to defend and promote our First Amendment freedoms around the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2078.

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.

AIRPORT ACCESS CONTROL SECURITY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2015

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3102) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to reform programs of the Transportation Security Administration, streamline transportation security regulations, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3102

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 "Airport Access Control Security Improvement Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. AVIATION SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of title XVI of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 1602. RISK-BASED SCREENING OF EMPLOYEES AT AIRPORTS.

"(a) SCREENING MODEL.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Administrator shall establish a risk-based, intelligence-driven model for the screening of employees at airports based on level of access and employment positions at domestic airports. Such screening model shall—

"(A) ensure that only those individuals authorized to have access to the secure areas of a domestic airport are permitted such access;

"(B) ensure that an individual is immediately denied entry to a secure area when such individual's access authorization for such secure area is withdrawn; and

"(C) provide a means to differentiate between individuals authorized to have access to an entire secure area and individuals authorized access to only a particular portion of a secure area.

"(2) FACTORS.—The Administrator shall consider the following factors when establishing the screening model described in paragraph (1):

"(A) Whether and how often employees at airports require employment-related access to Secure Identification Display Areas, Airport Operations Areas, or secure areas.

"(B) The ability of each airport operator to reduce employee entry and exit points to a mutually agreed upon minimum number of such entry and exit points necessary to maintain airport operations.

"(C) In consultation with airport operators, the ability of the Administration to create a randomization plan for screening at the defined operational minimum entry and exit points at airports which maximizes the deterrent effect of screening efforts.

"(b) DISQUALIFYING OFFENSES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Administrator, in consultation with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, labor organizations representing aviation, ground, and cabin crew workers, and the Aviation Security Advisory Committee, shall conduct an aviation security risk-based review of the disqualifying criminal offenses codified in sections 1542.209 and 1544.229 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, to determine the appropriateness of such offenses as a basis for denying to an employee a credential that allows unescorted access to Secure Identification Display Areas of airports. Such review shall consider the following:

"(A) The adequacy of codified disqualifying offenses to address the current aviation security threat environment, particularly the terrorism insider threat.

"(B) If such codified disqualifying offenses should be tailored to address the current aviation security threat environment, particularly the terrorism insider threat, by excluding or including other offenses.

"(C) The potential security benefits, drawbacks, and challenges associated with identifying patterns of misdemeanors or of other non-disqualifying offenses that could jeopardize aviation security.

"(D) The feasibility of integrating similar departmental eligibility requirements for access to Secure Identification Display Areas of airports.

"(E) If the ten year look-back period for disqualifying offenses is appropriate, in light of the current aviation security threat environment, particularly the terrorism insider threat.

"(2) WAIVER.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Administrator shall provide an adequate redress process for an employee who is subject to an adverse employment decision, including removal or suspension of such employee, due to a disqualifying offense referred to in paragraph (1), that is consistent with the appeals and waiver process established for applicants for commercial motor vehicle hazardous materials endorsements and transportation workers at ports under section 70105(c) of title 46, United States Code.

"(3) NOTICE.—Any changes to the Secure Identification Display area badge program,

such as changes considered pursuant to subparagraphs (B), (C), (D), and (E) of paragraph (1) shall be subject to notice of proposed rulemaking.

“(4) BRIEFING TO CONGRESS.—Upon completion of the aviation security risk-based review required under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall brief the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on the results of such review.

“(C) CREDENTIALING.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Administrator, in consultation with the Aviation Security Advisory Committee, shall review the auditing procedures for all airport-issued identification media. Such review shall determine the following:

“(1) The efficacy of the auditing program requirements at domestic airports to ensure the integrity, accountability, and control of airport-issued identification media.

“(2) The feasibility of including biometrics standards for all airport-issued identification media used for identity verification and badge verification.

“(3) The feasibility of integrating other departmental programs’ eligibility requirements for access to secure areas of airports.

“(d) VETTING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Administrator shall—

“(A) establish a program to allow airport badging offices to utilize the employment eligibility confirmation system established under section 404 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note; commonly referred to as ‘E-Verify’) to determine the eligibility to work in the United States of all applicants seeking access to secure areas of airports;

“(B) establish a process to transmit applicants’ biometric fingerprint data to the Office of Biometric Identity Management’s (OBIM’s) Automated Biometrics Identification System (IDENT) for vetting; and

“(C) conduct a data quality assessment to ensure that credential application data elements received by the Administration are complete and match the data submitted by the airport operators.

“(2) BRIEFING TO CONGRESS.—Upon completion of the responsibilities specified in paragraph (1), the Administrator shall brief the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on the results of such completion.

“(e) REPORTING OF VIOLATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Administrator shall establish a nationwide program for the anonymous reporting of violations of airport security.

“(f) CENTRALIZED DATABASE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Administrator, in consultation with the Aviation Security Advisory Committee, shall—

“(1) establish a national database of employees who have had either their airport or aircraft operator-issued badge revoked for failure to comply with aviation security requirements;

“(2) determine the appropriate reporting mechanisms for airports and airlines to submit data regarding employees described in paragraph (1) and to access the database established pursuant to such paragraph; and

“(3) establish a process that allows individuals whose names were mistakenly entered

into such database to have their names removed and have their credentialing restored.

“(g) UPDATED REVIEW.—Not later than April 8, 2016, the Administrator, in consultation with the Aviation Security Advisory Committee, shall conduct an updated and thorough review of airport access controls.

“(h) EMPLOYEE SCREENING STUDY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Administrator, in consultation with the Aviation Security Advisory Committee, shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Comptroller General of the United States a cost and feasibility study of a statistically significant number of Category I, II, and X airports, that ensures that all employee entry and exit points that lead to secure areas of such airports are comprised of the following:

“(A) A secure door utilizing card and pin entry or biometric technology.

“(B) Surveillance video recording, capable of storing video data for at least 30 days.

“(C) Advanced screening technologies, including at least one of the following:

“(i) Magnetometer (walk-through or hand-held).

“(ii) Explosives detection canines.

“(iii) Explosives trace detection swabbing.

“(iv) Advanced imaging technology.

“(v) X-ray bag screening technology.

“(2) CONTENTS.—The study required under paragraph (1) shall include information related to the employee screening costs of those airports which have already implemented practices of screening one-hundred percent of employees entering secure areas of airports, including the following:

“(A) Costs associated with establishing an operational minimum number of employee entry and exit points.

“(B) A comparison of costs associated with implementing the requirements specified in paragraph (1), based on whether such implementation was carried out by the Administration or airports.

“(3) COMPTROLLER GENERAL ASSESSMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon completion of the study required under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General of the United States shall review such study to assess the quality and reliability of such study.

“(B) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 60 days after the receipt of the study required under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General of the United States shall report to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on the results of the review required under subparagraph (A).”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1601 the following new item:

“Sec. 1602. Risk-based screening of employees at airports.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

□ 1715

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KATKO. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 3102 is a critically important, bipartisan piece of legislation, which serves as a culmination of months of intense oversight on the issue of airport access controls and the insider threat to aviation security.

The gaps in airport employee access control made headlines after an investigation revealed that aviation employees were trafficking weapons and ammunitions between Atlanta and New York. More than 170 guns were trafficked in such a manner.

Furthermore, a recent inspector general report found that TSA failed to identify 73 aviation workers with possible links to terrorism. Lastly, at airports such as Dallas/Fort Worth, Los Angeles International, and Oakland, many major drug-trafficking rings have been uncovered involving employees using their insider ability to access the airports.

It is the responsibility of this committee to act to prevent similar stories from continuing to emerge.

Specifically, H.R. 3102 requires TSA to consult with Federal and private sector partners to review existing employee screening protocols and work comprehensively to improve the effectiveness of controls at airports across the United States.

Moreover, the bill improves standards of vetting for the credentials granted to individuals with access to secure areas of airports and takes a robust approach to bolstering the oversight of the access given to these employees.

H.R. 3102 codifies a number of recommendations put forward by the Aviation Security Advisory Committee, which examined the issue of airport access controls earlier this year at our urging.

This legislation reflects rigorous oversight, including a number of hearings, site visits, and briefings from Homeland Security, TSA, the FBI, and aviation stakeholders.

Furthermore, I am very proud of the cooperation among our private sector stakeholders, Federal partners, and the labor community that has helped to bring this bill to the floor today.

Throughout this legislation’s development, we have worked tirelessly with the same end goal in mind: to enhance the security of our Nation’s airports and mitigate threats to aviation workers and the traveling public.

The insider threat to aviation is real, and it is critical that we evolve our security standards and best practices to stay abreast of changing threats to transportation.

I wish to thank Ranking Member RICE and Ranking Member THOMPSON

for their hard work and attention to this issue, as we have focused heavily on these problems in a bipartisan manner.

I also wish to thank the chairman of the full committee, Mr. McCAUL, for his support on the committee's oversight efforts and for seeing this bill through the committee.

Together—together—we can fix these problems and assure the American public that their aviation system is secure and adaptive to changing threats.

I urge all Members to join me in supporting this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise to speak in support of H.R. 3102.

Last year we learned that airport employees used their access to the secure areas of airports to bypass screening to smuggle weapons and drugs onto commercial flights.

In response, then-Acting Administrator Melvin Carraway requested that TSA's stakeholder advisory committee, the Aviation Security Advisory Committee, take on the challenge of evaluating airport access controls and come up with approaches to address security vulnerabilities.

In April, the ASAC issued a thoughtful report with 28 recommendations designated to mitigate threats and risks associated with airport access controls.

Congress approved legislation in December 2014 to codify ASAC in law in the hopes that it would result in better aviation security policymaking at TSA.

We envisioned a process in which various stakeholders throughout the aviation community were able to come together and address security issues affecting the industry. In this instance, the process worked as envisioned, and TSA is making sure and steady progress towards addressing many of the recommendations.

I believe that, by advancing this bill today, we will send a message to TSA and aviation stakeholders that we have a strong interest in raising the bar when it comes to securing our Nation's airports.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I simply reiterate that the committee remains interested in raising the level of security within our Nation's airports. As such, we will continue to track TSA's efforts at bolstering access controls and addressing the ASAC's recommendations.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the issues addressed in H.R. 3102 are a pressing concern to the security of our Nation's airports. It is critical that we send this bill to the Senate today. Congress cannot stand idly by and grant tacit approval to lax security standards for employees when we have the authority and responsibility to spur action and keep the traveling public safe from harm.

I want to thank Mr. RICHMOND for his bipartisan comments. That truly is the nature of what we have done today, is act in a bipartisan manner to attack a problem.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I rise to speak on H.R. 3102, the "Airport Access Control Security Improvement Act of 2015," which amends the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to reform programs of the Transportation Security Administration, and streamline transportation security regulations.

The objective of the bill is to establish a risk-based, intelligence-driven model for the screening of employees at airports based on level of access and employment positions at domestic airports.

The model is intended to ensure that only those individuals authorized to have access to secure areas of a domestic airport are permitted such access.

The model must be able to differentiate between individuals authorized to have access to an entire secure area and those who are not permitted access.

The Director of the FBI and Director of the Aviation Security Advisory Committee are directed to review the disqualifying criminal offenses in the Code of Federal Regulations to determine the adequacy for an individual to have continued access to Secure Identification Display Areas of airports.

The review based on the current language of the bill would consider whether the list of disqualifying offenses should be amended to include other offenses.

As House Judiciary Committee's Ranking Member on the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Investigation, I am concerned that the bill contains this language.

At a time when we are discussing the rights of non-violent offenders to have an opportunity, if their conduct and records dictate to be able to fully reintegrate into society, that there may be other efforts to make this process more difficult without a serious review of why such measures should be taken and for whom should they be applied?

I would offer to work with my fellow members on the House Committee on Homeland Security to consider carefully the reasons for any expansion on this list, especially if the expansion only involves the Department of Homeland Security.

There are similar concerns regarding language in the bill that may extend the period of time that may be considered between a particular situation and the life a person is currently leading.

Considering behavior of a teenager when considering the conduct of a 35 year-old adult, the weight of the consideration should be on the life of the adult and the seriousness of the offense.

Any new model that may be developed that would impact the employability of current persons who hold access credentials and future employees should be further reviewed by the full committee prior to becoming policy.

The bill's goals are important—the House should consider every aspect of airport security to improve aviation safety.

I will continue to work in my capacity on both the House Committee on Homeland Se-

curity and the House Committee on the Judiciary to improve aviation security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3102, 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.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY CYBERSECURITY STRATEGY ACT OF 2015

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3510) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a cybersecurity strategy for the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3510

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 "Department of Homeland Security Cybersecurity Strategy Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. CYBERSECURITY STRATEGY FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 141 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 230. CYBERSECURITY STRATEGY.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall develop a departmental strategy to carry out cybersecurity responsibilities as set forth in law.

"(b) CONTENTS.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

"(1) Strategic and operational goals and priorities to successfully execute the full range of the Secretary's cybersecurity responsibilities.

"(2) Information on the programs, policies, and activities that are required to successfully execute the full range of the Secretary's cybersecurity responsibilities, including programs, policies, and activities in furtherance of the following:

"(A) Cybersecurity functions set forth in the second section 226 (relating to the national cybersecurity and communications integration center).

"(B) Cybersecurity investigations capabilities.

"(C) Cybersecurity research and development.

"(D) Engagement with international cybersecurity partners.

"(c) CONSIDERATIONS.—In developing the strategy required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

"(1) consider—

"(A) the cybersecurity strategy for the Homeland Security Enterprise published by the Secretary in November 2011;

"(B) the Department of Homeland Security Fiscal Years 2014–2018 Strategic Plan; and

"(C) the most recent Quadrennial Homeland Security Review issued pursuant to section 707; and

“(2) include information on the roles and responsibilities of components and offices of the Department, to the extent practicable, to carry out such strategy.

“(d) IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.—Not later than 90 days after the development of the strategy required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall issue an implementation plan for the strategy that includes the following:

“(1) Strategic objectives and corresponding tasks.

“(2) Projected timelines and costs for such tasks.

“(3) Metrics to evaluate performance of such tasks.

“(e) CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT.—The Secretary 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 for assessment the following:

“(1) A copy of the strategy required under subsection (a) upon issuance.

“(2) A copy of the implementation plan required under subsection (d) upon issuance, together with detailed information on any associated legislative or budgetary proposals.

“(f) CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall be in an unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

“(g) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed as permitting the Department to engage in monitoring, surveillance, exfiltration, or other collection activities for the purpose of tracking an individual’s personally identifiable information.

“(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) CYBERSECURITY RISK.—The term ‘cybersecurity risk’ has the meaning given such term in the second section 226, relating to the national cybersecurity and communications integration center.

“(2) HOMELAND SECURITY ENTERPRISE.—The term ‘Homeland Security Enterprise’ means relevant governmental and nongovernmental entities involved in homeland security, including Federal, State, local, and tribal government officials, private sector representatives, academics, and other policy experts.

“(3) INCIDENT.—The term ‘incident’ has the meaning given such term in the second section 226, relating to the national cybersecurity and communications integration center.”

(b) PROHIBITION ON REORGANIZATION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may not change the location or reporting structure of the National Protection and Programs Directorate of the Department of Homeland Security, or the location or reporting structure of any office or component of the Directorate, unless the Secretary receives prior authorization from Congress permitting such change.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by adding at the end of the list of items for subtitle C of title II the following new item:

“Sec. 230. Cybersecurity strategy.”

(d) AMENDMENT TO DEFINITION.—Paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of the second section 226 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 148; relating to the national cybersecurity and communications integration center) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) the term ‘incident’ means an occurrence that actually or imminently jeopardizes, without lawful authority, the integrity, confidentiality, or availability of information on an information system, or actually or imminently jeopardizes, without lawful authority, an information system;”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3510, the Department of Homeland Security Cybersecurity Strategy Act of 2015, sponsored by Representative CEDRIC RICHMOND, ranking member of the Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies Subcommittee, of which I am the chairman.

This legislation would require the Department of Homeland Security to develop and to submit to Congress a cybersecurity strategy and implementation plan. Because the Department of Homeland Security is charged with securing the dot-gov domain and working with the private sector to secure the dot-com domain, a comprehensive strategic plan and implementation plan will support DHS’ essential cybersecurity mission.

Mr. Speaker, too often these days cyber attacks disrupt the operations of government, of businesses, and of the lives of the American people. The increasingly sophisticated nature of the cyber threats we face on a daily basis underscore the need to manage and strengthen the cybersecurity of our Nation’s critical infrastructure.

The Government Accountability Office has recommended the implementation of an overarching Federal cybersecurity strategy. H.R. 3510 is an important step toward accomplishing this task.

H.R. 3510 also precludes any reorganization effort of the Department of Homeland Security’s National Protection and Programs Directorate, or NPPD, without congressional approval. This is an effort to ensure that congressional oversight is conducted.

Mr. Speaker, in June of this year, a story in the press announced that the NPPD was planning a significant reorganization. Since June, very few specifics have emerged, and even those that have have been very sparse in detail.

The details that have been made public elicit concern because they support overhauling the infrastructure protection and cybersecurity functions of the directorate without providing details on exactly what this would mean for the mission, for the structure, or for the workforce of the directorate.

The language in this bill follows a bipartisan letter sent just last month to

the Department expressing congressional concern with the lack of transparency surrounding this proposed reorganization and communicating the congressional intent to provide oversight on this issue. The letter also clearly stated that any reorganization or realignment should require congressional authorization.

Over the past several years, the Committee on Homeland Security, on which I serve, has built up a collaborative working relationship with the NPPD, consulting with it to pass several strong and bipartisan pieces of legislation to improve chemical security and to strengthen DHS’ cybersecurity mission and stature in the Federal Government.

Given our shared goal of protecting this country and the committee’s continued legislative oversight efforts to strengthen DHS’ cybersecurity functions, it is essential that the Department submit any proposal to Congress prior to reorganization or realignment.

It is Congress’ role and responsibility to authorize the key responsibilities of the executive branch to include strengthening our cybersecurity posture and ensuring the security and resiliency of our Nation’s critical infrastructure.

I would like to thank Mr. RICHMOND for the work that he and his staff have done to come together in a bipartisan way on this legislation.

I urge all Members to join me in supporting this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 3510.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. RATCLIFFE. I want to thank the chairman of the full committee, Mr. MCCAUL, and the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. THOMPSON, who all signed on and support this legislation.

H.R. 3510, the Department of Homeland Security Cybersecurity Strategy Act of 2015, will require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a comprehensive strategy and implementation plan for carrying out its diverse and complex cyber and information security missions.

Today the Department of Homeland Security is not only responsible for working with Federal agencies to protect Federal civilian networks, but also for helping to bolster information security within the private sector, principally through the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center.

It also plays a major role in information security research and development, cyber crime investigations, and international engagement with cybersecurity partners.

My bill requires DHS to put in place a strategy that includes necessary strategic and operational goals for executing the Secretary’s broad responsibilities.

In September, the inspector general issued a report highlighting the need for such strategy. The report, entitled “DHS Can Strengthen Its Cyber Mission Coordination Efforts,” found that intradepartmental coordination was lacking and recommended that the Department develop a comprehensive cross-departmental strategic implementation plan that defines each component’s cyber missions and responsibilities.

The Department operates frontline programs that protect this Nation from manmade and natural disasters. With cyber threats increasingly at the forefront today, it is essential that all of the Department’s day-to-day programs, policies, and activities are effective and meeting its multi-layered cybersecurity responsibilities.

As the lead Federal agency responsible for securing Federal civilian networks and as the vital cyber information-sharing partner to national critical infrastructures, it is crucial that the Department have a comprehensive and achievable strategic plan in place.

Mr. Speaker, in recent years, Congress has provided significant resources to the Department to expand its cyber operations and workforce.

A lot of money has been spent to respond to cyber events and persistent information security threats. We must make sure our investments in operational plans and research and development are technically achievable and transparent where they can be.

Fundamentally, my bill seeks to ensure that the Department takes a measurable, strategic posture that can be a model for others and to help protect our Nation’s vulnerable information security networks.

I ask for my colleagues’ support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1730

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

Mr. Speaker, I once again urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3510.

I thank Congressman RICHMOND for his bipartisan approach in bringing this bill to the floor today.

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. 3510, the “Department of Homeland Security Cybersecurity Strategy Act of 2015,” which amends the Homeland Security Act of 2002, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a cybersecurity strategy for the Department of Homeland Security.

The strategy must include information on the programs, policies, and activities that are required to successfully execute the full range of the cybersecurity programs, policies, and activities in furtherance of the Department of Homeland Security’s mission regarding the National Cybersecurity and Communication Integration Center.

The National Cybersecurity and Communication Integration Center addresses cybersecurity risks faced by federal and non-federal entities.

In July of this year it was reported that the Office of Personnel Management lost personal information on 21.5 million current and former federal employees and their families.

In 2014, the following agencies reported breaches: The State Department revealed that its unclassified email network had been breached in a cyberattack; the U.S. Postal Service reported that 800,000 personnel files were potentially affected by a cyber breach; the Department of Health and Human Services reported cyber intruders had accessed a server used to test code for the healthcare.gov website and installed malicious software; and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the agency that oversees the U.S. nuclear power industry, revealed a number of attempted intrusions and three successful intrusions into its computer systems.

In cyber time, which is near the speed of light—federal computer networks will not get a warning from a determined enemy that an attack is occurring.

Our nation’s critical infrastructure and civilian government agencies depend on the cybersecurity talent and resources that the Department of Homeland Security can provide on the frontline to defend against attacks.

As with other threats that this nation has faced and overcome, we must create the resources and the institutional responses to protect our nation against cyber threats while preserving our liberties and freedoms.

We cannot accomplish this task without the full cooperation and support of the private sector, computing research community and academia.

This level of engagement requires the trust and confidence of the American people that this new cyber threat center will be used for the purpose it was created and that the collaboration of others in this effort to better protect computing networks will be used only for protection and defense.

There are people with skills and those with the potential to develop skills that would be of benefit to our nation’s efforts to develop an effective cybersecurity defense and deterrence posture.

It is my hope that as we move forward the Committee on Homeland Security will continue in a bipartisan manner to seek out the best ways to bring the brightest and most qualified people into the government as cybersecurity professionals.

Toward that end, I am hosting a Town Hall on Wednesday, October 7, 2015, Town Hall” on Minority Representation in the Cybersecurity Workforce.

I am pleased to have the Chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus join me in support of this important Town Hall.

The message from the federal government to the public regarding the employment opportunities available in STEM careers that include cybersecurity.

It is my commitment that Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic Serving Institutions, Native American Colleges and Women’s Colleges and Universities should be actively engaged when agencies conduct outreach and program development on cybersecurity.

The Brookings’ Metropolitan Policy Program’s report “The Hidden STEM Economy,” reported that in 2011, 26 million jobs or 20 percent of all occupations required knowledge in 1 or more STEM areas.

Half of all STEM jobs are available to workers without a 4 year degree and these jobs pay on average \$53,000 a year, which is 10 percent higher than jobs with similar education requirements.

There will be STEM winners and losers, but not because the skills needed are too difficult to obtain, but because people are not aware of the jobs that are going unfilled today, nor do they know what education or training will create job security for the next 2 to 3 decades.

I am very aware of the importance of STEM job training and education.

A third of Houston jobs are in STEM-based fields.

Houston has the second largest concentrations of engineers (22.4 for every 1,000 workers according to the Greater Houston Partnership.)

Houston has 59,070 engineers, the second largest populations in the nation.

STEM jobs are at the core of Houston’s economic success, but what we have done with STEM innovation and job creation in the city of Houston is not enough to satisfy the regions demand for STEM trained workers.

We anticipate that in the next 5 years the gap in the number of people with STEM skills and training will not keep up with the number of positions requiring those skills.

I ask my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 3510, the “Department of Homeland Security Cybersecurity Strategy Act of 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3510, 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.

ADOPTIVE FAMILY RELIEF ACT

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1300) to amend section 221 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide relief for adoptive families from immigrant visa fees in certain situations.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1300

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 “Adoptive Family Relief Act”.

SEC. 2. WAIVER OF FEES FOR RENEWAL OF IMMIGRANT VISA FOR ADOPTED CHILD IN CERTAIN SITUATIONS.

Section 221(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) PERIOD OF VALIDITY; RENEWAL OR REPLACEMENT.—

“(1) IMMIGRANT VISAS.—An immigrant visa shall be valid for such period, not exceeding six months, as shall be by regulations prescribed, except that any visa issued to a child lawfully adopted by a United States citizen and spouse while such citizen is serving abroad in the United States Armed Forces, or is employed abroad by the United

States Government, or is temporarily abroad on business, shall be valid until such time, for a period not to exceed three years, as the adoptive citizen parent returns to the United States in due course of his service, employment, or business.

“(2) NONIMMIGRANT VISAS.—A non-immigrant visa shall be valid for such periods as shall be by regulations prescribed. In prescribing the period of validity of a non-immigrant visa in the case of nationals of any foreign country who are eligible for such visas, the Secretary of State shall, insofar as practicable, accord to such nationals the same treatment upon a reciprocal basis as such foreign country accords to nationals of the United States who are within a similar class; except that in the case of aliens who are nationals of a foreign country and who either are granted refugee status and firmly resettled in another foreign country or are granted permanent residence and residing in another foreign country, the Secretary of State may prescribe the period of validity of such a visa based upon the treatment granted by that other foreign country to alien refugees and permanent residents, respectively, in the United States.

“(3) VISA REPLACEMENT.—An immigrant visa may be replaced under the original number during the fiscal year in which the original visa was issued for an immigrant who establishes to the satisfaction of the consular officer that the immigrant—

“(A) was unable to use the original immigrant visa during the period of its validity because of reasons beyond his control and for which he was not responsible;

“(B) is found by a consular officer to be eligible for an immigrant visa; and

“(C) pays again the statutory fees for an application and an immigrant visa.

“(4) FEE WAIVER.—If an immigrant visa was issued, on or after March 27, 2013, for a child who has been lawfully adopted, or who is coming to the United States to be adopted, by a United States citizen, any statutory immigrant visa fees relating to a renewal or replacement of such visa may be waived or, if already paid, may be refunded upon request, subject to such criteria as the Secretary of State may prescribe, if—

“(A) the immigrant child was unable to use the original immigrant visa during the period of its validity as a direct result of extraordinary circumstances, including the denial of an exit permit; and

“(B) if such inability was attributable to factors beyond the control of the adopting parent or parents and of the immigrant.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) and the gentleman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on S. 1300 currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

When I hold and kiss my little children good-bye to come to this place

every week, the pain that I feel in leaving them for several days is mitigated by the conviction that I will be seeing them again very soon.

But I stand here tonight, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of hundreds of American families who are separated from their children with no sense of certainty or knowing when they will be allowed to see their children again or to know when their children will be home for good. That is because, in September of 2013, now more than 2 years ago, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, or the DRC, ceased issuing exit visas, including visas for the more than 350 children who had been fully legally adopted by American families. These families had fully complied with international adoption laws in both the United States and the DRC, had already spent months or years going through the tedious intercountry adoption process, and some of them had already arrived in the DRC with the belief that they would be bringing their adoptive children home at last to their forever families in America.

Despite significant, ongoing efforts by both Congress and the State Department to alleviate any of the DRC Government's concerns and resolve the exit permit process, Mr. Speaker, it is unknown when that suspension will be lifted. Meanwhile, American adoptive families are being faced with the added burden of having to repeatedly renew their adoptive child's adoption paperwork and visas in order to keep it up to date.

Thus, the Adoptive Family Relief Act grants flexibility to the State Department to waive the immigration visa renewal fees of \$325 per child for adoptive families in America in extraordinary circumstances like this where the cause of delay is out of the family's control. Mr. Speaker, waiving the visa renewal fee would alleviate one portion of the overwhelming burden that these American families are enduring until their adoptive child or children can travel to the U.S.

While the U.S. Government continues to work toward the Democratic Republic of the Congo lifting the exit permit suspension, this legislation is critically important and will offer some practical relief to the American families held powerless in a very difficult situation.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the many families waiting to bring their adopted children home will receive encouragement from the strong bipartisan effort here in Congress to support them during this time, as we work collectively to engage the DRC Government and work toward the suspension being fully lifted. This bill is a reminder to them that the Congress has not and will not forget their plight, and we will not cease working on their behalf until their families are finally permanently united and whole.

Mr. Speaker, I especially want to thank Chairman GOODLATTE and Chairman ROYCE for their noble and principled leadership in helping to elevate

this issue and bring this legislation to the floor.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1300, the Adoptive Family Relief Act.

As has been mentioned, 2 years ago, the Democratic Republic of the Congo suspended issuing exit permits to children who had been adopted and trying to leave the country to be with their parents. To this day, that country continues to suspend issuing these permits; and without permits, the children can't join their mom and dad, the people who have adopted them, even though the children are in possession of immigrant visas.

Now, we know to be separated from a child and not to be able to provide love and care for that child is a stressful and tormenting episode for any parent. For the families that adopted children in the DRC, this is exacerbated by the fact that their children are stuck in a country that has one of the worst healthcare systems in the world.

There are hundreds of families throughout the United States—and about 350 of them are waiting simply for an exit permit—missing their children and worried about the health of their children stuck in the DRC. The only thing that is preventing them from bringing their child or children home is this exit visa.

Now, our visas are valid only for 6 months, unfortunately, and I think, as was mentioned, it costs \$325 to renew a visa even though, really, there is no work involved. We have checked with the State Department, and there is minimal expense. So this is not going to be a hit on the State Department's budget, but it is a hit on the budget of families. Some families have spent \$1,000 over the past 2 years, and since we don't know when the DRC is going to start issuing these visas, we don't know how much money these families are looking at in the future.

This bipartisan bill doesn't solve the exit problem, but at least it solves the financial burden that we have put, not intentionally, on these families. It is the right thing to do. It will show support for these families during this distressing time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1300, the Adoptive Family Relief Act.

For many, family is everything, and as any parent knows, not seeing your child for even one day can be hard. Now, imagine you are separated from your child by over 6,000 miles for more than 2 years. This is the reality for too many Americans. Hundreds of adopted children are stuck in the Democratic Republic of the Congo because their government has refused to provide the paperwork required for these children to leave.

For over 2 years, the Meyers, a family in my district, have been waiting to bring home their son and daughter, Papy and Octavie. We can do better for Papy and Octavie and all the other children waiting to come home to their families.

As the Department of State continues to work to bring home these children, S. 1300 would provide much-needed relief to American families going through this harrowing experience. I urge my colleagues to vote for this legislation. It is the right thing to do and worthy of your support.

Ms. LOFGREN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 1300, the Adoptive Family Relief Act. This bill seeks to remove obstacles for immigrant visas to be issued to adopted children from other countries. It eliminates fees for such visas.

Clearly, the challenge of caring for orphans due to crises worldwide is increasing. Rather than frustrate, however, or undermine the compassion and the love of American families who seek to adopt, this legislation modestly seeks to remove some of those barriers and some of those obstacles.

I would point out to my colleagues that I have held of number of hearings on adoption in my subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations. At one of those hearings several months ago, one of our witnesses made a very keen observation that there are more than 50 million children orphaned on the continent of Africa; and if you put that number in perspective, that would make that number of children, if they were in a single country, the fourth largest country in all of Africa after Nigeria, Ethiopia, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

One remedy, of course, for this crisis is intercountry adoption, which sometimes brings children from Africa to our shores to provide them with loving homes. Of course, this is only a partial remedy. Many do find a place to live, a home with family members, but many others are left to fend for themselves.

This legislation recognizes that countries' policies do matter. Look at the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Currently, there are more than 400 American families who have successfully adopted children from the DRC. However, due to the DRC Government's suspension of exit permits, which was implemented beginning in September of 2013, many of these families have been unable to bring their adopted children home to the United States. About a dozen of those children have paid with their lives, dying in the country before they could receive medical attention. Others are in dire need of medical aid which, again, this legislation would help, at least, in terms of the

families to give them a bridge for the financial burdens they face.

I would point out that at one of my hearings, one of the witnesses really, in a very powerful way, said—and her name was Jovana Jones, an adoptive parent—“As adoptive parents, we spend years preparing, and it is imperative that our children come home immediately. We have done our part. Our families have done all we can, and we are at our limit.”

And then she said: “Our arms are open now, and our homes are ready to receive them today. We pray that our government mirrors our dedication and acts now so that our children come home soon.”

This is a very important piece of legislation that hopefully will facilitate the adoption and, at least, help those parents who are putting their money on the line; and it allows them to facilitate that adoption, to just hang in there until they can get their children.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, before coming to the floor, I wanted to reassure myself that the State Department did not have the authority to waive these fees just administratively. It is pretty clear that they need this legislation in order to waive these fees. In fact, they want to waive the fees; they want to support the families. So there is no argument here between the House and Senate, between Republicans and Democrats, between the administration and the legislative branch. This is something that we can all agree on.

You know, to raise kids is one of the most wonderful experiences you can ever have, and we have wonderful American families that want to provide a home for orphans, not only in the DRC, but to orphans all around the world. So it is really important for those of us in the government, administration, and Congress to do what we can to support American families who want to raise these adoptive children.

It is worth noting that the DRC is the problem today, but we have had other problems in the past in other countries, in Latin America and Asia. So this change in the law is going to provide the necessary basis for relieving parents from excessive fees should this occur, God forbid, with other countries.

We would ask our State Department to redouble its efforts with the DRC to get these exit permits underway. It is really unfair to the children and their parents to keep these kids stranded.

□ 1745

Finally, I would just note that we have not done very much by way of anything touching on immigration where we could have bipartisan support. I still wish that we had before us comprehensive immigration reform. That is not this, but it doesn't mean that we shouldn't support this. I think that it is important that we pass this and show these American parents that we are on their side and we hope that they can use the funds that they save

to provide for their new sons and daughters.

Mr. Speaker, unless the gentleman has additional speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there are very few things that we do in this body more important than trying to make sure that parentless little children have hope in life. Through our State Department, all across the world we do very laudable things to try to make sure they have this chance in life. Sometimes it is orphanages; sometimes it is just other types of help through NGOs.

In this particular case, we are doing everything that we can to facilitate children being put into a loving family on a permanent basis. To bring sometimes childless parents together with often parentless children is, I think, a very beautiful and noble effort on our part. I hope that this bill allows that in a greater way with the DRC and, as Ms. LOFGREN mentioned, with other states across the world if it becomes necessary.

I am grateful for all the bipartisan support. I know this is something that we have come together on. Again, I express appreciation to Chairman ROYCE, Chairman GOODLATTE, and to the gentlewoman who has expressed her support for this.

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 Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1300.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 48 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 (Mr. POE of Texas) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

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. 1553, by the yeas and nays; and H.R. 1839, 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.

SMALL BANK EXAM CYCLE
REFORM 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. 1553) to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to specify which smaller institutions may qualify for an 18-month examination cycle, 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 Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 0, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 534]

YEAS—411

Abraham	Clarke (NY)	Flores
Adams	Clawson (FL)	Forbes
Aderholt	Clay	Fortenberry
Aguilar	Cleaver	Foster
Allen	Coffman	Fox
Amash	Cohen	Frankel (FL)
Amodei	Cole	Franks (AZ)
Ashford	Collins (GA)	Frelinghuysen
Babin	Collins (NY)	Fudge
Barletta	Comstock	Gabbard
Barr	Conaway	Gallo
Barton	Connolly	Garamendi
Bass	Cook	Garrett
Beatty	Cooper	Gibbs
Becerra	Costa	Gibson
Benishkeh	Costello (PA)	Gohmert
Bera	Courtney	Goodlatte
Beyer	Cramer	Gosar
Bilirakis	Crawford	Gowdy
Bishop (GA)	Crenshaw	Graham
Bishop (MI)	Crowley	Granger
Bishop (UT)	Cuellar	Graves (GA)
Black	Culberson	Graves (LA)
Blackburn	Cummings	Graves (MO)
Blum	Curbelo (FL)	Grayson
Blumenauer	Davis (CA)	Green, Al
Bonamici	Davis, Danny	Green, Gene
Bost	Davis, Rodney	Griffith
Boustany	DeFazio	Grothman
Boyle, Brendan F.	DeGette	Guinta
Brady (PA)	Delaney	Guthrie
Brady (TX)	DeLauro	Hahn
Brat	DelBene	Hanna
Bridenstine	Denham	Hardy
Brooks (AL)	Dent	Harper
Brooks (IN)	DeSantis	Harris
Brown (FL)	DeSaulnier	Hartzler
Brownley (CA)	DesJarlais	Hastings
Buchanan	Deutch	Heck (NV)
Buck	Diaz-Balart	Heck (WA)
Bucshon	Doggett	Hensarling
Burgess	Dold	Herrera Beutler
Bustos	Donovan	Hice, Jody B.
Butterfield	Doyle, Michael F.	Higgins
Byrne	Duckworth	Hill
Calvert	Duffy	Himes
Capps	Duncan (SC)	Hinojosa
Cárdenas	Duncan (TN)	Holding
Carney	Edwards	Honda
Carson (IN)	Ellison	Hoyer
Carter (GA)	Ellmers (NC)	Huelskamp
Carter (TX)	Emmer (MN)	Huffman
Cartwright	Eshoo	Huizenga (MI)
Castor (FL)	Esty	Hultgren
Castro (TX)	Farenthold	Hurd (TX)
Chabot	Farr	Hurt (VA)
Chaffetz	Fattah	Israel
Chu, Judy	Fincher	Issa
Ciilline	Fleischmann	Jackson Lee
Clark (MA)	Fleming	Jeffries
		Jenkins (KS)

Johnson (GA)	Miller (FL)	Sanford
Johnson (OH)	Miller (MI)	Sarbanes
Johnson, E. B.	Moolenaar	Scalise
Johnson, Sam	Mooney (WV)	Schakowsky
Jolly	Moore	Schiff
Jones	Moulton	Schrader
Jordan	Mullin	Schweikert
Joyce	Mulvaney	Scott (VA)
Kaptur	Murphy (FL)	Scott, Austin
Katko	Murphy (PA)	Scott, David
Keating	Nadler	Sensenbrenner
Kelly (MS)	Napolitano	Serrano
Kelly (PA)	Neal	Sessions
Kennedy	Neugebauer	Sewell (AL)
Kildee	Newhouse	Sherman
Kilmer	Noem	Shimkus
Kind	Nolan	Shuster
King (IA)	Norcross	Sires
King (NY)	Nugent	Slaughter
Kinzinger (IL)	Nunes	Smith (MO)
Kirkpatrick	O'Rourke	Smith (NE)
Kline	Olson	Smith (NJ)
Knight	Palazzo	Smith (WA)
Kuster	Pallone	Speier
Labrador	Palmer	Stefanik
LaHood	Pascrell	Stewart
LaMalfa	Paulsen	Stivers
Lamborn	Payne	Stutzman
Lance	Pearce	Swalwell (CA)
Langevin	Pelosi	Takai
Larsen (WA)	Perlmutter	Takano
Larson (CT)	Perry	Thompson (CA)
Latta	Peters	Thompson (MS)
Lawrence	Peterson	Thompson (PA)
Lee	Pingree	Thornberry
Levin	Pittenger	Tiberi
Lewis	Pitts	Tipton
Lieu, Ted	Pocan	Titus
Lipinski	Poe (TX)	Tonko
LoBiondo	Poliquin	Torres
Loeb	Polis	Trott
Long	Pompeo	Tsongas
Loudermilk	Posey	Turner
Love	Price (NC)	Upton
Lowenthal	Price, Tom	Valadao
Lowe	Quigley	Van Hollen
Lucas	Rangel	Vargas
Luetkemeyer	Ratcliffe	Veasey
Lujan Grisham	Reed	Vela
(NM)	Reichert	Velázquez
Luján, Ben Ray	Renacci	Visclosky
(NM)	Ribble	Wagner
Lynch	Rice (NY)	Walberg
MacArthur	Rice (SC)	Walden
Maloney,	Richmond	Walker
Carolyn	Rigell	Walters, Mimi
Maloney, Sean	Roby	Walz
Marino	Roe (TN)	Wasserman
Massie	Rogers (AL)	Schultz
Matsui	Rogers (KY)	Waters, Maxine
McCarthy	Rohrabacher	Watson Coleman
McCaul	Rokita	Weber (TX)
McClintock	Ros-Lehtinen	Webster (FL)
McCullum	Roskam	Welch
McDermott	Ross	Wenstrup
McGovern	Rothfus	Westerman
McHenry	Rouzer	Westmoreland
McKinley	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (FL)
McMorris	Royce	Wittman
Rodgers	Ruiz	Womack
McNeerney	Ruppersberger	Woodall
McSally	Rush	Yoder
McSally	Russell	Yoho
Meadows	Ryan (OH)	Young (AK)
Meehan	Ryan (WI)	Young (IA)
Meeks	Salmon	Young (IN)
Meng	Sánchez, Linda T.	Zeldin
Messer	Sánchez, Loretta	Zinke
Mica		

NOT VOTING—23

Capuano	Hudson	Sinema
Clyburn	Hunter	Smith (TX)
Conyers	Jenkins (WV)	Walorski
Dingell	Kelly (IL)	Whitfield
Engel	Lummis	Williams
Fitzpatrick	Marchant	Wilson (SC)
Grijalva	Rooney (FL)	Yarmuth
Gutiérrez	Simpson	

□ 1857

Mr. HONDA and Ms. BASS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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.

Stated for:

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 534 I was not present due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING
VICTIMS OF UMPQUA COMMUNITY
COLLEGE TRAGEDY

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and remember the lives of those who were taken too soon at Umpqua Community College on Thursday, October 1, 2015.

I ask that all Americans pray for the friends and families of these nine victims as they grieve and rebuild from this tragedy.

We must also keep in our thoughts and prayers those who were injured physically and emotionally by this event. It will take time, our support, and patience as they grieve and recover.

Mr. Speaker, Roseburg is a small, strong, and tight-knit community. I am heartened, and not surprised, by the acts of kindness and generosity in response to this unthinkable act. We call that “UCC Strong,” “Roseburg Strong.” It is this strong spirit that will carry everyone through this difficult time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House pause for a moment of silence in honor of those impacted by the tragic events at Umpqua Community College last week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will observe a moment of silence.

REFORMING ACCESS FOR INVESTMENTS
IN STARTUP ENTERPRISES
ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1839) to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to exempt certain transactions involving purchases by accredited investors, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 404, nays 0, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 535]

YEAS—404

Abraham DesJarlais Kennedy
 Adams Deutch Kildee
 Aderholt Diaz-Balart Kilmer
 Aguilar Doggett Kind
 Allen Dold King (IA)
 Amash Donovan King (NY)
 Amodei Doyle, Michael Kinzinger (IL)
 Ashford F. Kirkpatrick
 Babin Duckworth Kline
 Barletta Duffy Knight
 Barr Duncan (SC) Kuster
 Barton Duncan (TN) Labrador
 Bass Edwards LaHood
 Beatty Ellison LaMalfa
 Becerra Ellmers (NC) Lamborn
 Benishek Emmer (MN) Lance
 Bera Eshoo Langevin
 Beyer Esty Larsen (WA)
 Bilirakis Farenthold Larson (CT)
 Bishop (GA) Farr Latta
 Bishop (MI) Fattah Lawrence
 Bishop (UT) Fincher Lee
 Black Fitzpatrick Levin
 Blackburn Fleischmann Lewis
 Blum Fleming Lieu, Ted
 Blumenauer Flores Lipinski
 Bonamici Forbes LoBiondo
 Bost Fortenberry Loebsack
 Boustany Foster Lofgren
 Boyle, Brendan Foxx Long
 F. Frankel (FL) Loudermilk
 Brady (PA) Franks (AZ) Love
 Brady (TX) Frelinghuysen Lowenthal
 Brat Fudge Lroy
 Bridenstine Gabbard Lucas
 Brooks (AL) Gallego Luetkemeyer
 Brooks (IN) Garamendi Lujan Grisham
 Brown (FL) Garrett (NM)
 Brownley (CA) Gibbs Luján, Ben Ray
 Buchanan Gibson (NM)
 Buck Gohmert Lynch
 Bucshon Goodlatte MacArthur
 Burgess Gowdy Maloney
 Bustos Graham Carolyn
 Butterfield Granger Maloney, Sean
 Byrne Graves (GA) Marino
 Calvert Graves (LA) Massie
 Capps Graves (MO) Matsui
 Cardenas Grayson McCarthy
 Carney Green, Al McCaul
 Carson (IN) Green, Gene McClintock
 Carter (GA) Griffith McCollum
 Carter (TX) Grothman McDermott
 Cartwright Guinta McGovern
 Castor (FL) Guthrie McHenry
 Castro (TX) Hanna McKinley
 Chabot Hardy McMorris
 Chaffetz Harper Rodgers
 Chu, Judy Harris McNeerney
 Clark (MA) Hartzler McSally
 Clarke (NY) Hastings Meadows
 Clawson (FL) Heck (NV) Meehan
 Clay Heck (WA) Meeks
 Cleaver Hensarling Meng
 Coffman Herrera Beutler Messer
 Cohen Hice, Jody B. Mica
 Cole Higgins Miller (FL)
 Collins (GA) Hill Miller (MI)
 Collins (NY) Himes Moolenaar
 Comstock Hinojosa Mooney (WV)
 Conaway Holding Moore
 Connolly Honda Moulton
 Cook Hoyer Mullin
 Cooper Huelskamp Mulvaney
 Costa Huffman Murphy (FL)
 Costello (PA) Huizenga (MI) Murphy (PA)
 Courtney Hultgren Nadler
 Cramer Hurd (TX) Napolitano
 Crawford Hurt (VA) Neal
 Crenshaw Israel Neugebauer
 Crowley Issa Newhouse
 Cuellar Jackson Lee Noem
 Culberson Jeffries Nolan
 Cummings Jenkins (KS) Norcross
 Curbeo (FL) Johnson (GA) Nugent
 Davis (CA) Johnson (OH) Nunes
 Davis, Danny Johnson, E. B. O'Rourke
 Davis, Rodney Johnson, Sam Olson
 DeFazio Jolly Palazzo
 DeGette Jones Pallone
 Delaney Jordan Palmer
 DeLauro Joyce Pascrell
 DelBene Katko Paulsen
 Denham Keating Payne
 Dent Kelly (MS) Pearce
 DeSantis Kelly (PA) Pelosi

Perlmutter Ryan (OH)
 Perry Ryan (WI)
 Peters Salmon
 Peterson Sánchez, Linda
 Pingree T.
 Pittenger Sanchez, Loretta
 Pitts Sanford
 Pocan Sarbanes
 Poe (TX) Scalise
 Poliquin Schakowsky
 Polis Schiff
 Pompeo Schrader
 Posey Schweikert
 Price (NC) Scott (VA)
 Price, Tom Scott, Austin
 Quigley Scott, David
 Rangel Sensenbrenner
 Ratcliffe Serrano
 Reichert Sessions
 Renacci Sewell (AL)
 Ribble Sherman
 Rice (NY) Shimkus
 Rice (SC) Shuster
 Richmond Sires
 Rigell Slaughter
 Roby Smith (MO)
 Roe (TN) Smith (NE)
 Rogers (AL) Smith (NJ)
 Rogers (KY) Smith (WA)
 Rohrabacher Speier
 Rokita Stefanik
 Ros-Lehtinen Stewart
 Roskam Stivers
 Ross Stutzman
 Rothfus Swalwell (CA)
 Rouzer Takai
 Roybal-Allard Takano
 Royce Thompson (CA)
 Ruiz Thompson (MS)
 Ruppersberger Thompson (PA)
 Rush Thornberry
 Russell Tiberi

Tipton Titus
 Tonko Torres
 Trotter
 Tsongas Turner
 Upton Valadao
 Van Hollen Vargas
 Veasey Veázquez
 Velázquez Visclosky
 Wagner
 Walberg Walden
 Walker Walters, Mimi
 Walz Wasserman
 Schultze
 Waters, Maxine
 Watson Coleman
 Weber (TX) Webster (FL)
 Welch Wenstrup
 Westerman Wilson (FL)
 Wittman Womack
 Woodall Yoder
 Yoho Young (AK)
 Young (IA) Young (IN)
 Zeldin Zinke

WEST COAST DUNGENESS CRAB MANAGEMENT ACT

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2168) to make the current Dungeness crab fishery management regime permanent and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2168

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 “West Coast Dungeness Crab Management Act”.

SEC. 2. DUNGENESS CRAB FISHERY MANAGEMENT.

Section 203 of the Act entitled “An Act to approve a governing international fishery agreement between the United States and the Republic of Poland, and for other purposes”, approved November 13, 1998 (Public Law 105-384; 16 U.S.C. 1856 note) is amended—
 (1) by striking subsection (i); and
 (2) by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (i).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today, we are considering H.R. 2168, sponsored by my friend and fellow Washingtonian, Congresswoman JAIME HERRERA BEUTLER.

This bipartisan, consensus-based legislation makes permanent the long-standing management of the Dungeness crab fishery by Washington, Oregon, and California. The three States manage this crab fishery under the umbrella of the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission. Management is funded by the participating States.

We must pass legislation to continue this management. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office recently estimated that H.R. 2168 would save the Federal Government up to \$1 million in discretionary Federal spending since State management would continue under this bill.

If State management expires and this bill is not enacted, then the Federal Government would have to expend new resources to manage the fishery. This bill keeps that from happening. The States have shown that they are exemplary at handling this management and it is unnecessary for this authority to fall to the Federal Government.

NOT VOTING—30

Capuano Hahn Simpson
 Cicilline Hudson Sinema
 Clyburn Hunter Smith (TX)
 Conyers Jenkins (WV) Vela
 DeSaulnier Kaptur Walorski
 Dingell Kelly (IL) Westmoreland
 Engel Lummis Whitfield
 Gosar Marchant Williams
 Grijalva Reed Wilson (SC)
 Gutiérrez Rooney (FL) Yarmuth

□ 1909

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 535, I was not present due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for votes on Tuesday, October 6, 2015. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall votes 534 and 535.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZELDIN). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on additional 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.

Any record votes on the postponed questions will be taken later.

This bill is a win for the American taxpayer, a win for the seafood consumer, a win for my home State as well as the States of Oregon and California, and a win for those employed by the sustainable harvest of the species.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

H.R. 2168 would repeal the sunset clause from legislation that allows the West Coast Dungeness crab fishery in Federal waters to be managed cooperatively by the States instead of by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or NOAA.

□ 1915

The Dungeness crab fishery is one of the most valuable fisheries on the Pacific Coast, and it is a model of effective marine resource management.

The specifics of the fishery, including robust stock assessments, accurate catch reporting, and harmony between Federal waters commercial fishermen and near-shore recreational crabbers, make regional management a good choice.

California, Oregon, and Washington have managed the fisheries together with oversight from NOAA since 1980 and have proven they can do so responsibly.

H.R. 2168 would allow the States to continue managing the Dungeness fishery without having to return to Congress every several years for permission.

As opposed to a fishery like the Gulf of Mexico red snapper, management of the Dungeness crab is based on cooperation among States and fishing sectors as well as respect for the best available science, and the States have proven to be good stewards of the resource.

I agree with the goals of this legislation, and I ask my colleagues to stand with me in support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER), my colleague and friend, who has committed to me that she will go to every effort to make sure she has samples of Dungeness crab in her office so we all know what we are talking about.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to support H.R. 2168, the West Coast Dungeness Crab Management Act. This bipartisan bill is an important solution for residents of coastal communities in southwest Washington.

The successful, two-decades-old tri-state Dungeness crab management agreement will expire September 30 of 2016. This bill simply makes permanent the management authority between Washington, Oregon, and California. This management authority has worked.

For the last 20 years, these States have overseen one of the most valuable

fisheries in the Pacific Northwest. In 2014, fishermen delivered 53 million pounds of crab, totaling \$170 million. This economic activity helped support the 61,000 jobs relating to the seafood industry in Washington State alone.

How has it maintained this success? The fishery has been managed in a sustainable way. And, importantly, it doesn't cost taxpayers a dime.

However, should this authority expire, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or NOAA, says its management of the fishery will cost taxpayers over \$1.15 million each year.

So, simply put, this bill maintains local control on the West Coast and ensures sustainability of the Dungeness crab fishery, and it saves taxpayer dollars.

I want to thank Chairman BISHOP and the House Natural Resource staff for bringing this bill to the floor. It is common sense.

I urge the House to vote "yes" on this bill to ensure a bright, sustainable economic future for coastal crab-dependent communities like Ilwaco, Washington, and many others on the West Coast.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2168.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, have no further speakers. I urge my colleagues to support this good, bipartisan piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2168, 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.

ALBUQUERQUE INDIAN SCHOOL LAND TRANSFER ACT

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 986) to require the Secretary of the Interior to take into trust 4 parcels of Federal land for the benefit of certain Indian Pueblos in the State of New Mexico.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 986

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 "Albuquerque Indian School Land Transfer Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) 19 PUEBLOS.—The term "19 Pueblos" means the New Mexico Indian Pueblos of—

- (A) Acoma;
- (B) Cochiti;
- (C) Isleta;

- (D) Jemez;
- (E) Laguna;
- (F) Nambe;
- (G) Ohkay Owingeh (San Juan);
- (H) Picuris;
- (I) Pojoaque;
- (J) San Felipe;
- (K) San Ildefonso;
- (L) Sandia;
- (M) Santa Ana;
- (N) Santa Clara;
- (O) Santo Domingo;
- (P) Taos;
- (Q) Tesuque;
- (R) Zia; and
- (S) Zuni.

(2) MAP.—The term "map" means the map entitled "The Town of Albuquerque Grant, Bernalillo County, within Township 10 North, Range 3 East, of the New Mexico Principal Meridian, New Mexico—Metes and Bounds Survey" and dated August 12, 2011.

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

SEC. 3. LAND TAKEN INTO TRUST FOR BENEFIT OF 19 PUEBLOS.

(a) ACTION BY SECRETARY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall take into trust all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land described in subsection (b) for the benefit of the 19 Pueblos immediately after the Secretary determines that the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) have been satisfied regarding the trust acquisition of the Federal land.

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary shall—

(A) take such action as the Secretary determines to be necessary to document the transfer under paragraph (1); and

(B) appropriately assign each applicable private and municipal utility and service right or agreement.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The Federal land referred to in subsection (a)(1) is the 4 tracts of Federal land, the combined acreage of which is approximately 11.11 acres, that were historically part of the Albuquerque Indian School, more particularly described as follows:

(1) ABANDONED INDIAN SCHOOL ROAD.—The approximately 0.83 acres located in sec. 7 and sec. 8 of T. 10 N., R. 3 E., of the New Mexico Principal Meridian in Albuquerque, New Mexico, as identified on the map.

(2) SOUTHERN PART TRACT D.—The approximately 6.18 acres located in sec. 7 of T. 10 N., R. 3 E., of the New Mexico Principal Meridian in Albuquerque, New Mexico, as identified on the map.

(3) TRACT 1.—The approximately 0.41 acres located in sec. 7 of T. 10 N., R. 3 E., of the New Mexico Principal Meridian in Albuquerque, New Mexico, as identified on the map.

(4) WESTERN PART TRACT B.—The approximately 3.69 acres located in sec. 7 of T. 10 N., R. 3 E., of the New Mexico Principal Meridian in Albuquerque, New Mexico, as identified on the map.

(c) SURVEY.—The Secretary shall conduct a survey of the Federal land to be transferred consistent with subsection (b) and may make minor corrections to the survey and legal description of the Federal land described in subsection (b) as the Secretary determines to be necessary to correct clerical, typographical, and surveying errors.

(d) USE OF LAND.—The Federal land taken into trust under subsection (a) shall be used for the educational, health, cultural, business, and economic development of the 19 Pueblos.

(e) LIMITATIONS AND CONDITIONS.—The Federal land taken into trust under subsection (a) shall remain subject to any private or

municipal encumbrance, right-of-way, restriction, easement of record, or utility service agreement in effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(f) BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS USE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The 19 Pueblos shall allow the Bureau of Indian Affairs to continue to use the land taken into trust under subsection (a) for the facilities and purposes as in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, in accordance with paragraph (2).

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The use by the Bureau of Indian Affairs under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) be free of any rental charge; and

(B) continue until such time as the Secretary determines there is no further need for the existing Bureau of Indian Affairs facilities.

SEC. 4. EFFECT OF OTHER LAWS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), Federal land taken into trust under section 3(a) shall be subject to Federal laws relating to Indian land.

(b) GAMING.—No class I gaming, class II gaming, or class III gaming (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2703)) shall be carried out on the Federal land taken into trust under section 3(a).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 986, which would direct the Secretary of the Interior to place 11 acres of Federal land into trust for the collective benefit of 19 Pueblos in the State of New Mexico.

These 11 acres were historically part of the Albuquerque Indian School site, which are culturally and historically significant to the Pueblos. Upon transfer, the lands may be used by the 19 Pueblos for the educational, health, cultural, business, and economic development purposes by these Pueblo tribes. One important thing to note is this land may not be used for gaming purposes under this bill.

Since 1976, the 19 Pueblos have used the lands of the former Albuquerque Indian School for the cultural and economic benefit of the 19 Pueblos. This is the last portion of Federal lands of the former school site, which has not been conveyed to the 19 Pueblos.

This bill is supported by the entire New Mexico congressional delegation. Recognizing the support of the local delegation, the House companion bill, H.R. 1880, sponsored by Congresswoman LUJAN GRISHAM, was favorably reported by the Natural Resources Committee on September 30 of 2015.

I urge passage of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, Senate bill S. 986 would direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey approximately 11 acres of land to the United States to be held in trust for the 19 Pueblos of New Mexico.

The land taken into trust shall be used for the educational, health, cultural, business, and economic development of the 19 Pueblos.

Passage of this bill will finally complete the process started in 1969 when the United States began converting the Albuquerque Indian School Reserve into land under the jurisdiction and control of the 19 Pueblos.

I would like to thank our colleague, Ms. LUJAN GRISHAM, for introducing and championing the House version of the act and to Chairman BISHOP and Ranking Member GRIJALVA for moving it swiftly through committee.

I would also like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Washington, for joining me tonight in managing this bill.

Just as Mr. NEWHOUSE stated, this legislation is supported by the entire New Mexico delegation. I urge its quick adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM), the sponsor of the House version of the bill.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative SABLAN and Representative NEWHOUSE for their support. I also thank Chairman BISHOP and Ranking Member GRIJALVA for their help in bringing this legislation to the floor. Of course, I extend my gratitude to our Senator TOM UDALL for working with me on this important piece of legislation.

I am the proud sponsor of the House companion to the Albuquerque Indian School Land Transfer Act, which, as you have heard, directs the Secretary of the Interior to take into trust four tracts of land for the New Mexico 19 Pueblos.

The land taken into the trust would be used for educational, health, cultural, business, and economic development of the New Mexico Pueblos. The four parcels are located within a former Federal Indian boarding school site called the 1884 Albuquerque Indian School Reserve in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

In 1969, the United States started the long process of converting the Reserve into land under the jurisdiction and control of the New Mexico Pueblos. Since then, Congress has enacted legislation in 1978, 2001, and 2008 to convey additional land from the Reserve in trust for the New Mexico Pueblos.

Pursuant to the 2008 legislation, the Bureau of Land Management conducted

a new survey of the former school properties and identified minor discrepancies in the previous trust deeds and, also, identified the correct boundaries of two additional tracts of land within the Reserve that the Bureau of Indian Affairs no longer needed for its administrative functions.

This legislation addresses those technical discrepancies identified by BLM's survey, and it would complete the process of transferring BIA's portion of the Reserve to New Mexico's Pueblos.

This transfer allows the Pueblos to expand their current economic development plan for the region, which creates jobs, expands educational and cultural opportunities, while continuing to generate revenue for the New Mexico Pueblos.

I urge my colleagues to support this noncontroversial legislation, which, as you have heard, has the support of the entire New Mexico delegation and would benefit the New Mexico 19 Pueblos.

Mr. SABLAN. We have no further speakers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to support S. 986.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 986.

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.

NEW ENGLAND FISHERMAN PRESERVATION ACT

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

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, heavy new fines the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration is proposing could destroy New Hampshire's remaining fishermen who are carrying on a proud New England tradition.

That is why I recently introduced legislation to stop the Federal agency from shifting its funding responsibility to our struggling Granite State fishermen.

NOAA mandates that at-sea contractors monitor their daily catch, but will cease to pay for this government mandate in December, forcing fishermen to pick up the more than \$700 per day tab.

These small family businesses will be on the hook for thousands of dollars in new fees each month. That is a figure that would simply eradicate the industry in my home State.

This is not a partisan issue. The New England Fisherman Preservation Act simply asks the Federal agency to continue paying for a program it has funded for years rather than forcing hard-working, middle-class families to pay for it.

I am asking colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in support of this bill, so important to hardworking fishermen who put food on our tables so that they can continue with their task.

□ 1930

AMERICAN VETERANS DISABLED FOR LIFE MEMORIAL

(Ms. FRANKEL of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am the proud mother of a United States Marine war veteran, and our family is blessed he returned home with sound body and mind, but too many of our courageous heroes did not.

October 5 marks the 1-year anniversary of the dedication of the American Veterans Disabled for Life Memorial. It is a beautiful tribute to the brave men and women who suffered permanent injuries on the battlefield. This memorial sits just south of our Capitol, and it reminds us every day of the selflessness of those who fought for our freedom and returned home with the scars of duty.

I offer my great thanks and appreciation to the 4 million veterans who are living today with service-related disabilities and the friends and the family who take care of them. The American Veterans Disabled for Life Memorial celebrates your lives every day, as we all do in our hearts and our minds.

HONORING THE DEDICATION OF THE TOTI MENDEZ CARDIOPULMONARY DIAGNOSTIC SUITE

(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 today to recognize the tragically short life of Ramiro "Toti" Mendez and to honor the dedication of the Toti Mendez Cardiopulmonary Diagnostic Suite at Florida International University, my alma mater, in Miami.

Toti was an accomplished 20-year-old FIU student baseball player who passed away, sadly, on April 2, 2000, as a result of an undetected heart problem. Florida International University will celebrate the dedication of this important health resource on Monday, October 19. Parents of student athletes may now find the peace of mind that their sons or daughters are clear of any underlying heart issues before they ever hit the field.

Through the Toti Mendez Cardiopulmonary Diagnostic Suite, Toti's legacy will continue to live on at FIU in support of other student athletes throughout south Florida, indeed, throughout our great State.

I congratulate Toti's mom and the entire family for helping keep his leg-

acy alive and for saving so many student athletes' lives.

THE ROBOGALS ARE AN INSPIRATION TO YOUNG WOMEN

(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, I rise today in honor of the triumph of the RoboGals, a student robotics team from the 11th Congressional District of Illinois.

The RoboGals are Kaiya Hollister, a fifth grader at the John C. Dunham STEM Partnership School, and Jensie Coonradt, a fourth grader at The Wheatlands Elementary School, both in Aurora, Illinois. They met at an after-school robotics club hosted by Chasewood Learning, an educational organization that uses Lego robots to teach students how to build and program their machines for competition.

After winning the regional competition at SciTech Hands On Museum in Aurora, Illinois, the RoboGals went on to win the national championship of the World Robotic Olympiad in Michigan. Now they advance to the world championship round in Qatar, taking on over 50 countries from all over the globe. I, together with all Americans, wish them the best of luck.

The RoboGals are an inspiration to young women across our country who are enthusiastic about science and engineering, and the 11th Congressional District is proud to have such bright young women representing our country on the global stage.

NUMBERS NEVER LIE—UNLESS THEY DO

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the numbers never lie—unless they do.

Each month we all react to the release of the employment report as the supposed indicator of economic health around our country. The most recent jobs numbers show an unemployment rate of 5.1 percent, but that headline number paints a picture that simply doesn't exist. It distorts the economic outlook and distracts this Chamber from working toward the creation of better jobs and more opportunities for millions of Americans.

Economists of all persuasions have criticized this method as overstating job market strength, noting that the Bureau of Labor Statistics only considers limited factors when reporting the unemployment rate and ignoring things like underemployment or the number of workers who have left the labor force. What we are left with is a flawed view of labor market strength.

With that in mind, I have joined with colleagues in introducing the Labor Statistics Improvement Act, which

would clear the way for changes in methodology that could help the unemployment rate more accurately reflect the strength of the labor market.

If the jobs report dictates how this Congress addresses real economic challenges, we can't afford to get it wrong.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ERMA JOHNSON HADLEY

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a dedicated Fort Worth community leader, Erma Johnson Hadley, who passed away last week after a very long battle with cancer.

Mrs. Hadley was born in Leggett, Texas, where she graduated from high school in 1959 and became the first Black woman from Leggett to attend college. Mrs. Hadley attended Prairie View A&M University.

When she finished her career teaching in high school, she came to Tarrant County College, where she served in a variety of different roles, including vice chancellor, and was ultimately named the interim chancellor and chancellor in 2010 of the Tarrant County College system.

Chancellor Hadley was known for her passion for ensuring accessible and affordable education for students in Tarrant County. I will never forget Mrs. Erma Johnson Hadley telling me a story about how while all kids are not necessarily gifted equally, all kids that put their mind to it, if their parents work with them, can get a good education and make something of themselves.

Mrs. Hadley believed in each and every student that attended Tarrant County College, and I know that the campus and the students are going to continue to benefit from her legacy and her belief in them.

She is survived by her husband, Bill Hadley; Ardenia Johnson Gould, who is her daughter; and Spencer Gould, her son-in-law; and a grandchild.

IT IS TIME FOR CONGRESS TO ACT

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this is a very difficult time for Americans as we mourn with our fellow citizens in Oregon. I offer my deepest sympathy to the congressional delegation here in the Congress, as we join them in their expression of deep sympathy to those who were injured and those who lost their lives, to the families of those individuals.

I spoke to a member of the United States military, and he indicated that in battle he had two guns. We understand that the perpetrator of this horrible act had at least 14 guns, or double-digit guns.

I have heard the refrain: "What else will have to happen before we address

the question of gun regulation and gun safety?" Mr. Speaker, it is time now to ask the question of an extended waiting period so that someone would not amass 14, 15, 30 guns, more than the United States military, and a serious background check dealing with any issues that would impact a person's stability in having guns.

Yes, people do kill, not guns, but they use guns to kill. I have been through too many of these, Mr. Speaker, from Columbine to this incident. Every single one I have been through since being in the United States Congress. It is time for the Congress to act.

IMPORTANT ISSUES THAT AFFECT AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, the attention of the House is drawn to many, many issues this week. Certainly, the tragedy in Oregon draws all of our attention, our sympathy, but unfortunately not our vote. We have never really had a vote here on the floor of the House to deal with this issue of gun safety; although, legislation has been passed around many, many times.

Even the most conservative columnists are now saying that we must take action, and we really should. So I will just start by saying to all of our colleagues: Let's vote, vote up or down on the various proposals that have been made.

Certainly the attention of this body is turned to who is going to be the next Speaker. It seems to occupy most of the discussion and most of the articles in the newspapers around this town. It is important, but there are many, many other issues that come before the House. Some of them are really going to affect America.

I want to talk about one of them today, and it is in the context of something we have been discussing here for the last 4 or 5 years. We call it Make It In America. It is about rebuilding the American manufacturing sector. It is about rebuilding the American middle class. It is about creating jobs in America by doing what we once did so very, very well, which is manufacturing. Make things: big things, little things, all kinds of things. We call it our Make It In America agenda.

I am going to go through it very quickly here and then focus on one piece of this agenda. Here it is: trade policies. This is going to take a lot of time to discuss this. We are not going to go into it today, but the President announced just in the last couple days that the Trans-Pacific Partnership deal is done.

Now, we don't know what is in it. We have—at least I have—great concerns

about this and that it will be one more step in hollowing out the American manufacturing sector, but it is all secret. We don't know yet. We will find out soon enough, and we will undoubtedly come back and talk about trade.

Taxes and tax policies, I will hit on this in a few moments.

Labor issues, well, that ties back to the trade issue and whether we are going to send more of our jobs overseas.

Education, research, infrastructure, today I really want to focus on this energy and infrastructure. If you bear with me a few moments, I want to go into this in some detail.

For many, many years, we have tried to make America energy independent, and in the last 5 years, 6 years now, we have seen an enormous increase in the production of energy in the United States.

Now, a lot of that energy has come from green technologies—solar, wind, and biofuels—and many other ways of producing renewable energy called green energy. That is good because all of that reduces greenhouse gas emissions, and we need to do more of it.

Frankly, we need tax policy.

Maybe I will put this back up again so I can point out the way in which the Make It In America agenda fits all of this.

Tax policy has a great deal to do with green energy. There are tax breaks for solar installation on your home, solar installation for businesses, the production tax credit for wind and solar. All of these things make it really possible to advance the green energy agenda.

Tax policy also has a great deal to do with the other part of our energy independence—we are not quite there, but we are making great advances on it—and that has to do with petroleum products: natural gas and crude oil.

There has been much talk about the Bakken revolution in Wyoming and North Dakota producing a lot of energy. We are talking about different techniques to extract oil, enhanced oil production, otherwise known as fracking. All of these things have led to an explosion—well, literally, in the case of the Bakken fuel because it is highly volatile, and it does explode when trains tip over.

But what we are talking about here is an explosion in the volume of oil and natural gas produced in America. We have literally doubled the production of natural gas and oil over the last 5 to 6 years, bringing down the cost of fuel. Also, around the world, the slowdown of the Chinese economy and Europe have reduced the demand for oil, and we are seeing a reduced price of oil on the world market, even at a time when we are seeing more and more production of crude oil and natural gas here in the United States.

What does all this mean to the oil industry, to the petroleum industry? It means they have got a lot of oil, and the United States is not consuming all

of it or as much as they would like to keep the prices up. So guess what they want to do. They want to export oil. Isn't that something?

□ 1945

How do we become energy-independent if we are exporting oil? Well, we have got a lot of interesting economic arguments about how that could be done. I am saying I don't think so.

I don't think it is in the interest of the United States to take a strategic national asset—natural gas, crude oil—and export it to China. It may be good for China. It certainly would be good for the energy industry, the petroleum industry. Wow, they have got a new market.

You see, right now there is a Federal ban on the export of crude oil to other countries, with the exception of Mexico and Canada. We swap crude oil back and forth. A little bit of crude oil is also shipped out of the United States from the North Slope of Alaska.

A very interesting law was established back in the seventies, when there was this energy crisis and there were long lines at the gasoline pumps. That law said: No. You cannot export crude oil.

And then later, in the 1990s, there was a little opening provided for Mexico and Canada and for Alaska North Slope oil. It could be shipped to other countries—exported—with this caveat: You cannot increase domestic oil prices.

I don't know that that was ever enforced. We certainly saw the gasoline prices zip to the top last year. Now it is coming back down, and that is good. It is bad that it went up, good that it is coming down.

But I don't think the Department of Energy or the Department of Commerce really enforced what was in the law about the export of crude oil from Alaska.

So we have got this strategic asset—natural gas and crude oil—that has allowed us to have a resurgence of American manufacturing. They are coming home. American manufacturers are coming home to make it in America.

Dow, a big chemical operation, is coming back to America because natural gas prices are low. Other companies are doing the same thing. Because the United States has a strategic advantage as a result of strategic assets: oil and natural gas, together with green energy.

So what does the petroleum industry want to do? They want to ruin all of that. They want to take the strategic assets and ship them overseas.

This week the House of Representatives is going to take up a piece of legislation that opens the spigot for the export of crude oil. There is already an open spigot for the export of natural gas. I will come to that in a few moments.

So is this in the interest of the United States? Well, if you are in the oil patch—North Dakota, Texas, maybe

even California—maybe it is good. Maybe you will be able to make a little more money.

But at the expense of who? America, American consumers at the pump, truckers, trains. All of those use diesel produced here in the United States from our refineries.

So good for the petroleum industry, but bad for America. We ought not do that. And if you would consider for a few moments that, should we ever allow the export of crude oil, we ought to put some serious caveats on that piece of legislation.

But just today the Rules Committee of this House decided no, no, no caveats. Just a bare bill. Open the spigot. Send the crude oil overseas. Don't worry about the price of fuel. Don't worry about the price of energy in the United States. Worry about the bottom line of the petroleum industry.

I say time out. Wait a minute. This is America. This is about the American economy. This is about men and women that go to the gas pump and buy gasoline, farmers out there having to buy diesel in order to plow their fields and harvest their crops, trains moving goods and services back across the United States, the airline industry.

This is not just about the petroleum industry. This is a big deal for America. If we take a strategic national asset and just allow it to go anywhere in the world so that it is to the benefit of a small, but important, slice of the American economy, we are making a big mistake.

So let me just put some caveats on this piece of legislation. Harken back to the Alaska situation back in 1995 where they opened the spigot. They put in a caveat that said: No. You can't do it if it results in an adverse effect on the price of transportation fuels and home heating fuels in the United States.

Does the legislation we have this week have any caveats on it? No. It doesn't have that one.

Let me give you another caveat. If we are going to ship a strategic national asset overseas, why don't we look at other strategic assets in the United States, shipbuilding?

The entire United States Navy is dependent on American shipyards for all of their ships. Those shipyards no longer produce large, ocean-going commercial vessels. All of that has been off to China, off to Korea and Japan. All of those countries subsidize those shipyards. We don't do it in the United States.

But we can put caveats on the export of this crude oil and simply say, if we are going to export crude oil, caveat one, not at the expense of American consumers; two, not at the expense of American refiners and other strategic asset—the refinery of these petroleum products; and, three, ship it on American-built ships with American mariners.

Right now there are over 400,000 men and women working in the shipyards

producing smaller ships for trade within the coastal zone of the United States and for the barges up and down the rivers and canals of the United States, but not building ocean-going tankers. What does it mean? Well, let me just give you an example.

It has been estimated that the maximum amount of oil that could be shipped is somewhere about 3.6 million barrels a day. That is at the top level. Hopefully, they will never get close to that because that is almost certain to raise prices. But let's say that they do.

For the largest tanker currently on the ocean today—these are the maximum tankers, too large to even go through the new Panama Canal and larger than the Panamax ships—it would take 180 ships to handle 3.6 million barrels of oil a day.

What if those ships were American-built ships? This isn't Saudi Arabian oil. This isn't Iraqi oil, Venezuelan oil. This is American oil. What if we require that that oil be shipped on American ships and suddenly, over the next decade or two, our shipyards were to build 180 supertankers or, if they are Panamax-size ships, 384 Panamax-size ships?

Think of the employment that would take place in the American shipyards and then through the entire supply train, all of the engines, all of the communications, all of the electronics, all of the pumps, all of the valves. We could see a resurgence in American manufacturing.

Who benefits from this? Americans benefit. Americans benefit in the shipyards and in the manufacturing facilities all across this Nation.

But, no, we are not going to do that here on the House floor. We are going to simply take a bill that opens the spigot and that gives the benefits to the oil patch, to the petroleum industry.

And I am not saying that is not good for them. There will certainly be jobs. There will be some construction jobs, and there will be oil rigs that will have to be built. That is good.

But think what we could do if we had a law that said: Okay. We are going to ship, but we are going to protect the domestic price of refined products, we are going to protect the American refineries, we are going to build American ships, and we are going to put American mariners on those ships.

We are talking about tens of thousands, if not a hundred thousand, new jobs in the United States. That is a good thing for the middle class. That is a good thing for America.

We can do it by simply amending the oil export bill. But it is not going to happen. The majority here isn't going to allow that. They are simply going to pass a bill that opens the spigot.

It is a shame. Shame on all of us if we would allow that to happen. Shame on us if we do not protect the American consumer. Shame on us if we do not protect the American maritime industry, the shipyards of America, the American middle class.

Watch closely. It is going to happen. It is going to happen here on the House floor this week while all of the attention of America is looking at this Speakership thing.

Okay. That is where we are on one critical issue. I want to take up one more and then I will call it a night.

That is a new Amtrak locomotive for the Eastern Corridor, and it is 100 percent American-made. Why is it 100 percent American-made for the first time in decades—well, at least a decade and a half—and that the United States is once again producing locomotives?

By the way, that is made near my district, in Sacramento. It is about 4 or 5 miles from the edge of my district. Several hundred men and women are employed doing this.

Why did this happen? Because the Congress wrote policy that said your taxpayer dollars are going to be used not to buy a locomotive made in China or Japan or Europe, but to buy a locomotive made in America, made in America. Your tax dollars are being used to build locomotives in America.

It is part of a transportation policy, which is where I want to go now. Before I do, I guess I forgot this.

This is a liquefied natural gas tanker. I was just talking about crude oil and what could be done. This is another one. If we are going to export our natural gas—that strategic asset—it ought to be exported on American-made liquefied natural tankers.

A new facility is opening down in Texas to export liquefied natural gas. That facility will take 100 tankers for that one facility. Not to worry. Those tankers are going to be made in China, Japan, Korea. They are not going to be made in America.

But under 16 lines of law—all we need to do is write 16 lines of law—we would be manufacturing these tankers in the United States.

It is the same argument that I made about the crude oil tankers. I won't go into it in any more detail. This is one of the great could-do's, should-do's, ought-to-do's for America.

So the export of these strategic national assets—natural gas, petroleum—why don't we build them in America? Why don't we make it in America?

I started to talk about the locomotives. October 29 is just about 23 days from today. The highway trust fund is out of money. Once again, we are on one of those cliffs—this time, a transportation cliff—and we have got to do something.

And so what are we going to do? The President proposed the GROW America Act. It provides money for our crumbling transportation system, the infrastructure structure.

There is a rail portion of it, locomotives, improving the rail system. There are buses, ports, bridges, and highways. It is a very, very good piece of legislation. It is \$476 billion over the next 6 years. It is a big deal.

□ 2000

It helps America come from number, I think, 18 in the infrastructure capability compared to other nations of the world.

China has, I don't know, 5,000, 3,000 miles of high-speed rail. The United States has zero. Chinese airports, Japanese airports. I think even Cuba is now in the process of building a new deep-water port to take the Panamax ships.

And what are we doing? Not much. The Grow America Act is totally stalled. It is not going anywhere right now.

But we have got 23 days. So what are we proposing? Are we proposing something that will increase the rail capacity in the United States, that will combine rail, ports, and highways into a system to provide for goods movement, freight movement, integrated? No, we are not going to do such a thing. Other countries do it. Hey, but this is America. We just like to fall behind.

So where are we with the Grow America Act? Well, some of us have introduced it. Some of us think we ought to do something like this, that we really ought to pay for our infrastructure.

Oh, by the way, this doesn't raise gas taxes. It doesn't raise diesel taxes, but it does require that those American corporations that have skipped out on their obligation to their home country to bring their profits back to the United States and be taxed.

So we maintain the existing excise tax on gasoline and fuel, and we pay for the rest of this by having American corporations pay their just due to this Nation by repatriating their foreign earnings hidden off somewhere in Ireland or some other tax havens, not taxed, even though they are American corporations.

Oh, and some of this stuff is just too good.

Apple, an American company, all of their manufacturing is overseas, and most of their profits are overseas also because, even though it is invented here, even though the software, even though the new equipment is invented in California, it is licensed in Ireland, and the profits stay in Ireland and are taxed there at a very low percentage—not fair to America.

So those profits would come home from other companies as well, and it would fill this \$476 billion over 6 years.

I want to just go through some of this, and then we will wrap this up.

The Grow America Act would provide \$52 billion a year for highways. We are presently spending \$41 billion a year for highways, so we are looking at something \$11 billion more for highways. Maybe there won't be so many potholes. Maybe one out of four bridges in the United States will get repaired. Right now, they are deficient. They could fall down. They are insufficient in capacity. Maybe we could do that.

Now, the Senate has done a little better. The Senate has passed a highway bill that is \$46 billion a year, which is \$5 billion more than we are currently

spending, and that is good. It is a 5-year program that is only paid for in 3 years.

Huh? How does that work? It doesn't, but it is a good start. But the Grow America Act, \$52 billion a year.

Anybody take buses in the United States? Anybody take BART in California, or the Metro system in Los Angeles, or here in Washington, the Metro, or the subways in Chicago, New York, Atlanta and so forth? That is called transit. We are presently spending about \$10 billion, \$10.6 billion a year on transit, supporting these transportation systems. The Senate bill adds about \$2 billion, so they go to \$12.5 billion.

The Grow America Act, let's get on with it. Let's build those systems. \$19 billion, without raising your fuel taxes.

But if you happen to be those American companies that have skipped out on their obligation to this Nation, they are going to wind up paying their fair share.

So we go from 10.6 for transit, \$10.6 billion annually for transit, to \$19 billion in the Grow America Act.

Remember, I put some of these trains up here? We presently spend \$1.4 billion on our rail system—not the transit. This is the heavy rail system. The Senate would go to \$2.2 billion, and the Grow America Act would go to \$4.7 billion.

Are we going to do this? Not likely. Not likely.

We have perfected a childhood game here in the House of Representatives and the Senate. In fact, your American Government has perfected this game. Something, when you didn't have a ball to kick around, you would kick a can around. It is called kick the can down the road. We have perfected that. I think we have done it more than 30 times to transportation over the last decade and a half.

We are highly likely to do it again, as the attention of America and the attention here amongst all of us is focused on the Speakership fights, which will culminate at the end of October when the Speaker retires and we will have a new vote. But in the intervening 23 days, are we going to focus on a transportation program for America or are we going to focus on the internal politics of the House of Representatives?

I will tell you where I would put my money. I would put my money on the House of Representatives worrying about the internal politics of who is going to be the next leader and not paying attention to what America wants us to do.

America wants us to pay attention to their needs, not to the internal politics of this place, but to the needs of America, American jobs for American workers.

Can we build ships? Oh, yeah, we can build ships.

Can we build liquefied natural gas tankers? You bet we can. We are already building ships that are fueled by

liquefied natural gas. We are doing it in San Diego. We know how to do this. We would have to ramp up. We are not going to build 180 ships in 1 year, but we sure could over the next two decades.

But maybe we care more about the petroleum industry than we do about the American worker and the American sailor and the shipyards of America. I am afraid that is the way it is likely to be here.

I notice that I am joined here by an extraordinary woman from what used to be the manufacturing center of the United States, the Midwest, Ohio, to be quite clear.

MARCY KAPTUR, I have been going on for more than I probably should have in time but, boy, these are important issues. These are really important issues. Please join us.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman from California for being an extraordinary leader on Make It In America and restoring prosperity to all corners of this country. The citizens of California really have sent an amazing Congressman to speak on behalf of the Nation and the importance of making items in America.

It is probably a tragedy, over the last three decades, that we have accumulated over \$9 trillion in trade deficit, which translates into lost wealth, lost income for America's families, and, ultimately, a budget deficit that we just can't get under control because people aren't earning enough. So much economic activity has been outsourced that there are many who have forgotten how much manufacturing actually matters.

So I agree with the gentleman. Make it in America, grow it in America, use the technology of America to transform farm field products into ethanol and biodiesel.

Let us use the sun. Let us invent our way forward to become energy independent because, at some point, not in our lifetime, but at some point over the next 100 years, the oil wells will run dry, and even the natural gas fields currently being discovered in Ohio and Pennsylvania, which are mother lode supplies with horizontal drilling, those are finite and they will be gone. So the world with many more people is going to have to figure out how to sustain life.

The gentleman has addressed many of these issues in terms of energy production, America's need to become energy secure, which would create prosperity here at home, and also all the investments of hard infrastructure on rail, on over-the-road, air transportation.

I have to add, obviously, our ports and, in my part of the country, the Great Lakes St. Lawrence Seaway so in need of infrastructure improvement, several billion dollars actually.

We are having a Great Lakes St. Lawrence Seaway meeting tomorrow

morning, inviting in many of the business interests along the seaway and looking for ways in our transportation bill where we can make more investment in that region so it can sing fully economically again.

So I thank the gentleman for a moment here. And believe me, I unite with you in your efforts to make America fully strong again, and Make It In America can lead us down that path.

Mr. GARAMENDI. You have been a leader on these issues for many, many years and certainly in your territory of Ohio. You saw what happened when the manufacturing plants left; but they are coming back, and we can make policy to do that.

I think you may have other things that you would like to bring to our attention. You are certainly welcome to do so.

I think with that, it is time for me to say “enough,” or maybe I have said too much already.

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

MENTAL HEALTH WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MCSALLY). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, this evening, just before votes, I went outside on the balcony here of this Capitol to watch the sun set. It was one of those beautiful evenings of crimson and gold and gray clouds silhouetted against the twilight glow of the evening. And then I glanced over to the buildings here at the Capitol and was suddenly brought back to reality when I saw so many flags on our buildings flying at half mast, flying at half mast because, once again, we are remembering the tragedies that have shaken our Nation time and time again.

This has been a bloody summer, a bloody summer of many attacks that have been associated with folks with mental illness.

I know most people with mental illness are not violent, and I know that there are many other tragedies that occur; but tonight, during this week, which is Mental Health Week in America, I want to highlight, Madam Speaker, what we must do as a nation, what we cannot continue to push aside.

Just think of what happened this summer, just a few examples:

June 13, attack on the Dallas Police headquarters by a man who had a history of family violence and mental instability;

July 23, Lafayette, Louisiana, a shooting in a movie theater by a man who had had a judge’s orders to send him to a mental hospital in the past;

August 16, Antioch, Tennessee, a movie theater attack;

August 26, Roanoke, Virginia, a live, on-air shooting, a tragic scene of a reporter being killed, and a cameraman;

August 28, 2015, Houston, Texas, while a deputy police officer was at a gas station, riddled with bullets by a man who had a history of mental illness;

September 22, the son of a State senator, former State senator of Virginia, killed a man, and also killed himself in Bowling Green;

And this last week, October 1, in Roseburg, Oregon, nine people were killed, and the gunman killed himself in another tragic scene.

There is more to it than this, of course. In this country last year, 125 people with mental illness were killed in some sort of a police shooting where the police oftentimes did not even know, but the confrontation grew and ended in a death.

It is estimated there were somewhere between 1,200 and 1,500 murders in this country this last year by people with mental illness. But more than that, there are 10,000 or more, maybe 20,000, maybe 100,000 people with mental illness who are the victims of crime. Some are killed.

There are thousands and thousands of people who are homeless, who die that slow-motion death of homelessness, of their physical ailments and their illnesses.

There were 41,000 suicide deaths, 1.2 million suicide attempts that required some medical care, 43,000 substance abuse overdose deaths. This list goes on and on and on.

And what happens is, when we treat people with mental illness early in their life, their prognosis is improved. In many cases, they can go on to have fruitful lives. But when it is untreated, they likely develop other problems, not just with mental illness, but social, job, and physical health.

Persons with serious mental illness, in treatment, are 15 times less likely to engage in an act of violence than those who are not in treatment.

□ 2015

In America, some 60 million people in any given year will have some diagnosable mental illness, from the very mild and transient ones, which we all experience, to severe mental illness, such as schizophrenia or bipolar or extreme depression. But of those with serious mental illness, about 4 million of those 11 million will not have any treatment for a variety of reasons: treatment may not be available; they may refuse treatment; or what happens so often with those with serious mental illness, they are characteristically unaware that they have an illness—it is a brain illness, a serious mental illness—like a person with Alzheimer’s or stroke or traumatic brain injury, a person who may not even know that they have a problem.

What do we do about this as a nation? Mostly we just talk. Sadly and tragically, what we do here in the House of Representatives, we will have a moment of silence, but it is not followed by action. What we need is not more silence. We need action.

Madam Speaker, we need people in this country to rise up and say: This is the time. This is the day. This is the issue where we are, once and for all, going to do comprehensive reform of our mental health system in America.

Our mental health system in America is fragmented at best, a system with regulations that are abusive and neglectful towards those with serious mental illness. And more so, it is worse if you are a minority or low-income.

This is odd because in a field that is filled with some of the most compassionate and caring people I know, people I have had the pleasure to work side by side with in my role as a psychologist, we have Federal policies and State policies that leave their hands tied, their eyes blinded, and their mouths gagged to prevent treatment from occurring. Ultimately, the individuals suffer and their families suffer.

Tonight we will review what the problem is and what can be done systematically, thoroughly, and definitively, what this country must do if we are serious about treating mental illness.

One of my colleagues from the Toledo area, who represents northern Ohio, is with us now. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank you, Congressman MURPHY, for yielding to me. I want to say how fortunate the country is that the people of Pennsylvania have elected you here to serve the people of our Nation with the strong background that you have and with the obvious depths of knowledge that you have about those who are mentally ill and the compassion you have in a field that is very difficult, where the answers still remain incomplete.

I want to be on the floor this evening to say to those who are listening in the Chamber, to those who may be listening outside, your efforts to draft the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, H.R. 2646, is a watershed moment in this Congress.

I have served in this Congress a lot longer than the others on the floor this evening. I was here in 1998 when, sadly, we lost two of our Capitol Police officers, Jacob Chestnut and John Gibson. A diagnosed schizophrenic receiving Federal SSI benefits but off his medicines and estranged from his family headed on a rampage all across the country, all the way from the West to here, and delusionally, he set out to quash, I guess, a purple force he had tracked here to the Capitol.

He broke into the majority leader’s office. All the staff went under the desks. I thought, well, maybe this is the moment that Congress will finally face up to the violent impulses that have fallen right at our knees. I said, but I would wager one of two things will happen: either we will finally cut the mustard and do what is right, or we will have more barricades and armed officers. Well, it was the latter option that actually happened.

As we mourn the deaths of nine innocent victims at Umpqua Community

College, I commend Congressman MURPHY of Pennsylvania for putting a bill forward that forces us to probe deeply the pattern of these mass shootings. We need to know the perpetrators.

We understand the perpetrator in Oregon had served in the U.S. military for a very brief time. He was discharged. And my question to the U.S. military is: Why? Why was he discharged? Did you discharge him to care if you saw a pattern that needed treatment? Or did you close your eyes too? Because that has happened repeatedly in the U.S. military, though I must say that they are doing a little bit better, because some of their own members have now been killed around the country because of individuals who face very severe illnesses in their own lives and have simply never had the kind of doctor to help them come out of the dark shadows of the existence in which they have been living.

Many of these individuals have been abandoned by their families. Many times they are expelled from school.

As you look around the country and you see the people who commit these heinous, heinous crimes and then many times take their own life, they are completely alone or they are living with one member of their family, abandoned by their other family members and, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said, many times ending up homeless, the victims of attacks themselves, or many times, out of whatever is happening in a very ill brain, taking it out on the rest of society.

Probing deeply into mental illness requires a discipline that Congressman MURPHY has and an understanding that no Congress yet has had. That myopia is symptomatic of what is happening across our Nation: more security but no significant attention to those who show out-of-control and violent tendencies, those tragically mentally ill citizens who are driven by their illness to harm others.

If someone has a broken back, we have special wards. What happens to the mentally ill in the district that I represent and across this country, some of them end up in the jail. Seventy-five percent of those incarcerated in northern Ohio have dual diagnoses of mental illness and substance abuse. What does that tell us? Our jails have become the depositories for this Nation's mentally ill.

I am not saying that individuals diagnosed with mental illness are more likely to commit crimes. I agree with Congressman MURPHY that most of them become victims of crimes because they aren't thinking straight, and it doesn't have to be this way.

The bill that Congressman MURPHY has written and has vetted and has worked with different groups and individuals, and which I support and a host of other Members do on a bipartisan basis, is supported by one of the most important organizations in our country: the National Alliance on Mental Illness. I have the highest respect for them.

H.R. 2646 fixes the Nation's broken mental health system by refocusing programs, reforming grants, and removing Federal barriers to care. It names an assistant secretary for mental illness at the Department of Health and Human Services, and it encourages more meaningful involvement from family members and caregivers who, frankly, at this point, many times, just give up because they have this force within their homes that they cannot contain.

Rather than just paying tribute to those among us who have been lost and those who save them at risk to their own lives, cannot we elevate the solution to efforts that could help to prevent further tragedies?

We think about the Capitol shootings. We think about Sandy Hook. We think about Virginia Polytechnic. The U.S. leads the world in mass shootings. There have been 294 mass shootings in 2015 alone, and each one gives us an indicator of the possible sign of untreated mental illness. Each one represents a failure of our society, and dispelling the stigma of mental illness for those who suffer remains a task unfinished.

When do the elected Representatives of the American people say, "Enough. America can do better. America must do better"? Let's create a pathway, by passing H.R. 2646, to immediate treatment for those mentally ill citizens dangerous to others and dangerous to themselves.

Congressman MURPHY, I can't thank you enough. I don't recall a bill which has had such broad bipartisan support. You have worked so hard to go around the country. This is not a partisan issue; this is an American issue. I hope America can lead the world in trying to find a better way.

The suffering that we see in our districts, in community after community after community, broken families, broken people, this doesn't have to be in our country.

In the hearing that you conducted in Cleveland, I learned something really important that I didn't know, and that is that in the way that the reimbursement occurs to hospitals for people seeking care, that research in mental illness is at the bottom of the list because reimbursement doesn't flow the same way. So as we try to find answers to what is going on in the human brain, with the secretion of such chemicals like dopamine and serotonin and these different chemicals that those who are healthy have been secreted at a normal level, those who do not have that system working for them have big problems; but yet, if doctors try to get research dollars to solve and figure out what is going on in the human brain, the reimbursement system we have today simply doesn't work. I didn't know that.

So I thank you for coming to Ohio because I am focused on that like a laser beam, and it is a part of the answer. So thank you for allowing me

some time tonight on the floor. The people I represent thank you. We want to help you. I hope those listening will find cosponsors from their different parts of the country to help you move this bill forward. We couldn't do anything more important for the country. Thank you.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and a cosponsor of this bill.

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Thank you to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I, too, want to thank him for his tireless work on this effort. This is such an important piece of legislation in dealing with mental health and putting necessary reforms in place. The gentleman has truly been an absolute champion on this issue, and H.R. 2646 is such a meaningful piece of legislation that will help in so many different ways.

Mental health in this country is a crisis and it is an epidemic, and there are so many families across this country that are dealing with this issue.

The gentleman came to my district a little over a year ago, and we had a wonderful roundtable discussion. There were so many individuals who came to it, so many family members who came to it to speak on this issue. They were so appreciative of the fact that there was actually some legislation that was being developed to deal with this issue. These are families that have nowhere else to go.

In my experience as a nurse, in health care, but then also as my experience has gone forward in taking care of those in my district and then traveling across the country and meeting with families and talking with individuals about how much this affects their lives, and it is almost amazing when you start having the conversation about this piece of legislation because I don't even think they think that anybody wants to help them anymore. I think they feel so far and left behind that it isn't even in their mind that someone is out there looking for an answer and helping in a way that will be meaningful into the future.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has done extensive work with so many groups, so many patient advocacy groups. His own personal knowledge as a child psychologist has played into this issue. There are certain barriers that are in place, and they are in place because we have put them there. Well-meaning, well-intended HIPAA laws, all of these things that have been put in place to help protect patients and their privacy and their issues, yet it prevents us from being able to understand the situation. It prevents families from being able to get care for their loved ones.

Maybe an adult child of parents who are struggling to help their child, their son, their daughter. They may be out

on the streets; they may be at home; they may have issues; they may not be working. I mean, there are so many different things that can be happening, and they know that that individual needs help, and they have no one to go to.

□ 2030

Madam Speaker, this legislation will change much of that. It is a step in the right direction. There is much more that needs to be done. We were just talking a moment ago about our jails, our prisons, and how many of those who are within those walls and behind those bars literally are there because they have mental health issues. Yes, they may have committed a crime; yes, they may have found themselves in a terrible situation and ended up in jail, possibly even drug abuse; but the bottom line is the mental health issue that lies there.

We are talking even about issues of fiscal responsibility in this country, and I think of how much money we will save and how much of a difference it will make if we deal with this issue in the way that it needs to be dealt with.

So, Madam Speaker, I am a cosponsor of this legislation. This is an incredibly important piece of legislation. It is bipartisan, and it is for every American in this country, every American in this country that is dealing with this issue with a loved one or with a friend. We all have them. We all walk down the streets and see individuals who we know are homeless, and we know that the root cause is mental illness. We can change something in this country. This is one change we need to make. We need to come together as a whole House of Representatives to pass this piece of legislation.

Again, I just want to finish by thanking the gentleman from Pennsylvania one more time for his tireless efforts. You have truly been the champion for every mental health issue, and this piece of legislation passed by the House of Representatives will be a monumental step in the direction of mental health reform.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentlewoman for her comments and for her continued pursuit of making sure we pass this.

This bill was first introduced over a year ago, reworked with a lot of bipartisan input, Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle, and also from many, many organizations. The other day, some 23 organizations delivered a letter to some Members of Congress saying they want to see comprehensive mental health reform.

This is the first and the most comprehensive mental health reform our country has seen. The last time some efforts were made, it was the very last bill that President Kennedy signed before he was assassinated to begin to make some change in our country to move away from the asylums and towards community mental health. Unfortunately, that dream only came par-

tially true because what happened is we closed those asylums.

Back in the 1950s, we had 550,000 psychiatric hospital beds in this country. At that time the population of the country was 150 million. Now the population of the country is over 316 million, 320 million, and we only have 40,000 psych beds.

Now, Madam Speaker, some of that is because we have come up with more effective treatments, better ways of identifying and diagnosing people, better medications, and, quite frankly, those asylums of yesteryear needed to close. Many times they were homes of abuse and given nicknames like snake pits, cuckoo's nests, and other derogatory terms because they were so bad. But then along came community medical health centers, and that was supposed to pick up the slack. As States found that they could close these asylums, they looked and saw that they could save some money, and they didn't put the money into mental health services, nor did the Federal Government. What happened instead was the people traded the hospital bed for the jail cell, for the homeless shelter, and for the morgue. That is where we are today.

Now, it is not for lack of trying because, indeed, the Federal Government has spent a lot of money—some \$100-plus billion a year—on this, mostly through disability payments, but some for Federal programs.

Madam Speaker, what I want to do tonight is now talk about 10 things we can do as a nation to deal with this, 10 things we must do.

First of all, the General Accounting Office report that we commissioned from the Energy and Commerce Committee, we said: Tell us what programs there are in the Federal Government that deal with mental health and, more specifically, serious mental illness.

I was amazed to hear how many there were, 112 agencies scattered across eight departments. It is a dysfunctional and uncoordinated system. It is a system that really does not have central control. It is a system that has not even met among these agencies for years, even though one of the agencies, SAMHSA, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, is supposed to be the lead agency to say get together and meet. They hadn't even met since 2009.

By the way, when we had a hearing on this in the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee, they said: Oh, we will start doing that soon. But this report that came out that excoriated the Federal programs said that they are not only uncoordinated, but nobody even checks to see if what they do works. They are programs with the Department of Defense; Veterans' Affairs; Education, Health and Human Services; HUD. The list goes on and on. I think there are 20-plus programs for homelessness. There was redundancy and there was overlap, but it is not coordinated. We make it the most difficult for those who have the most difficulty.

So here is number one of what we want to do. We want to have the office of the assistant secretary for mental health and substance abuse created—a new office, but not new money. We do not need any money for this. We take the current office of SAMHSA and elevate that title of the person who runs that agency to the level of an assistant secretary. That person's job will be to create an annual report to Congress to tell us the state of the States, tell us how they spend their money that they get from the Federal level, tell us what are the best practices out there that can serve as models for other States, collect that data.

Right now what we do get is data on numbers of suicides. We get some homicide data, but we really don't get that much on homeless data. We have so-so quality of data for substance abuse, what happens there. But for the most part, no one asks about these agencies and coordinates them. This person's job is to do this. More so, this person is going to have to be a mental health provider, someone who understands the field. The last Director of SAMHSA was an attorney, perhaps well-intended, but did not understand the field. Just like you would not appoint someone to head the Joint Chiefs of Staff to run the Army who is not a general or the Navy who is not an admiral, you need someone to run this who knows what they are doing.

In addition to coordinating these agencies, what they would do is give a report to Congress of which ones can be eliminated because they are redundant, merge the money together, make more money available, and send more money out to communities. Let Congress then act to revamp these multiple organizations to do what is most effective to get funding back to the communities and to the people where it is needed, not to stay in Washington, D.C.

I think President Reagan talked about perhaps some proof of eternity is a Federal program. What we don't want to have here is the continuation of programs that exist just for the sake of employment. Programs should exist for the sake of doing the right thing for people out there, and right now, we have a failure.

The second item is to drive evidence-based care. Another General Accounting Office report which came out talked about some of the abysmal conditions here. They were saying that agencies had difficulty identifying programs supporting individuals with serious mental illness because they didn't always track whether or not such individuals were among those served by the program.

Again, SAMHSA in the past—which is supposed to lead these organizations—doesn't really track to say: What are the evidence-based programs you are doing? When we had a hearing on these issues, SAMHSA told me afterwards they would change nothing.

They do list some evidence-based programs, but the evidence base is oftentimes people who do programs and say: Take my word for it, it works.

If it works, why do we have millions of people with mental illness? Why do we have 4 million people not getting any care at all? Why do we continue to fill our jails, homeless shelters, and morgues with people with mental illness? There are some excellent programs out there, quite frankly, but there are also many that need to be changed.

As part of this process, it was stated in the GAO report that many of the programs hadn't completed their evaluations, many had no evaluations, some were underway, and 17 programs had no evaluation completed and none planned. So the government was not even looking to see if what they were doing had any value. We are going to change that, Madam Speaker. We are going to make sure the programs that are out there have evidence-based care.

The National Child Traumatic Stress Network is an excellent program that does a great job. Another program is called RAISE, Response After Initial Schizophrenia Episode. It does a great job because they work in terms of getting care early in someone's life when they first show symptoms. It is called the prodromal stage. When you get to someone early, you improve their prognosis. But a lot of these other programs—and I will highlight some of the sloppy and irrational programs we have out here tonight—can make a difference if they are done the right way.

Madam Speaker, it is important to note that with regard to serious mental illness, about 50 percent of those with serious mental illness, it will emerge by age 14, and about 75 percent of the cases by age 24. Every time a person has what the public popularly knows as a breakdown, or we refer to it as a psychological or psychiatric crisis, there is harm that occurs to the person, psychological harm and neurological harm, because it is a brain disease. So it is important to get to people early on. That is why we want evidence-based care that really and truly does that and not programs that are fluff. We want them to have outcome measures and determine them.

By the way, Madam Speaker, just the opposite of that, some of the things that SAMHSA has funded in the past have also been programs specifically geared toward telling people to stop taking their medication. When people have anxiety, they have plans in telling you how to drink a fruit smoothie. None of those are evidence-based care, and none of those treat people with serious mental illness.

Number three, go to the mental health workforce. We have a serious, serious shortage here of providers. Even if you wanted to get care, you can't get care in many counties. I think perhaps one-fourth or one-third of counties in Oregon do not even have a psychiatrist in them. Many do not

have a clinical psychologist or clinical social workers or peer support teams with the adequacy to meet the need. It is the same across the Nation.

What happens here is there are about 9,000 child psychiatrists in this country. We need 30,000, precisely for the reason I said before, that these problems emerge during those adolescent and young adult years. If you don't have the right qualified people, you can't treat them. Similarly, clinical psychologists, counseling psychologists, clinical social workers, and peer support teams specifically trained and available to be out there, we have massive shortages.

Part of the job of the assistant secretary is going to be to identify what do we need in communities and how do we get them. Our bill authorizes, for the first time, minorities to work with fellowships.

We also authorize people to be volunteers at community health centers. This is one of the bizarre things that only the Federal Government can do. If you want to work at a community health center, you can work, and your medical malpractice insurance is covered. If you want to volunteer, it is not there.

Now, think about this. If there are some well-intended and compassionate—as I know many are—mental health providers who want to volunteer maybe an afternoon a week, give of their time to help, they are not allowed to do it because the center can't afford their malpractice insurance because they would have to pay the regular rate as opposed to a Federal plan rate. Our bill also authorizes that they can volunteer.

We also authorize programs with telemedicine so that when a pediatrician or a family member identifies someone in need of care, they can access them immediately if need be, especially in rural areas and faraway areas where there is not enough support there.

The next one is the shortage of mental health beds. I had mentioned earlier this grave shortage where we had 550,000 beds in the 1950s; we have 40,000 today. It is a serious crisis-level shortage in every community.

During one of our hearings, Senator Creigh Deeds, a State senator in Virginia, testified. Many are familiar with his story. He was a former gubernatorial candidate in Virginia, and he took his son, Gus, with him oftentimes campaigning around the State of Virginia.

Gus played a musical instrument, and they enjoyed their time together; but sadly, Gus deteriorated. When his father, who raised him, fed him, and clothed him, took him to a hospital for care, the hospital said: We don't have any psych beds.

As they made calls and tried to find more in Virginia, they couldn't find any. Young Gus was sent home with his father. They wouldn't provide many details, but they sent Gus home. Gus

took a knife and attacked his father, nearly killing him. Creigh escaped, and Gus then killed himself, all because of a lack of beds.

Madam Speaker, there was a story last week in *The Washington Post* about another Virginia man, a 24-year-old man who was arrested for \$5 worth of shoplifting at a 7-Eleven in Virginia. He was taken to jail for shoplifting. But upon recognizing that he had a serious mental illness, they wanted to get him to a hospital. Again, there weren't beds available. So he stayed in that jail, I believe, over 70 days, often naked, covered in his own feces, refusing to eat, and losing 40 pounds. Ultimately, he died for lack of a bed.

Now, that is not the only problem that is out there. Understand that we don't want to bring back those asylums, but when a person is in that crisis mode, it is not appropriate to bring them to a jail.

□ 2045

It is not appropriate to leave them in an emergency room for hours or days or weeks sometimes waiting for a hospital bed to open up, and it certainly is inappropriate to discharge someone without any wraparound services or care.

But what happens is, when you have a bed shortage, you cannot get care for crisis by qualified persons. We don't have the providers. We don't have the places.

It is important for someone to have a clean and calm and caring environment separate from other environmental stresses and problems so you can work with them and stabilize them, perhaps get them on medication, help them relax, help organize things for home care or outpatient care for them. Sometimes that takes a few days. Sometimes that takes a couple weeks. But the idea is you need a place for them.

Without beds, oftentimes a staff simply cannot do a thorough evaluation and they sometimes then will simply make an uninformed and premature release of the individual, of the consumer, saying, "Well, he doesn't seem that bad. We will send him home," not really understanding whether or not that person is a threat to themselves or someone else.

Understand this, that even with the brain diseases of schizophrenia and bipolar, when questioned, someone could be in a position where, when asked if they are going to harm themselves or someone else, they would say, "No. I am fine. Really, it is okay. It was just a disagreement I had." They can keep it together for a little bit.

And if a staff is already saying: Look, we don't have hospital beds. Let's send him home," they will be sent home without really knowing the seriousness of their illness or providing full services.

Further, if you want to evaluate if someone is a threat to harm themselves or someone else or in imminent

danger of that, many times the doctors and the courts are reluctant to go through that process. Many times they are looking for another out.

And many times—like in Pennsylvania, it is called a 302 procedure—they will bypass that or they will say to the patient, “Can you just voluntarily commit yourself or promise you will be okay and you will go out and get care?”

I want to add this because it is very important while the President and other people are talking about access to guns and talking about background checks. You can't do a background check if you don't have a background record—you can't do a background check if you don't have a background record—and if there is no place to help people when they are in crisis.

And if doctors and judges are not going to have someone involuntarily committed, there is no record. There is nothing that can appear on the national list to prevent a person from purchasing a firearm.

There was no time spent in a hospital where staff can truly evaluate are these delusions and hallucinations which can be controlled with medication, will the person be stabilized, are they a risk threat. You can't do that. We need more beds, and our bill says there will be more.

This is one of those areas of incredible prejudices and bigotry. You see, Medicaid has this rule that, if you are between the ages of 21 and 64, you cannot go into a private hospital that has more than 16 beds. Now, think about that.

If you have money, you can go in a hospital. If you are low income, you are out of luck. You are on the street. It is a different standard that is grossly unfair and incredibly prejudicial. And again I go to this point, that those who are minorities or low income are treated the worst.

A person is ten times more likely to be treated in a jail cell than in a hospital if they are seriously mentally ill—ten times more likely. And, yet, that treatment in a jail cell is not appropriate at all.

It is not treatment. Oftentimes they are put in isolation. They may get in a fight with a guard. What started off as a small charge may end up as a felony assault charge.

A person with serious mental illness oftentimes for the same crime will spend four times the amount in jail as a person who is not mentally ill. And all along, if we had the proper place to treat them, we could have done that.

Our bill lifts this 16-bed cap, this ridiculously absurd 16-bed cap, and says, instead, we would like to have an average length of stay of less than 30 days. That can be achieved. In about 98 percent of cases, it can be achieved.

And, by the way, it is far less expensive to have someone in a psychiatric hospital bed than an emergency room by about four times. Some studies have gone as high as saying it is about 20

times less expensive to have them in outpatient care than in a jail cell.

We would save a lot more money if we fixed this crisis shortage, worked on other outpatient care to transition people out, and wrap them around with the necessary services so they could go out more stable.

Point number five: We eliminate the same day doctor barrier, another one of those ridiculously prejudicial rules out there that Medicaid has that harms those of low income.

I mentioned a number of times that the prodromal stages of adolescents and young adulthood is when serious mental illness begins to emerge, those first symptoms that sometimes someone may think is a little bit strange, there is something different about this person. Perhaps their grades are dropping. Perhaps they are not taking care of themselves the way they used to. Perhaps they are withdrawing from relationships and friends.

Those could be early signs of a bigger problem. But it takes, between first symptoms and first professional treatment, on average, 110 weeks, over 2 years, of waiting time between first symptoms, in part, because people are not aware of what to look for in the symptoms, but, in part, because they are not connected with other providers here and, even when they are, they are not allowed to do anything.

The same day doctor rule is a Medicaid rule which says you can't see two doctors in the same day at the same location.

So here is the problem. If a pediatrician says to a mother or father, “We are very concerned about your teenage son”—who is in the later years, 17 or so—“I would like him to see a psychiatrist right away because I am very concerned about the behaviors you are describing to me” and then, when that doctor realizes that that person is on Medicaid, basically, Medicaid says, “We are not paying for it,” how cruel and abusive is that, to say to someone, “Just because you have low income we are not going to cover the services here” when this is a critical time?

When you have that warm hand-off in the doctor's office, there is a 95 percent likelihood that the person will follow up, according to a study by Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh.

When you wait and you say, “Here is the number. Call it another day,” that likelihood drops below 45 percent.

And when you miss that golden opportunity to help a person in times of need, that person may be very reluctant to come back for care in the future. We fix this by saying we are going to drop that same day doctor rule.

Number six: We have to empower parents and caregivers to be part of the solution. Twenty years ago HIPAA laws came out that said, “In order to help your insurance be portable, we want to protect the records.” Good idea. “We wanted to make sure records had privacy.” Good idea.

But HIPAA moved from the place where we are supposed to assist care

and confidentiality to the point where it impairs care. It has gone too far. Let me give you a couple of examples.

Right now a doctor—and I am a psychologist. If I know a family member brings someone in to see me, I can listen to them in a very passive mode, but I can't provide them any information. That is helpful. They are giving me vital information for history.

If I don't have the accurate history, a provider does not have accurate history, you can't accurately diagnose. You don't know if the person has been on medication before, does it work or not work, who has this person seen before, what sets them off, are they doing better, what are their symptoms.

If I don't have or a provider does not have that information, they may miss making the accurate diagnosis and then not be able to provide proper treatment and follow-up. When that occurs, harm can follow.

Now, if I get the information, great. But what happens if that family member is not there? The provider can't go out and seek other family members and friends to get that information because HIPAA laws are seen as barriers to that.

Because as soon as a doctor at a hospital calls and says, “Your adult son is in the hospital. I need to ask you some information about it,” that doctor has already violated HIPAA laws by identifying the person's son is in a hospital.

Now, think about this, though. A parent, the person who was caring and loving throughout a lifetime, committed to their family member, a brother, a sister, someone's mother or father, they are prohibited from being part of the care team by HIPAA laws.

A stranger, some appointed worker, someone who may see them as they roll in and out of their job, even if they care and they burn out, they will be maybe sitting next to a family member in court and simply say, “I can't tell you anything about this family member. You will have to find out for yourself.”

Here is another problem, though. Not only are you impaired from getting diagnostic information, you can't evaluate medications. But understand that people with serious mental illness are often at high risk for other medical problems, in part, because their hygiene may be poor, they may not take care of themselves, may not see doctors, et cetera.

But they also are in a situation where they may take some medications that make them high risk for diabetes or heart disease. And without getting a family member to help them with that, they do not have the ability to properly treat them.

My goal in this bill is to simply say that, in cases where someone has diminished capacity to take care of themselves where, in absence of treatment, they become gravely disabled, a provider may tell a known caregiver—so notice I have already set the bar pretty high—may tell a known caregiver a few simple facts: the diagnosis,

the treatment plan, the treating doctors, time and place of appointment, and what are the medications they are on. No therapy notes are allowed to be exchanged. We specifically prohibit that in this bill. But that is important.

And, by the way, I might add one other thing. As I hear a lot of people talking about the concerns of why didn't a parent do anything, why didn't they know anything in some cases, like the young man at Virginia Tech who killed so many students or the gentlemen in Oregon or at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Connecticut, it is because providers cannot do a risk assessment.

They cannot contact a family member and say, "Can you tell me if this person has any morbid fantasy and fascination with death, with extremely violent video games, with dark Web sites? Do they have weapons that are unsecured? Do they talk about violent issues? Have they made threats before?" You can't do that risk assessment. Without that, you end up not knowing the risk.

Number seven: States receive money for mental health services and substance abuse disorders. Those dollars are about \$500 million for mental health and about \$600 to \$700 million for substance abuse. The odd thing about this is States are not allowed to mingle that money. They can't braid it together.

Even worse is that many people with a substance abuse disorder have a mental illness and many people with mental illness will turn toward other substances to self-medicate. And, yet, the person will have to go to two different providers, two different clinics, to get care instead of one. We drop that barrier and say Federal grants should go to States in a way that help the States work this best.

Number eight: We want to bring accountability to the spending of Federal funds. Now, here is where we have seen in another GAO report the absolute absurdity and cruelty of how money is spent.

A GAO report done this last summer told us that many times documents and applications for many who receive grants were not reviewed. They couldn't tell you what the application criterion was to get an award. They didn't have program-specific guidance. Information was missing or not readily available. They didn't even know where it was stored. You couldn't follow the paper trail to see where it was. And so what happens is no one knows how this money was spent.

But let me tell you some of the absurd things we have found money is spent on, our tax dollars. How about this? A Web site last winter was posted by SAMHSA for the people of Boston to help them with their worries about snow. That is right. They posted a 1-800 number you could call if you had snow anxiety. These are people from New England, for goodness sake. They know how to handle snow. But our tax dollars went to help them understand it.

There are Web sites that tell you to drink a fruit smoothie if you are anxious, programs that tell you how to make a mask, programs that we fund to how to make collages, a painting in SAMHSA's headquarters that cost \$22,500 of two people sitting on a rock surrounded by other people—\$22,000.

When we asked the director of SAMHSA what that was for, they said it is more mental health awareness. The only thing I am aware of is it is a waste of money and that money could have gone to help pay someone's salary to actually treat a patient.

Well, it gets worse. A Web site for 3-year-old children, the cost of \$426,000, with animated characters and sing-along songs. The purpose, we asked the director of SAMHSA, prevention. "Prevention of what?" we said. "Well, we think prevention is good." "Well, what does this prevent and what does it do and does it work and does it do anything?" We waited for weeks to get an answer and we still don't have it 1 month later. By the way, they took the Web site down when we shined a bright light on it, saying, "What does this do?"

We want accountability to this spending. There will be different grant programs now—demonstration grants, innovation grants—where people will know what these grants are. They can look at them as scientific studies in a blind review to make sure it is going to quality programs that really make sense. No more of this behavioral wellness stuff, but truly working at things that make a difference.

Number nine: Develop alternatives to institutionalization and have real jail diversion. I said already what happens to so many people with mental illness. They end up in jail. Forty to sixty percent of people in prison have a mental illness.

And what this does is it helps provide some extra funding for States that have wraparound services for those who have this history of violent incarcerations, arrests, mental illness.

□ 2100

New York has a program called Assisted Outpatient Treatment. Their program, which means a judge will say you need to stay in treatment at an outpatient level, has found they reduced incarcerations by 81 percent. They reduced homelessness by over 70 percent. They reduced admissions to emergency rooms by over 70 percent. They had patient satisfaction, consumer satisfaction at over 90 percent. And they cut costs in half.

States have different programs here. About 46 States have something on the books. But many of these States do not put these programs in practice because of the big cost. We know States will save a lot of money once they start doing this.

But what we want to do is take people out of this cycle, this revolving door of jail and risk and more damage, and say that States need to have pro-

grams where it wraps around services for that person. Don't just dump them from jail onto the streets and expect a problem because it will erupt again. Make sure those services are there. Make sure the person stays in treatment.

Now some say, well, that is unfair. Some say that might be an involuntary commitment, that it puts people there against their will and you impair their rights.

But I say this, that a person with serious mental illness 40 percent of the time is not even aware they have a problem and so many times they refuse treatment or their past run-ins with the police and other hospitals because they don't want to be there, they don't want to get treatment.

If we provide quality, compassionate, accessible care, they may get that, but not under the current system. We want to make sure they have that care, and we will provide the funding to do it.

Number 10, advance early intervention and prevention programs: A lot of what our government spends money on is what is called primary prevention, the things we do for everybody, like don't smoke, wear a seat belt.

But what happens is, in the area of mental illness, those wellness programs like I described before that are out there, the silly things that SAMHSA does, are not an effective use of dollars.

Secondary and tertiary prevention is valuable. Secondary is when you recognize someone is at risk, but not with symptoms. Tertiary is when they have symptoms and you try and help them get better.

By focusing money on the programs I mentioned before—the RAISE program or others, the Child and Adolescent Traumatic Stress Network—you can move the dollars where they need to be funded and stop this silliness.

Now, I should say this while I am talking about SAMHSA, that despite two GAO reports that criticize them—and one time afterwards I had the director of SAMHSA in my office and I said, "Okay. Here is your opportunity. Would you change anything?" And she said, "No. I wouldn't change a thing."

Another time during one of our hearings one of my colleagues said, "On a scale of 1 to 10, how would you rate yourself on your programs?" And the director said, "I would give myself a 10," despite all these failures.

That is the reason why we need to have an assistant secretary of mental health. That is the reason why we need to make these changes. This is the current reason why we have so many of these problems.

Before I wrap up here, I want to yield a couple of minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON), who has also been involved in the field of wellness and is also a supporter of this bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for yielding and for

leading on this incredibly important issue that is before us.

I rise in support of Congressman MURPHY's bill, H.R. 2646, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act of 2015. You know this significant piece of legislation aims to address the fact that millions of Americans who suffer from a serious mental illness are going without treatment, as families and caregivers struggle to find support in a disorganized healthcare system.

I practiced rehabilitation services for 28 years before I had the privilege and honor in 2009 to come to work on behalf of the citizens of Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District. Part of my career was working acute psychiatric services, working with people that were experiencing some of the most chronic and reoccurring disabling conditions that are out there.

Many times the system that we are in only really responded when people were in crisis, but it only responded to the point that the person was no longer a danger to themselves or someone else.

The system did not allow for the types of resources to be deployed and the care to be provided to really meet the needs of these individuals to stop the cycle.

It was really a privilege and honor to work with many different individuals and many different family members.

But I am so excited about this step that we are taking with this bill, and I really encourage leadership. This is a bill whose time is now. We need to elevate it to the House and to the Senate. This needs to be on the President's desk because we can make a difference in people's lives with this bill.

It is hard to deny the staggering consequences of neglecting our mental health system. Suicide rates are at the highest they have been in more than 25 years. Our nationwide shortage of psychiatric beds is nearly at 100,000. The three largest mental health hospitals in the United States are classified as criminal incarceration facilities, prisons.

I have taken the opportunity—I think it is important—to make visits to our prisons within the congressional district. I have done that. I have more of those visits coming up.

It is very apparent to me that, as we have closed in the past facilities that perhaps we could have improved upon versus closing, all we did was shift people to the streets and from the streets to the prisons.

So many people today have a dual diagnosis, some type of psychiatric diagnosis, but also a substance abuse diagnosis, which tends to be a part of that spiral. And your heart breaks to see that.

If we want to reduce our prison population and the cost that it takes to maintain individuals, then this bill is a good step in that direction of breaking that cycle. I would argue that this bill will help have a cost savings over time, short term and certainly long term.

Congressman MURPHY has taken a compassionate and evidence-based approach to reforming the way the Federal Government addresses mental health.

H.R. 2646 breaks down barriers for families. It encourages innovative models of care. It advances early intervention and prevention programs.

Notably, it employs telepsychiatry to reach underserved and rural population areas where patients have difficulty accessing needed care. I know for a fact using telepsychiatry reduces the stigma of reaching out for help.

I authored a bill that has become law. It is called the STEP law, the Servicemember Telemedicine Electronic Portability Act, which we really did this for our military, our Active-Duty military Reserve and Guard.

We changed the law a few years back with a piece of legislation that has expanded telemedicine that is used by the Department of Defense, and it really has helped save lives. It has not been the only thing we have done, but it was a valuable part in the reduction of the suicide rate among our military.

So we know the many provisions within this bill are tested. They are proven. There are lives to be improved and lives to be saved. It recognizes the important role of the family, the caregiver.

Now, these are some of the most chronic and recurring conditions, and you need a strong support system. The way our system is today, it excludes those family members.

So there is just a lot to support here, and I am certainly proud to do it.

It is important that we make a commitment to address mental health with the same urgency as we do physical health.

I will remain steadfast in my support for H.R. 2646, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. In my closing minute, let me say this: As I opened up, this will be known as the bloody summer of 2015. Let this time be the autumn of our compassion in 2015.

The time is now. We have 40 newspapers around this country that have published endorsements for this legislation. We have 133 bipartisan cosponsors.

I plead with my colleagues to please become a cosponsor to this bill. I beg leadership. Let's no longer have a blind eye to this, let's no longer have a moment of silence, and let this be the time of our action.

Let's pass H.R. 2646, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, and let's bring compassion and care to the many families in America who are suffering from mental illness and show them that that twilight, as the sun sets, is indicating that there soon will be a dawn of great hope in America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF ESTABLISHING A SELECT INVESTIGATIVE PANEL OF THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE

Ms. FOXX (during the Special Order of Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-288) on the resolution (H. Res. 461) establishing a Select Investigative Panel of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3192, HOMEBUYERS ASSISTANCE ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM OCTOBER 12, 2015, THROUGH OCTOBER 19, 2015

Ms. FOXX (during the Special Order of Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-289) on the resolution (H. Res. 462) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3192) to provide for a temporary safe harbor from the enforcement of integrated disclosure requirements for mortgage loan transactions under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 and the Truth in Lending Act, and for other purposes, and providing for proceedings during the period from October 12, 2015, through October 19, 2015, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HUDSON (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and October 7 on account of family reasons.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2835. An act to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection officers.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on October 5, 2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following 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.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 7, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3029. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31035; Amdt. No.: 3659] received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3030. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0245; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-135-AD; Amendment 39-18268; AD 2015-19-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3031. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31034; Amdt. No.: 3658] received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3032. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0676; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-164-AD; Amendment 39-18238; AD 2015-17-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3033. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Jet Route J-513; North Central United States [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3601; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AGL-5] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3034. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Vulcanair S.p.A. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0656; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-027-AD; Amendment 39-18259; AD 2015-18-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3035. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Direc-

tives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0583; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-130-AD; Amendment 39-18258; AD 2015-17-25] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3036. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-1044; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-148-AD; Amendment 39-18245; AD 2015-17-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3037. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; SOCAT Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-2047; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-013-AD; Amendment 39-18243; AD 2015-17-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3038. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airspace Designations; Incorporation by Reference [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3375; Amendment No.: 71-47] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3039. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt and Whitney Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2014-1130; Directorate Identifier 2015-NE-04-AD; Amendment 39-18250; AD 2015-17-17] received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3040. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; GE Aviation Czech s.r.o. Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0625; Directorate Identifier 2015-NE-09-AD; Amendment 39-18253; AD 2015-17-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3041. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca S.A. Turbohaft Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0900; Directorate Identifier 2015-NE-12-AD; Amendment 39-18251; AD 2015-17-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3042. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Lockheed Martin Corporation/Lockheed Martin Aeronautics Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0779; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-052-AD; Amendment 39-18260; AD 2015-18-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3043. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31036; Amdt. No.: 3660] received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3044. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0242; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-100-AD; Amendment 39-18240; AD 2015-17-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3045. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31033; Amdt. No.: 3657] received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3046. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-1050; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-123-AD; Amendment 39-18241; AD 2015-17-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3047. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0363; Directorate Identifier 2014-NE-08-AD; Amendment 39-18252; AD 2015-17-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3048. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class C Airspace; Burbank, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0690; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AWA-1] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3049. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0680; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-165-AD; Amendment 39-18236; AD 2015-17-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3050. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0772; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-090-AD; Amendment 39-18233; AD 2015-16-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October

5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3051. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; CFM International S.A. Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0277; Directorate Identifier 2015-NE-05-AD; Amendment 39-18262; AD 2015-18-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3052. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Portland, OR [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1137; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ANM-4] received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3053. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0823; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-211-AD; Amendment 39-18249; AD 2015-17-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3054. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Douglas, WY [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1089; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ANM-11] received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3055. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0777; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-088-AD; Amendment 39-18257; AD 2015-17-24] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3056. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace, Delta, CO [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0343; Airspace Docket No.: 14-ANM-10] received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3057. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0085; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-078-AD; Amendment 39-18255; AD 2015-17-22] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3058. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0926; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-121-AD; Amendment 39-18263; AD 2015-18-05] (RIN:

2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3059. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Iron Mountain, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1871; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AGL-10] received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3060. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Newberry, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1869; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AGL-9] received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3061. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0673; Directorate Identifier 2014-SW-034-AD; Amendment 39-18244; AD 2015-17-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3062. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Tracy, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1623; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AWP-10] received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3063. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Tracy, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1623; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AWP-10] received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3064. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Aurora, OR [Docket No.: FAA-2014-1070; Airspace Docket No.: 14-ANM-9] received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3065. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31039; Amdt. No.: 522] received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3066. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0523; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-050-AD; Amendment 39-18246; AD 2015-17-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3067. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of

Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0455; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-006-AD; Amendment 39-18247; AD 2015-17-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3068. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0822; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-210-AD; Amendment 39-18248; AD 2015-17-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3069. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting the final Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan integrated project implementation report and environmental impact statement, pursuant to the Water Resources Development Act of 2000, Sec. 601; (H. Doc. No. 114-65); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

3070. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting the report on modifications to Calcasieu Lock, inland navigation project, pursuant to the River and Harbor Act of 24 July 1946; (H. Doc. No. 114-66); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

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. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1525. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to make certain improvements to form 10-K and regulation S-K, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-279). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1553. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to specify which smaller institutions may qualify for an 18-month examination cycle (Rept. 114-280). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1839. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to exempt certain transactions involving purchases by accredited investors, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-281). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 2091. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to clarify the ability to request consumer reports in certain cases to establish and enforce child support payments and awards (Rept. 114-282). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 3102. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to reform programs of the Transportation Security Administration, streamline transportation security regulations, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-283). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 3510. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a cybersecurity strategy for the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-284). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2295. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to require the Secretary of the Interior to identify and designate National Energy Security Corridors for the construction of natural gas pipelines on Federal land, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-285). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2288. A bill to remove the use restrictions on certain land transferred to Rockingham County, Virginia, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-286). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2358. A bill to amend the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to enhance the reliability of the electricity grid and reduce the threat of wildfires to and from electric transmission and distribution facilities on Federal lands by facilitating vegetation management on such lands; with an amendment (Rept. 114-287, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 461. Resolution establishing a Select Investigative Panel of the Committee on Energy and Commerce (Rept. 114-288). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STIVERS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 462. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3192) to provide for a temporary safe harbor from the enforcement of integrated disclosure requirements for mortgage loan transactions under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 and the Truth in Lending Act, and for other purposes, and providing for proceedings during the period from October 12, 2015, through October 19, 2015 (Rept. 114-289). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Agriculture discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2358 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

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. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama):

H.R. 3684. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide that an individual may remain eligible to participate in the teacher loan forgiveness program under title IV of such Act if the individual's period of consecutive years of employment as a full-time teacher is interrupted because the individual is the spouse of a member of the Armed Forces who is relocated during the school year pursuant to military orders for a permanent change of duty station, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia:

H.R. 3685. A bill to direct the United States Trade Representative to initiate negotia-

tions with the Government of the Republic of Turkey to seek to enter into a bilateral free trade agreement with Turkey; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EMMER of Minnesota (for himself and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 3686. A bill to direct the Inspector General of the Department of Veterans Affairs to make certain reports publicly available and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 3687. A bill to modify the prohibition on United States assistance and financing for certain exports to Cuba under the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Agriculture, 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. CUELLAR:

H.R. 3688. A bill to provide for the authority for the successors and assigns of the Starr-Camargo Bridge Company to maintain and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Rio Grande City, Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 3689. A bill to establish a worker adjustment assistance program to provide assistance and job retraining for workers who have lost their jobs due to unplanned closures of coal and coal dependent industries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. HAHN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 3690. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to establish an efficient system to enable employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. TONKO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H.R. 3691. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the residential treatment programs for pregnant and postpartum women and to establish a pilot program to provide grants to State substance abuse agencies to promote innovative service delivery models for such women; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. FARR, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 3692. A bill to provide for environmental restoration activities and forest management activities in the Lake Tahoe Basin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a pe-

riod 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:

H.R. 3693. A bill to require a report on whether Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps is a terrorist entity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TROTT (for himself and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 3694. A bill to combat trafficking in human organs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 3695. A bill to simplify and improve the Federal student loan program through income-contingent repayment to provide stronger protections for borrowers, encourage responsible borrowing, and save money for taxpayers; 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. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 463. A resolution recognizing October 7th as National Trigeminal Neuralgia Awareness Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONAWAY (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. BABIN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LUTKEMEYER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana):

H. Res. 464. A resolution affirming that private equity plays an important role in growing and strengthening United States businesses throughout all sectors of the economy and in every State and congressional district and that it has fostered significant investment in the United States economy; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 465. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the justices of the United States Supreme Court should make themselves subject to the existing and operative ethics guidelines set out in the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, or should promulgate their own code of conduct; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. CHABOT:

H.R. 3684.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: “. . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia:

H.R. 3685.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which states that “Congress shall have the power . . . [t]o regulate Commerce with foreign Nations . . .”

and that

“Congress shall have the power . . . [t]o 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. EMMER of Minnesota:

H.R. 3686.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution: The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 3687.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerated powers listed in Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution, to regulate Commerce with Foreign Nations.

By Mr. CUELLAR:

H.R. 3688.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 3689.

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. POCAN:

H.R. 3690.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 3691.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 3692.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 3693.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. TROTT:

H.R. 3694.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 3695.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 10: Mr. COLE, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Ms. FOXX, and Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 167: Mr. DENHAM and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 174: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 192: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 213: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 228: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 302: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 403: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 410: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 446: Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 542: Ms. GRAHAM.

H.R. 546: Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 563: Mrs. BEATTY and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 581: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 590: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 662: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 670: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 699: Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 721: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 757: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 814: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 829: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 837: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 870: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SABLÁN, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 879: Mr. WALKER and Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 953: Mr. HANNA, Mr. NEAL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 957: Mr. ASHFORD.

H.R. 969: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 986: Mr. HILL.

H.R. 1055: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1093: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 1107: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 1148: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 1188: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 1197: Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 1217: Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HIMES, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. MICHELLE LUJÁN GRISHAM

of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PASCARELL, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SIREY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. HAHN, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. FARR, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 1233: Mr. ASHFORD and Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 1256: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 1258: Ms. MENG, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1283: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 1288: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 1309: Mr. ASHFORD and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 1312: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1401: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 1422: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1427: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 1453: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 1475: Mr. FARR, Mr. BEYER, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SIREY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 1482: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

H.R. 1516: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1550: Mr. VARGAS and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 1567: Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1571: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 1603: Mr. GARRETT and Mrs. LOVE.

H.R. 1608: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 1625: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 1632: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 1653: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1684: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 1728: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1737: Mr. CRAWFORD, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. ZINKE.

H.R. 1752: Mr. BLUM and Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 1761: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 1769: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. TONKO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 1786: Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. PITTINGER, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 1814: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Ms. Graham.

H.R. 1843: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1850: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1854: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1877: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 1919: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 1934: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1941: Mr. MICA.

H.R. 1942: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. KATKO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 2009: Ms. MCSALLY and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 2013: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 2050: Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 2083: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 2090: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 2293: Ms. MENG, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Mr. HURD of Texas.

- H.R. 2304: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, and Mr. BUCK.
- H.R. 2315: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. SCHRADER.
- H.R. 2368: Ms. DELBENE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. VARGAS.
- H.R. 2404: Mr. FLORES.
- H.R. 2405: Mr. NADLER.
- H.R. 2406: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
- H.R. 2460: Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. REED, and Mrs. LOVE.
- H.R. 2473: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Ms. NORTON.
- H.R. 2492: Mr. CRENSHAW.
- H.R. 2513: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.
- H.R. 2519: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.
- H.R. 2540: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
- H.R. 2568: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.
- H.R. 2597: Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. DOLD, and Mr. ROSKAM.
- H.R. 2611: Mr. LAMBORN.
- H.R. 2646: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. ROUZER.
- H.R. 2661: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. GARAMENDI.
- H.R. 2663: Mr. SCHRADER.
- H.R. 2675: Mr. HENSARLING.
- H.R. 2698: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. POMPEO.
- H.R. 2710: Mr. WENSTRUP and Mr. MEADOWS.
- H.R. 2726: Mr. HONDA and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
- H.R. 2728: Ms. DELBENE.
- H.R. 2737: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. HECK of Washington.
- H.R. 2759: Mr. HASTINGS.
- H.R. 2799: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. TONKO.
- H.R. 2802: Mr. TROTT.
- H.R. 2855: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
- H.R. 2858: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. MENG, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Mrs. CAPPs.
- H.R. 2869: Mr. WOMACK.
- H.R. 2872: Mr. STIVERS.
- H.R. 2873: Mr. MEEKS.
- H.R. 2880: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
- H.R. 2903: Mr. MOOLENAAR.
- H.R. 2906: Mr. TAKANO.
- H.R. 2916: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
- H.R. 2917: Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. RANGEL.
- H.R. 2920: Mr. FOSTER.
- H.R. 2922: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. KNIGHT.
- H.R. 2948: Mr. BOUSTANY.
- H.R. 2957: Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 2962: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
- H.R. 2965: Mr. TROTT.
- H.R. 2987: Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MOORE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
- H.R. 3011: Mr. MULVANEY.
- H.R. 3018: Mr. FLEMING.
- H.R. 3033: Mr. POSEY, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. SESSIONS.
- H.R. 3081: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
- H.R. 3099: Mr. O'ROURKE.
- H.R. 3119: Mr. LOBONDO, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. AMODEI.
- H.R. 3193: Mr. LYNCH.
- H.R. 3221: Mr. MEEKS.
- H.R. 3223: Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. BOST.
- H.R. 3255: Mr. CARNEY.
- H.R. 3286: Mr. HURD of Texas.
- H.R. 3293: Mr. ROUZER and Mr. HENSARLING.
- H.R. 3308: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. KAPTUR.
- H.R. 3310: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 3326: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BUCK, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. TAKAI.
- H.R. 3337: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. KILMER.
- H.R. 3338: Mr. YODER.
- H.R. 3381: Mr. HARPER and Ms. ESHOO.
- H.R. 3411: Mr. BEYER and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.
- H.R. 3412: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Ms. BASS.
- H.R. 3428: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. ROUZER.
- H.R. 3463: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
- H.R. 3471: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. SHUSTER.
- H.R. 3473: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ABRAHAM.
- H.R. 3477: Mr. COLE and Mr. CRAMER.
- H.R. 3480: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. ALLEN.
- H.R. 3497: Mr. LYNCH and Ms. EDWARDS.
- H.R. 3510: Mr. MCCAUL and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
- H.R. 3514: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. VELA, Mr. SIREs, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. YARMUTH, and Ms. TITUS.
- H.R. 3516: Mr. PERRY, Mr. BLUM, Mr. ZINKE, and Mr. POE of Texas.
- H.R. 3517: Mrs. TORRES.
- H.R. 3519: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
- H.R. 3549: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
- H.R. 3573: Mr. WILLIAMS.
- H.R. 3623: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
- H.R. 3626: Mr. BUCK.
- H.R. 3643: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. HENSARLING.
- H.R. 3644: Mr. POSEY and Mr. CRENSHAW.
- H.R. 3646: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
- H.R. 3651: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. LUCAS, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BLUM, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. GROTHMAN, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BRAT, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. VELA, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. MESSER, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. SIREs, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. NUNES, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
- H.R. 3665: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. NADLER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
- H.R. 3666: Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 3678: Mr. POMPEO and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
- H. Con. Res. 56: Mr. POE of Texas.
- H. Con. Res. 65: Ms. BASS, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. KENNEDY.
- H. Con. Res. 75: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. TROTT, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. SPIER, Mrs. LOVE, and Mr. PITTS.
- H. Res. 54: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
- H. Res. 112: Mr. CICILLINE.
- H. Res. 130: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
- H. Res. 230: Mr. WALDEN.
- H. Res. 354: Mr. PERRY.
- H. Res. 396: Mr. TROTT.
- H. Res. 422: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. Michael F. Doyle of Pennsylvania, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DENT, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. FATTAH.
- H. Res. 428: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. CAPPs.
- H. Res. 429: Mr. ROUZER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. DELAURO, and Mrs. ROBY.
- H. Res. 436: Ms. ESHOO.
- H. Res. 437: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. FOSTER.
- H. Res. 443: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
- H. Res. 445: Mr. MOULTON.
- H. Res. 451: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. JONES, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. POSEY.
- H. Res. 452: Mr. NOLAN.