



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2015

No. 23

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 11, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVID W. JOLLY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

ADMIRAL ROBERT HARPER SHUMAKER ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS CAPTURE

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, February 11, 2015. What is the special significance? We become involved in our routines

and our responsibilities. We greet our colleagues, and the day continues. This was not the case 50 years ago.

A young Navy pilot climbed into the cockpit of his F-8 Crusader aboard the USS *Coral Sea*, readying himself for a mission over North Vietnam.

Now, imagine yourself, Mr. Speaker, as a young naval aviator. They are some of the best that we have in our Armed Forces—some may say a little cocky. They are actually able to fly a flying engine, in essence. An F-8 Crusader can go faster than the speed of sound. They can fly missions and actually land back on a ship at night in rough seas.

So, 50 years ago today, this young naval aviator boarded his F-8 Crusader and was going to fly a low-level mission about 1,000 feet above the surface. Yet, after he took on some fire, very quickly he realized that he was in some trouble. The cockpit filled with smoke, and he had a very short amount of time to exit the plane. His parachute opened at about 35 feet above the ground, and he broke his back upon impact. This young pilot's world had just changed—and dramatically. What was he going to do with the pain? His first thought was: "When am I going to be killed?" He was picked up very quickly and was marched by bayonet.

The interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, is that, as the second American aviator shot down over North Vietnam, he was a prize and, therefore, was photographed. While this may not seem lucky, it was actually very fortunate in the fact that his family now knew and the people back in the United States now knew that he was alive and in captivity. He was, indeed, one of the lucky ones because, as the POWs would mount over this conflict in Vietnam, many did not have that same luck.

On having broken his back on impact, he was looking for medical attention. The medical attention he received was a white robe and a bunch of cam-

eras, taking pictures, and as soon as the cameras left, the extent of his medical treatment ceased. He was taken to the Hoa Lo Prison, which we now affectionately know as the Hanoi Hilton. He was the one who was eventually credited with naming the Hanoi Hilton.

As those who know who have been in captivity and as many of us have read, when you are in captivity, you are able to give your captors four basic—what they call the big four—pieces of information: your name, your rank, your serial number, and your date of birth. As we know, this obviously was not going to be enough.

Over the next 8 years and a day, this naval aviator endured some of the worst torture. At some point in time, everyone breaks, and the torture that they endured and that this man endured eventually had to give—whether it was sitting on broomsticks for days at a time or tying your arms behind your back and then having your elbows brought together by ropes and then slowly risen above your head. So he did give some additional information.

His father was a lawyer but also owned a farm in Pennsylvania. The Vietnamese wanted to know how many chickens did they have. At some point in time, he said: That is pretty innocuous information. I will let them know—19 chickens. He knew when he got back to his cell, and some of these cells, Mr. Speaker, were about 3 by 9, some 4 by 9. Now, just imagine spending 10 hours in a 4-by-9-foot space, not to mention 2½ years of solitary confinement, 8 years in captivity. So he gave this additional information, and as he went back to his cell, he realized it was going to get worse and worse. He tried to take his own life, Mr. Speaker, because he thought he had let his country down.

Communication, however, was a huge savior—a savior for himself and for the other men who would be in captivity—that sense of camaraderie, that sense

□ 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.

H921

of making sure that your brain could continue to focus on other things, that message to keep them and their spirits up. They devised a tap code. It was a 5-by-5 metric of A, B, C, D, E and the next line of F, G, H, I, J. They left out the K because that would not make it a 5-by-5-foot box.

His courage, his integrity, his leadership and loyalty to his fellow prisoners—his love of country—cemented faith wherever present. His valor in the face of the impossible ensured that he returned with honor.

Lieutenant Commander Robert Harper Shumaker—now Admiral Shumaker—holds a near and dear place in my heart. He happens to be my uncle. When my wife and I had our first daughter, we decided to name her Harper after one of the most incredible people we know.

Mr. Speaker, my daughter gave me very clear instructions before I came here, and that was to let everyone know how much we love this American hero. In my office, I keep two pictures: one of the day he was shot down, and the other of the day he was reunited with his family. They were reminders to me not of the darkness and cruelty of war but of the power of faith and the strength of a brotherhood and the honor that no one could take away.

On the 50th anniversary of one of the darkest hours endured by an American aviator, let the record show that we stand and applaud this most revered American patriot.

**PRIME MINISTER NETANYAHU'S
INVITATION TO SPEAK TO A
JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS**

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the scheduled March 3 invitation by Speaker BOEHNER to Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu to speak to a joint session of Congress is wrong on many levels.

It is a deliberate attempt by the Israeli Prime Minister and the Speaker of the House to undercut an effort at a diplomatic solution to stop Iran from becoming a nuclear power. This is calculated to occur at a very sensitive stage in talks to reach a potential agreement to limit Iran's nuclear ambitions. Undercutting that diplomatic option is wrong for the United States. It undermines our efforts to smooth choppy waters at a time when we are deeply concerned with ISIS, Hezbollah, Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria. The potential of being able to work with Iran beyond the nuclear weapons issue is important for trying to manage many of the world's most explosive problems.

It is impossible to fully comprehend the next steps if we undercut this diplomatic effort. Why give Iran an excuse to blame the United States for a failure of negotiations and play to their hardliners, who don't want any agreement

that would contain their efforts to build nuclear weapons?

There are no other good alternatives. Some of the people most eager to ultimately use military force against Iran are the same people who were so enthusiastic about going to war with Iraq. The fallout of the war with Iran would likely be as bad or worse at a time of upheaval in this troubled region.

There are other critical issues besides the negotiations with Iran. It is outrageous to think that Israel or any country would use Congress as a prop for their highly contested domestic elections. This proposed speech would be right in the middle of a short and heated Israeli election. It is unseemly and counterproductive. One has only to look at Netanyahu's television commercials from his last election—and how he used his appearance before Congress—to see where this is going.

Finally, there is the issue of respect for the Office of the President and the responsibility to conduct foreign policy. I can't imagine what the reaction would have been if Speaker NANCY PELOSI had offered French President Sarkozy an opportunity to lecture Republicans and George Bush about our disastrous policy in Iraq. Republicans would have been apoplectic.

This is not good for Israel either. It is creating a backlash at home for Netanyahu. It is creating heartburn for some of the strongest supporters of Israel in Congress, and it is straining the relationship between the administration and the Government of Israel. This drama is coming at a time when the majority of Israelis think their country is headed in the wrong direction, when Netanyahu does not have the majority support of his countrymen, when the election is quite close, with a significant number of undecided voters; and polls tell us a majority of Israelis think this speech is a bad idea.

It is unnecessary; it is unfortunate; and it is a bad precedent. Joint sessions involving heads of state and other world leaders should advance American interests and be a positive expression of our values and our opportunities, not a partisan or an ideological device. This proposed speech fails that test. The invitation should be withdrawn or rescheduled, or the Israeli Prime Minister, himself, should reconsider. I, for one, have no intention of being part of dignifying this blatant political act with my presence, because it is not good for Congress; it is not good for Israel; and it is not good for the United States.

**REDEDICATING OURSELVES TO
OUR NATION'S UNFINISHED WORK**

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, 7 score and 12 years ago, another gentleman from Illinois went to Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, to dedicate the 4-month-old, still unfinished Union cemetery at

the site of one of the bloodiest battles in American history. There he would give one of our Nation's defining speeches. Amazingly, President Lincoln's address was not even the main event of that day. Edward Everett, the former president of Harvard, was the event's main speaker, spending 2 hours lecturing about ancient Greece and how that society honored their fallen soldiers.

Everett later wrote:

I should be glad if I could flatter myself that I came as near to the central idea of the occasion in 2 hours as President Lincoln did in 2 minutes.

In the 2½ minutes Lincoln spoke, he did more than honor our fallen soldiers. In 272 eloquent words, he reminded us that we live in a nation dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. He asked whether that nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure.

In his address, the President also issued a challenge to his contemporaries and to generations of Americans thereafter, saying:

It is for us, the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced.

He concluded:

Our Nation shall have a new birth of freedom and that a government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from this Earth.

In his address, I believe, President Lincoln was asking the question: What do we as Americans mean when we say all of us "are created equal"?

□ 1015

In the over 150 years since the Gettysburg Address, we have had our struggles, but we have also had our successes.

We have suffered the Supreme Court's decision in Plessy v. Ferguson, but we also experienced the redemption of Brown v. Board of Education. We allowed the women of this Nation to remain disenfranchised for more than a century, but we also passed the 19th Amendment, which affirmed women's right to vote.

We lived through the travesties of Jim Crow, but we also celebrated the passage of the Civil Rights Act. We watched Truman's executive action desegregate our military. We passed Don't Ask, Don't Tell—and repealed it—and DOMA, but we also have witnessed the legalization of same-sex marriage in 37 States and the District of Columbia.

All of these examples serve as reminders of the difficulties in ensuring equality for all, but they also demonstrate a nation that has responded to challenge and has been reborn. Each time, we have come a little closer to living up to the ideal that all of us are created equal.

To paraphrase Dr. King, the moral arc of our Nation may be long, but as history shows us, it bends towards justice, equality, and freedom.

In times of dissonance, inequality, and injustice, great leaders like Lincoln have reminded us of our Nation's true purpose: equality.

On Lincoln's birthday, let's rededicate ourselves to our Nation's unfinished work. Let's ensure that women get equal pay for equal work. Let's recognize all love as equal and extend marriage rights to all of our citizens once and for all. Let's strengthen the Voting Rights Act to guarantee that no one is disenfranchised and all Americans have access to this fundamental right.

Let's finish the work the Senate started and pass a comprehensive immigration reform bill. Let's pass the Employment Non-Discrimination Act so that no American can be fired simply because of who they love or who they are. Let's allow our neighbors and friends who put in a full day's work, whether in the mailroom or the boardroom, to provide their families with a living wage.

Lincoln modestly believed that "no one would long remember" his address that day at Gettysburg, but we do remember and strive to honor all those who have sacrificed and struggled—and continue to struggle—for equality because we believe, as Dr. King spoke of on the steps of Lincoln's own sacred memorial, "that one day this Nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal."

WORLD IS SILENT AS SUDAN RENEWS GENOCIDAL ATTACKS

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the deteriorating humanitarian and human rights situation inside Sudan. Regrettably, as the attention of the world has been pulled in many different directions, the people of Sudan have been forgotten.

For over a year and a half, the situation inside Sudan has been getting worse and worse. It happens quietly, out of the limelight, but the suffering of the Sudanese people is not silent. Their cries are deafening to those trying to help.

On July 22, 2004, the House of Representatives adopted House Concurrent Resolution 467 by a vote of 422-0. That resolution declared that the crimes of Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir in Darfur constituted genocide.

Over a decade later, the Sudanese government has renewed and increased its genocidal attacks in Darfur. As humanitarian agencies withdraw from the region, unable to carry out their missions in the face of unrelenting attacks, the civilian and displaced populations of Darfur are left without protection and without witnesses.

In the past weeks, the government-supported Janjaweed—now reincar-

nated as Bashir's Rapid Support Forces, or RSF—have intensified their scorched earth campaign of attacks, bombings, rape, displacement, and destruction.

According to the Satellite Sentinel Project and the Enough project, these forces are "better equipped, centrally commanded, and fully integrated into the state's security apparatus, with legal immunity from prosecution."

According to reports by United to End Genocide, since January 1, at least 20,000 innocent civilians have been forced to flee their homes in Darfur. President al-Bashir is bombing civilians, blocking the investigation of the reported mass rape of over 200 Darfuri women and, in the midst of the sharpest increase in violence in years, demanding the removal of U.N. peacekeepers.

On January 6, the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs reported that 115 villages have either been abandoned or burned to the ground in North Darfur. Attackers have forced women, children, and the elderly to leave their villages with nothing to survive on, often looting everything belonging to civilians.

It is clear that the RSF and their masters in Khartoum are engaged in a campaign to strip the people of Darfur of everything they own, anything that might keep them alive, and condemn them to increasing poverty displacement, starvation, and death. And the world—including Congress and the U.N. Security Council—remains silent.

In the border states of South Kordofan and Blue Nile, defenseless civilians in the Nuba Mountains face a relentless bombing campaign by the Sudanese Air Force and ground attacks by the Sudanese Armed Forces. On January 20, a hospital in South Kordofan run by Doctors Without Borders was deliberately targeted by an aerial bombing campaign, depriving the local population of lifesaving care.

In the past few months, under the auspices of the African Union, countries from the region, as well as the United States and Europe, have sought to bring the Bashir regime and various rebel forces to the table in order to negotiate a cessation of hostilities and promote an inclusive national dialogue. This is a worthy effort with worthy goals, but while such talks meander, Khartoum continues its genocidal campaign to impose military solutions to the political crisis facing Sudan.

President Bashir has no political solution to Sudan's problems. As the people of Darfur, South Kordofan, and Blue Nile know only too well, displacement, starvation, and death are the only strategies being pursued by the government in real time and in real life.

It is unconscionable—it is shameful—that these horrors are taking place inside Sudan in complete silence. The lack of response by the United States, by the Europeans, by the nations of the

region only serves to provide Bashir with a green light to continue the killing.

Over 10 years ago, Congress called these very same actions acts of genocide and crimes against humanity. At the end of this month, I intend to reintroduce an updated version of my bipartisan bill, the Sudan Peace, Security, and Accountability Act, and demonstrate to the suffering people of Sudan—especially those in Darfur, South Kordofan, and Blue Nile—that we hear their cries and that this House intends to take action.

I ask all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in this effort.

[From United to End Genocide, Dec. 9, 2014]
WILL 2015 BE THE WORST YEAR FOR SUDAN?

(By Daniel Sullivan)

Sudan's impunity and intransigence have taken a sharp turn for the worse. That's a pretty high bar considering the country's track record since the genocide in Darfur started more than a decade ago. But even measured against a long history of abuse, Sudan's recent actions led by President Omar al-Bashir are a particularly harsh slap in the face for the international community.

In recent weeks, the Government of Sudan has newly bombed civilians in Darfur and the Nuba Mountains, blocked the investigation of a reported mass rape of over 200 Darfuri women, and, in the midst of the sharpest increase in violence and displacement in years, called for the removal of UN peacekeepers.

These new bold actions must be met with equally bold measures by the United States and the rest of the international community.

The facts are astounding. More than 430,000 people newly displaced in Darfur in 2014, the highest number since the height of the genocide. Over 2,000 bombs dropped in South Kordofan and Blue Nile since fighting began there in 2012. And new bombings in Darfur are in clear violation of UN Security Council Resolutions.

"Increased criminality" and "prevailing insecurity" cited in the latest report of the UN Secretary General on Darfur including fifty-five cases of violence, nearly half by government forces, in recorded by UN peacekeepers in the last 90 days. Serious allegations of mass rape that the UN Secretary General and highest UN peacekeeping officials have insisted must be investigated.

Yet, the Sudanese government is blatant in its denial. Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir, wanted on charges of genocide by the International Criminal Court, accused the UN peacekeeping mission in Darfur (UNAMID) of being a "security burden" and blamed foreigners for fabricating rape allegations to "confuse the improvement of the situation in Darfur".

To make matters worse, this is not just an escalation of the kind of posturing the Sudanese regime has practiced in the past. Bashir is also getting new support from Russia. In a recent visit, the Russian Foreign Minister announced plans for increased military support for the Sudanese regime and the Sudanese government said that Russia supports its position on removal of UNAMID.

The irony is that as a permanent member of the UN Security Council, Russia is among those responsible for failing to support UNAMID.

On paper, the Council has given UNAMID a strong mandate, backed by the strongest authorizations under Chapter VII of the UN Charter including the use of force to protect civilians. But in reality, Sudan has been allowed to intimidate UNAMID and there has

been little accountability from the international community when the mission fails to report or act to protect civilians.

The way to address these problems is not play into the hands of the perpetrators and to remove the imperfect last line of defense for many civilians, but rather to reinforce the peacekeeping mission so that it can carry out the mission that has been set out for it.

The UN Security Council, including Russia, must live up to its own commitments in terms of justice and accountability. The year 2014 will close with the latest briefing of the UN Security Council on Darfur by the Chief Prosecutor to the International Criminal Court (ICC) Fatou Bensouda. Amazingly, this is the 20th such briefing since the Council referred the case of Darfur to the ICC.

In her last such briefing, Bensouda admonished the Security Council for its failure to take action in the face of "total impunity" in Darfur and called for "a dramatic shift in this Council's approach to arresting Darfur suspects". Six months later little has been done to support the court.

Sadly, the only dramatic shift has come on the part of the Government of Sudan whose latest intransigence is mind-bogglingly being met with more welcome than condemnation. For the sake of past victims of genocide and those now in the cross-hairs of the sharpest uptick in violence in nearly a decade, the Security Council must respond.

DEAR MADAM, DEAR SIR, DEAR COLLEAGUE, Please find below a statement released today by Doctors Without Borders/Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) regarding the aerial bombing of a hospital operated by MSF in Sudan on January 20, forcing the suspension of medical activities.

You may find the full statement below, and on the website.

Sincerely,

MANUEL LANNAUD.

SUDAN: MSF HOSPITAL BOMBED IN SOUTH KORDOFAN

NEW YORK/PARIS, January 22, 2015.—A hospital operated by the international medical humanitarian organization Doctors Without Borders/Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) was directly targeted in an aerial bombing in Sudan on January 20, forcing the suspension of medical activities, MSF announced today.

The hospital, located in the Nuba Mountains village of Frandala in the South Kordofan region of Sudan, was bombed by the Sudanese Air Force (SAF). Repeated and targeted bombings in the region prevent the safe operation of medical activities, depriving the local population of lifesaving care.

"We condemn in the strongest terms the bombing of the Frandala hospital," said Marc Van der Mullen, MSF head of mission. "With more than 100 patients present, we were very lucky not to have more casualties because people simply had no time to seek protection. Everyone is shocked and frightened of further attacks."

Approximately 150 patients and staff were in the hospital when a SAF fighter jet dropped a cluster of 13 bombs, two of which landed inside the hospital compound. The others struck just outside the hospital fence. One MSF staff member and one patient were injured. The property also suffered damage.

The attack is part of an indiscriminate bombing campaign in South Kordofan, a feature of the war between authorities in Khartoum and rebels groups in the Nuba Mountains. Health facilities are not spared, adding to the suffering of the population created by the bombing raids.

The Frandala hospital was previously bombed in June, 2014. That attack took place despite the Sudanese government's knowl-

edge of the hospital location and its activities, which had been previously communicated to the authorities by MSF. One patient was killed in the attack and several others were wounded. The hospital also sustained significant damage. MSF publicly condemned the attack and demanded respect of medical facilities.

"Today there can be no doubt that this was a deliberate and targeted bombing on a civilian hospital structure and part of a strategy to terrorize the community," said Van der Mullen. "MSF again calls on Khartoum to respect assistance provided to the population. Despite this latest setback we will try to find a way to continue to provide care to the population caught in this largely undocumented war."

MSF is one of the few health care providers in South Kordofan. The MSF facility in Frandala, featuring outpatient and inpatient wards, began operating in 2012. Nearly 80,000 consultations have been performed, along with close to 4,000 hospitalizations.

FUND HOMELAND SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, the President has issued an AUMF, which is the authority to determine the questions of war and peace, particularly in light of the dangers we face with ISIS. In spite of that, we are holding hostage the funding of the armor of security for this Nation, the Department of Homeland Security, the committee upon which I have sat since the horrible, heinous act of 9/11.

We take our work very seriously. We know that we oversee the national security of this Nation, along with the very important aspect and leadership of our Defense Department. Every day, we are mindful of the roles that individuals play who are a part of the Department of Homeland Security.

Rather than looking to be concerned about the dangers of unaccompanied children, as our Republican friends seem to be, challenging the President's thoughtful executive actions within the context of his constitutional authority, we are now using those reasons for holding hostage the very armor of domestic security.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you, the TSA officers that I see as I travel around this country are front liners. I speak to them all the time. They have protected this Nation from various attacks—or potential attacks, might I say—stopping threats that many of us are not even aware of. These very faithful workers, along with border security workers, will have to work without pay. There will have to be a reordering of the strategies of the Secretary of Homeland Security.

Mr. Speaker, 40,000 Border Patrol agents; 50,000 TSA personnel; 13,000 Immigration and Customs Enforcement, or ICE, officers; 40,000 Coast Guard; and 4,000 Secret Service officers will be threatened by this.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I demand that we do the right thing, with 8 legislative days left. Fund the Department of

Homeland Security. Speak in a tone that is that of America. Defend our Nation. Protect our Nation. Stop this politicizing of the funding of the Department of Homeland Security.

I ask the Republicans to join me in an important patriotic effort. Fund the Department of Homeland Security.

TRIBUTE TO ERNIE BANKS, AMBASSADOR FOR BASEBALL, MR. CUB

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate African American History Month, I rise to acknowledge and pay tribute to one of the most outstanding athletes in the history of baseball but also one of the most congenial personalities in public life, Ernie Banks, also known as Mr. Cub, Mr. Chicago, and Mr. Ambassador for Baseball.

Ernie Banks was indeed a superior athlete, playing 19 years for the Chicago Cubs, named MVP in 1958 and 1959, named to the All-Star team 12 times, hit .274 with 512 home runs, voted into the Baseball Hall of Fame on his first year of eligibility. But it was actually his cheerful attitude and his love of the game that made him such a popular player.

Ernie was always the absolute optimist. You could always count on him to express a most positive attitude:

Everyday was a good day; let's play two.

No matter what the Cubs' record, this was the year that they could win the pennant and become World Series champions.

After his playing days were over, Ernie became a coach and was active in the community. He founded a charitable organization, became the first Black Ford Motor Company dealer in the United States, and even ran unsuccessfully for the Chicago City Council.

A few years ago, Ernie approached me about an effort he had underway to get young athletes who grew up in the inner city and depressed communities to pool some of their resources and reinvest in the rebuilding and redevelopment of these neighborhoods. He was an inspiration to stars like Magic Johnson, Isaiah Thomas, and others who are doing just that.

In 1997, he was inducted into the Baseball Hall of Fame; in 1999, he was named to the Major League Baseball All Century Team; and in 2013, he was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom by President Barack Obama.

Ernie Banks, we salute you, Mr. Cub, Mr. Chicago, Mr. Ambassador for Baseball, but most importantly, Mr. Cheerleader for Life and Positive Living.

CONGRESS IS A COEQUAL BRANCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIP-TON). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strongest support for the invitation to have Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu address this body and to express my personal support for the Speaker's invitation.

Congress is a coequal branch. The Constitution acknowledges that. It establishes that. To suggest, as some have, that this body does not have a role in the geopolitical and diplomatic strategy of this Nation is flatly wrong.

This body, this Congress, funds our diplomatic activities. We, this body, this Congress, funds our military activities. And this body authorizes the use of military force, as acknowledged by the President just today with his delivery of a request for an authorization to use military force.

This body, this Congress, authorizes sanctions. And this body has expressed strong support in recent years for additional sanctions on Iran. We have a disagreement with the President, very respectfully, on this issue. But to suggest that this body, this Congress, this coequal branch, established by article I of the Constitution, should simply lay down its responsibility because the President of the United States suggested during the State of the Union that he will veto any additional sanctions we pass would be a dereliction of the duty of this body, of this Congress.

□ 1030

That is why we have expressed our interest and we have said to the President that we do want to hear from our greatest ally in the Middle East to express our position of how to secure the region. It is appropriate. We are a coequal branch.

At a time when the President continues negotiations with Iran over the objections of so many in this body, at a time when the administration has had to acknowledge—forced to acknowledge a secret letter to Iran, it is appropriate for this body to stand up, and it is appropriate for this body to suggest that we stand with Israel perhaps in a way that the President does not.

This body, this House, this Member, we welcome the Prime Minister here in March. We look forward to hearing his vision, the vision of our greatest ally in the region, on securing peace in the Middle East, providing for the stability of the Middle East, securing democracy, and to say with the people of Israel that we stand with you in providing for your security.

CONTINUED REMITTANCES TO SOMALIA

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, my question to all my colleagues today as I stand before this body is: If we could prevent a humanitarian disaster, would we? Should we?

Right now, Somalia may be on the brink of a preventable humanitarian

disaster. My district happens to be home to one of the largest Somali American communities in the world, and it is certainly the largest in the Western Hemisphere.

My constituents have come to me and have explained in very detailed and moving ways that it is time for us to figure out this problem that we have in the United States with helping people remit money that they have earned to their loved ones in the Horn of Africa.

Somali Americans in my district are proud of the progress Somalia has made, as I am and many people around the world are. This is a nation that, for over two decades, had civil war but now has a President, a legislature, and is planning for elections in 2016.

This country is fighting off al Shabaab, a terrorist organization in league with al Qaeda, and this nation has successfully fought off famine and want of many kinds. Now, they are on another kind of problem, and this problem has to do with remittances and the ability of Somali Americans to send money to their loved ones.

It is important to understand that the progress they have made is fragile. We, in the United States, don't need to worry about sending money there right now, although we should, and we have, and we are. We need to just get out of the way to allow Somali Americans to send money to their own loved ones, and our financial system is inhibiting that.

Every year, Somali Americans send about \$215 million to Somalia, a figure comparable to the entire U.S. aid package, which is approximately about \$200 million a year. Individual Somali Americans send more money than the whole Government of the United States sends there, and that vital pipeline is lifesaving money that is shut off now as we speak.

The bank that provided 60 percent of the remittances or funds sent to Somalia closed accounts of businesses that transfer money from the U.S. to Somalia, and this is catastrophic.

Now, Somali Americans cannot send money to their loved ones, and Somalis can no longer receive money that they depend on for food, for school fees, for medical bills. Many of the financial institutions in the United States have chosen to avoid serving money services businesses that send money to vulnerable nations like Somalia, due to concern that the money could find its way into bank accounts of unsavory money launderers.

The goal of the U.S. financial regulator is good. We want to keep money from the money launderers and the terrorists; but do we arrive at a point where our regulation is so tight that even the legitimate money that we want to flow is being cut off?

I am calling on our government to get together—Treasury, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, State Department—and have a real conversation, how we can stop the bad money but also let the good money flow.

As I said, Somalia depends upon this money. It is a very fragile state. It is emerging from being a failed state. If they cut the remittances off, we will see catastrophic results.

One of those catastrophic results will be an opening to groups like al Shabaab, a terrorist group that argues that the United States and the West generally don't want to help Somalia.

We need to stop them from using that recruiting message by figuring out how we can achieve our goals of stopping bad money from flowing and allowing good money to flow. For years, I have been asking for agencies to work with me to prevent this foreseeable tragedy. We need to be creative about finding a solution.

The Federal Reserve Bank of New York could use its wire service to process transfers to east Africa; that is a possibility. We could follow the example of the United Kingdom and set up a safe corridors program for banks to safely transfer money while managing risk. We could provide proactive training and assistance for banks that want to serve east African communities. There is no shortage of ideas.

I urge our government to sit down at a table and figure out a way to stop the money launderers and the bad money from flowing, but to certainly allow legitimate remittances to flow. We could prevent a catastrophe if we do.

END THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY IMPASSE NOW

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

Mr. TAKAI. Aloha, Mr. Speaker.

On February 27, the Department of Homeland Security will run out of money—17 more days. If this is not resolved, at best case, approximately 200,000 workers will stay on the job without pay or be furloughed or, at worst, not work.

Mr. Speaker, I was elected to Congress and came here promising my constituents no more government shutdowns, no more Federal furloughs, and no more sequestration; yet here we are, on the verge of letting funding for Homeland Security run out and partially shutting down government. This impasse needs to end, and it needs to end now.

I say the bottom line—to paraphrase DHS Secretary Johnson's point—is security for our Nation is not free. Our homeland security cannot be hijacked by political games. We must get past this political stalemate and work out a clean bill for funding Homeland Security.

If we don't, significant portions of the Department of Homeland Security could be crippled, and hundreds of thousands of critical Federal personnel—our constituents—could be affected.

Let's remember that we are talking about some of the most critical security personnel who are working to keep

Americans safe—shuttering the DHS Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, which would no longer alert and coordinate with local law enforcement agencies, and withholding the Securing the Cities grants that pay for critical nuclear detection capacities in cities across the country; halting research and development work on countermeasures to devastating biological threats, on nuclear detection equipment, and on cargo and passenger screening technologies; crippling FEMA's preparations for future disasters, furloughing nearly 22 percent of FEMA personnel; and ending FEMA's training activities with local law enforcement for weapons of mass destruction events.

Although some DHS employees would continue to work in the event of a shutdown, they would be forced to work without pay, creating a significant distraction and dealing a direct blow to morale.

Among those who would be affected and expected to protect Americans without getting paid would be more than 40,000 Border Patrol agents and Customs and Border Protection agents; more than 50,000 TSA aviation security screeners; more than 13,000 Immigration and Customs Enforcement law enforcement agents and officers; more than 40,000 Active-Duty Coast Guard military members; and more than 4,000 Secret Service law enforcement agents and officers.

Holding hostage funding of DHS for the purpose of overturning the President's executive actions on immigration is wrong. President Obama was forced to take action because of the inaction of this House to consider a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill that the Senate passed last year. Here we are again, yet with more inaction.

We cannot waste any more time here with political bickering, and it is not fair to try to hijack Homeland Security funding with an anti-immigration agenda. The security of our Nation and our people hang in the balance.

Again, no more government shutdowns, no more Federal furloughs, no more sequestration—let's get to work, come together, answer the call of our constituents, and just pass a clean bill for DHS funding.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 40 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

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

Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As we meditate on all the blessings of life, we especially pray for the blessing of peace in our lives and in our world. Our fervent prayer, O God, is that people will learn to live together in reconciliation and respect so that the terrors of war and violence will be no more.

As You have created each person, we pray that You would guide our hearts and minds, that every person of every place and background might focus on Your great gift of life and so learn to live in unity.

May Your special blessings be upon the Members of this assembly in the important, sometimes difficult work they do. Give them wisdom and charity that they might work together for the common good.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas 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.

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST THE ISLAMIC STATE OF IRAQ AND THE LEVANT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-9)

The SPEAKER 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 Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The so-called Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) poses a threat to the people and stability of Iraq, Syria, and the broader Middle East, and to U.S. national security. It threatens American personnel and facilities located in the region and is responsible for the deaths of U.S. citizens James Foley, Steven Sotloff, Abdul-Rahman Peter Kassig, and Kayla Mueller. If left unchecked, ISIL will pose a threat beyond the Middle East, including to the United States homeland.

I have directed a comprehensive and sustained strategy to degrade and defeat ISIL. As part of this strategy, U.S. military forces are conducting a systematic campaign of airstrikes against ISIL in Iraq and Syria. Although existing statutes provide me with the authority I need to take these actions, I have repeatedly expressed my commitment to working with the Congress to pass a bipartisan authorization for the use of military force (AUMF) against ISIL. Consistent with this commitment, I am submitting a draft AUMF that would authorize the continued use of military force to degrade and defeat ISIL.

My Administration's draft AUMF would not authorize long-term, large-scale ground combat operations like those our Nation conducted in Iraq and Afghanistan. Local forces, rather than U.S. military forces, should be deployed to conduct such operations. The authorization I propose would provide the flexibility to conduct ground combat operations in other, more limited circumstances, such as rescue operations involving U.S. or coalition personnel or the use of special operations forces to take military action against ISIL leadership. It would also authorize the use of U.S. forces in situations where ground combat operations are not expected or intended, such as intelligence collection and sharing, missions to enable kinetic strikes, or the provision of operational planning and other forms of advice and assistance to partner forces.

Although my proposed AUMF does not address the 2001 AUMF, I remain committed to working with the Congress and the American people to refine, and ultimately repeal, the 2001 AUMF. Enacting an AUMF that is specific to the threat posed by ISIL could serve as a model for how we can work together to tailor the authorities granted by the 2001 AUMF.

I can think of no better way for the Congress to join me in supporting our Nation's security than by enacting this legislation, which would show the world we are united in our resolve to counter the threat posed by ISIL.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 11, 2015.

JOINT RESOLUTION

To authorize the limited use of the United States Armed Forces against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant.

Whereas the terrorist organization that has referred to itself as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant and various other names (in this resolution referred to as "ISIL") poses a grave threat to the people and territorial integrity of Iraq and Syria, regional stability, and the national security interests of the United States and its allies and partners;

Whereas ISIL holds significant territory in Iraq and Syria and has stated its intention to seize more territory and demonstrated the capability to do so;

Whereas ISIL leaders have stated that they intend to conduct terrorist attacks internationally, including against the United States, its citizens, and interests;

Whereas ISIL has committed despicable acts of violence and mass executions against Muslims, regardless of sect, who do not subscribe to ISIL's depraved, violent, and oppressive ideology;

Whereas ISIL has threatened genocide and committed vicious acts of violence against religious and ethnic minority groups, including Iraqi Christian, Yezidi, and Turkmen populations;

Whereas ISIL has targeted innocent women and girls with horrific acts of violence, including abduction, enslavement, torture, rape, and forced marriage;

Whereas ISIL is responsible for the deaths of innocent United States citizens, including James Foley, Steven Sotloff, Abdul-Rahman Peter Kassig, and Kayla Mueller;

Whereas the United States is working with regional and global allies and partners to degrade and defeat ISIL, to cut off its funding, to stop the flow of foreign fighters to its ranks, and to support local communities as they reject ISIL;

Whereas the announcement of the anti-ISIL Coalition on September 5, 2014, during the NATO Summit in Wales, stated that ISIL poses a serious threat and should be countered by a broad international coalition;

Whereas the United States calls on its allies and partners, particularly in the Middle East and North Africa, that have not already done so to join and participate in the anti-ISIL Coalition;

Whereas the United States has taken military action against ISIL in accordance with its inherent right of individual and collective self-defense;

Whereas President Obama has repeatedly expressed his commitment to working with Congress to pass a bipartisan authorization for the use of military force for the anti-ISIL military campaign; and

Whereas President Obama has made clear that in this campaign it is more effective to use our unique capabilities in support of partners on the ground instead of large-scale deployments of U.S. ground forces: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Authorization for Use of Military Force against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant."

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION.**—The President is authorized, subject to the limitations in subsection (c), to use the Armed Forces of the United States as the President determines to be necessary and appropriate against ISIL or associated persons or forces as defined in section 5.

(b) WAR POWERS RESOLUTION REQUIREMENTS.

(1) **SPECIFIC STATUTORY AUTHORIZATION.**—Consistent with section 8(a)(1) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1547(a)(1)), Congress declares that this section is intended to constitute specific statutory authorization within the meaning of section 5(b) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(b)).

(2) **APPLICABILITY OF OTHER REQUIREMENTS.**—Nothing in this resolution supersedes any requirement of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).

(c) **LIMITATIONS.**—The authority granted in subsection (a) does not authorize the use of the United States Armed Forces in enduring offensive ground combat operations.

SEC. 3. DURATION OF THIS AUTHORIZATION.

This authorization for the use of military force shall terminate three years after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, unless reauthorized.

SEC. 4. REPORTS.

The President shall report to Congress at least once every six months on specific actions taken pursuant to this authorization.

SEC. 5. ASSOCIATED PERSONS OR FORCES DEFINED.

In this joint resolution, the term "associated persons or forces" means individuals and organizations fighting for, on behalf of, or alongside ISIL or any closely-related successor entity in hostilities against the United States or its coalition partners.

SEC. 6. REPEAL OF AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ.

The Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243; 116 Stat. 1498; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) is hereby repealed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY DOUBLE-DIPPING

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans who have paid into Social Security rely on the promise that it will be there for them when they become disabled and cannot work. Unfortunately, under current law, some people can get both disability benefits and unemployment benefits. That just doesn't make any sense. Disability benefits are for those who can't work. Unemployment benefits are for those who can work.

That is why I will be introducing commonsense legislation this week that will help ensure Social Security disability benefits are only for those who truly cannot work. With the disability program going broke next year, we cannot afford to continue to allow individuals to double dip. My bill will stop this double-dipping and will help ensure that the disability program is there for those who truly need it.

NATIONAL SALUTE TO VETERAN PATIENTS

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, each year, the Department of Veterans Affairs designates a week in February as the National Salute to Veterans to honor the brave men and women who have served our country. More than 98,000 veterans are cared for in the VA facilities across America, and the National Salute to Veterans is one small way to say thank you to these brave men and women.

Every year, I join with students all across Rhode Island to deliver Valentines to veterans during this week in order to pay tribute and express our appreciation for their service. This Saturday, I will visit the Providence VA Medical Center and veterans' homes across the State to personally deliver thousands of handwritten cards. This week, VA medical facilities all over will be holding many special activities to pay tribute to the veterans who have bravely served our country.

I encourage my colleagues and everyone listening to contact your nearest VA medical center and ask for Voluntary Service to get involved and salute America's heroes this week.

HONORING SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that Congress today will honor a great American patriot, Barry Goldwater, with a statue in the National Statuary Hall of the U.S. Capitol.

On July 4, 1963, I visited Washington, by bus, for the first time to participate in the National Draft Goldwater Rally. Senator Goldwater's legacy of promoting limited government, a strong national defense—leading to victory in the cold war—and protecting personal freedoms is more vital than ever. As a teenage Republican, I lived the southern Republican revolution he inspired. He helped transform the South from nonexistent, or insignificant, Republican legislative membership in 1963, culminating in 2014 with Republican legislative majorities in all States from Virginia to Texas and Oklahoma to Arkansas.

I am grateful the southern Republican revolution has created an open process in South Carolina, with Nikki Haley being the first female Governor in 340 years, with TIM SCOTT being the first popularly elected African American ever elected in the South to the U.S. Senate, and Alan Wilson being elected America's youngest attorney general.

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

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF BLOODY SUNDAY, TURNAROUND TUESDAY, AND FINAL SELMA TO MONTGOMERY VOTING RIGHTS MARCH

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor those who, in the face of violent opposition, bravely stood for what is right. This March will mark the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, and the final Selma to Montgomery voting rights march.

In 2013, I had the honor of joining Congressman JOHN LEWIS to visit some of these historic sites, including the Edmund Pettus Bridge, where nearly 8,000 foot soldiers marched to demonstrate against the denial of African Americans' right to vote. The sacrifice and perseverance of the Selma foot soldiers inspired the Nation, and in August of that year, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 was signed into law.

As we continue to celebrate Black History Month, I, along with many of my colleagues, am a proud original cosponsor of H.R. 431, which would award the highest civilian honor, the Congressional Gold Medal, to the foot soldiers of the voting rights movement. The bravery of the civil rights activists demonstrated half a century ago was remarkable, but we must not forget how much still needs to be done.

KAYLA MUELLER

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about Kayla Mueller, one of my constituents, who was brutally kidnapped and killed by the Islamic State, or ISIS.

Kayla was a young woman who was still full of youthful exuberance, optimism about peace and human relations, and who was willing to put her life on the line to help others halfway around the world. She was a beautiful soul, and I know she is with God now.

I am not youthful.

I see ISIS for what it is.

This is an Islamic terrorist group that is a scourge to humanity. Our society cannot exist with barbaric and evil people who value death over life, war over peace, and chaos over order. Their evil deeds are well known—as they publicize them—genocide, mass murder, sadistic killings.

I am done. I hope you are, too.

The elimination of ISIS is long overdue. In order to defeat these terrorists, we need a strategic and comprehensive military strategy.

FUNDING HOMELAND SECURITY AND IMPROVING PORT SECURITY

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to warn of the impending danger of shutting down the Department of Homeland Security.

While terror attacks are occurring worldwide, it is unbelievable and it would be unforgivable to stop funding the Department that protects our Nation's security. Yet some in Congress are willing to shut down this Department and put our Nation at risk unless we deport 5.3 million people.

As cochair of the Ports Caucus and as the Representative of the Port of Los Angeles, I can tell you that our ports are one of the most vulnerable entryways into this country; and though I believe we should do more to protect our Nation's ports, closing the Department of Homeland Security at this time would make our ports even more vulnerable to an attack.

We must act now. Time is running out to pass legislation to keep this Department open.

□ 1215

TERRORISM THREAT NOT ON PAR WITH CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in the administration's national security strategy unveiled last week, they went as far as to identify climate change as a threat on par with terrorism and weapons of mass destruction.

I agree that we need to continue to be cognizant and attentive of the impacts of the climate, but it is downright dangerous to equate the issue to the very real and direct threats that terrorist organizations and networks around the world pose to the lives of American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, Americans saw firsthand and will never forget the horrors of September 11, 2001.

Mr. Speaker, I also believe that thousands of U.S. troops who have fought in Afghanistan and Iraq, and the families and friends of the thousands of Americans who have paid the ultimate price, would respectfully disagree with the President.

Mr. Speaker, just this morning, the White House circulated a proposal to Congress to authorize military action to fight Islamic State terrorists—a day after it was confirmed that an American aid worker had been killed by the terrorist group.

This is a clear indication that the threat of terrorism has posed and continues to pose a much more immediate challenge to our national security and the safety of every American than climate change.

FUNDING FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, it is irresponsible to hold homeland security funds hostage simply because some of my colleagues don't like the President's action on immigration. There is a time and place to have this debate—and this isn't it.

I spent my career working in public safety and emergency preparedness with the LAPD. Security is in my blood. I know how important it is to be able to plan, prepare, and maintain the morale of those on the front lines.

If we let the Department of Homeland Security funding expire, it isn't nameless bureaucrats who will be suffering. We will shutter the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, halt R&D work to counter security threats, and end FEMA training activities with our local law enforcement. That says nothing of the 147,000 Border Patrol, ICE, and TSA officers, Active Duty Coast Guard, and Secret Service agents who will be forced to work without pay.

These men and women have our backs. We should have theirs.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, in the President's State of the Union Address he declared the need for "21st century infrastructure." With today's legislation to complete the Keystone XL pipeline, we are offering him an infrastructure bill that would create jobs and promote energy security.

This study from the President's own State Department says Keystone will create about 42,000 jobs and generate about \$2 billion in earnings, all while imposing a negligible environmental impact.

This project has been waiting for approval for more than 2,300 days. The Nebraska Supreme Court struck down the challenge against it. Fifty-eight percent of Americans said they support it, and a bipartisan majority in both Chambers of Congress approved it.

I urge the President to listen to the will of his constituents and, if nothing else, maybe read the reports from his own administration. The excuses have run out. It is time to build.

FUND HOMELAND SECURITY

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, as you have heard, there are only 17 days until the GOP recklessly shuts down the Department of Homeland Security—and only 6 legislative days before that happens. We have a bipartisan bill that we have already agreed to. Bring it to the floor. We will be here. We can pass it today.

When the majority leader was asked why we should pass the DHS funding bill, he said: "Why do we have to?" Seriously. This is about the safety of the

American people. Rather than dealing with the safety of the American people, the Republican leadership has decided to continue to pander to the extreme Tea Party voices within their party.

We ought to be taking this up as a matter of course and get back to the business of dealing with the big questions that people want us to take on, like how we can create an economy that is not rigged for the people at the top, with the rest of us paying the price. These are questions that people want us to deal with.

We ought to set aside the politics of this Homeland Security bill and bring the bill that you have already agreed to, and we will vote on it and get on with the business of the American people.

WE NEED STRONG LEADERSHIP ON TERRORISM

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

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep concern about the continued expansion of Islamic terrorist groups and the threat they pose to the American people.

Today, the President requested congressional authorization for his limited efforts against ISIS, but make no mistake: this request does not constitute a strategy, nor does it substitute for resolve.

In August, the President promised to “degrade and destroy” this terrorist army through airstrikes and military assistance to our partners. Since then, his efforts have remained lacking, while ISIS’ sanctuary has grown to the size of Maryland.

The administration has instead courted the mullahs of Iran and signaled a willingness to work with Syria’s brutal dictatorship, the Assad regime, even though they both still continue to contribute to this crisis.

History has shown us that the world pays a heavy price when we appease dictators and turn a blind eye to evil. The President has allowed the emergence of a global threat that will likely persist for years.

The American people deserve stronger leadership from their Commander in Chief and to hear directly from him how the action he is asking Congress to authorize will destroy ISIS.

FY 2015 FUNDING FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, in these challenging times, as we work to protect the country from the security threats we face, I call on the Republican leadership to bring a clean bill to

fund the Department of Homeland Security to the floor.

As a senior member of the Committee on Homeland Security, I know that DHS plays a vital role in protecting us from threats like ISIL, and I strongly support those who defend our Nation, go to work every day to protect us, and particularly those who put their lives on the line.

Protecting the homeland extends beyond conventional acts of terror to things like cybersecurity, an area that I am deeply concerned about. Through endeavors like the National Cybersecurity Communications and Integration Center and US-CERT, DHS partners with industry to defend us against attacks and works to protect and assist Federal agencies from cyber assault.

Mr. Speaker, the attack on Sony and Anthem’s massive data breach underscore the need for the robust cybersecurity activities supported by DHS. For the majority to prevent DHS’ hardworking employees from being paid or undertaking new projects is politics trumping policy, and I urge my Republican colleagues to abandon their misguided strategy and bring a clean bill to the floor that will appropriately fund DHS.

HONORING DANE A. MILLER

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

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory and the legacy of Dr. Dane A. Miller, who passed away yesterday.

Dane was born in 1946 and, along with his wife, Mary Louise, was nothing short of the classic American success story. There is also no shortage of professional accomplishments to fully describe this industry titan.

As the founder of Biomet, now a medical device company in Warsaw, Indiana, he started the company—in true Indiana form—in a converted barn. During his time as president and CEO, he managed to grow Biomet into a company of over \$2 billion in annual sales and 4,000 employees.

Dane was a brilliant man. He was a Ph.D. and a biomedical engineer known for numerous innovations in the medical device industry. Perhaps the only two things he didn’t know how to do was to give up on a problem or to retire. He was tireless in his efforts. The only thing larger than his ability was his heart.

His time and energy were fully dedicated to his wife, family, and the greater community of Warsaw and his hometown of Winona Lake.

My heart goes out to his family and the innumerable people whose lives he touched. For me and so many others, Dane Miller will be a shining example of hard work, charity to one’s fellow man, and doing this all while maintaining a humble spirit. He enjoyed nothing more than spending time with his

friends and family. Dane has affected so many lives in wonderful ways and will long be missed.

FUND DHS

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to me to watch the Republicans recklessly play politics with our national security. That is right. Keeping America safe is why we have a Department of Homeland Security. That is what it does.

Funding for the Department of Homeland Security expires February 27. We have only 6 legislative days between now and then to pass a clean funding bill.

If we fail to pass a bill, 30,000 workers will be furloughed and the rest will work without getting paid. Really? These workers are Border Patrol Agents, TSA security screeners, immigration officers, and members of the Secret Service and Coast Guard. We rely on them to keep us safe—and they rely on us to pay them.

Shame on the Republican Party for jeopardizing our national security in a misguided attempt to score political points with the extremist wing of their base. Give us a clean bill and let us fund the Department of Homeland Security.

PASS THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE BILL

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, this year, House Republicans have hit the ground running in addressing harmful and outdated policies that have hindered job growth and hurt the American economy over the last several years. One of our first priorities has been to pass a bill to build the Keystone pipeline, which I hope will have final passage here later today.

It has been 6 years since the original Keystone pipeline application was submitted—6 long years where we would have increased job creation, energy security, lowered energy costs, and built a stronger economy.

It is time to take action where this administration has failed to and move forward with the Keystone pipeline, an issue that has broad bipartisan support and will create jobs and positively impact hardworking families across the country.

We plan on getting a lot done this Congress, and our top priority will be kick-starting our stalled economy. House Republicans remain focused on creating good-paying jobs, growing our economy, and ensuring that every hardworking American has the opportunity to succeed.

HONORING ALEX RAY

□ 1230

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

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Alex Ray, a Granite Stater who has made significant contributions to our State's identity and our economy.

When you ask most people in New Hampshire what restaurant captures the essence of our State, they will say the Common Man. Alex built the Common Man family of restaurants from the ground up, expanding from one location in Ashland, New Hampshire, in 1971 to 16 eateries around the State. He has also given back a great deal to communities across New Hampshire and has been involved with a wide array of philanthropic endeavors over the years.

Alex's motto for the Common Man family is simply, "Do Good," which he seeks to instill in his staff and live by in his own life.

He is currently in the process of completing two beautiful new rest areas off Interstate 93. These new facilities are great examples of the public-private partnerships that have been so successful in New Hampshire.

Alex's creative and community-oriented approach to both business and philanthropy has had an incredibly positive impact over the last four decades.

I am honored to count Alex as a good friend, and I would like to express my appreciation for all his wonderful work on behalf of the citizens of New Hampshire.

FUNDING DHS

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, as the sign points out, today marks 17 days until the Department of Homeland Security shuts down, leaving our Nation's national security at risk.

Why is DHS closing down? It is closing down for the reason that it is being held hostage because it is riddled with immigration policy riders which, as we all know, have a zero chance of being signed by the President.

If funding lapses, our Nation's ports of entry will be severely impacted. For example, I represent the Port of Long Beach. They will not be able to upgrade their communications and their surveillance systems unless DHS continues and is able to put out grant funding. That is unacceptable and also very unwise.

The Senate has made clear that it will not accept the current bill and will not pass that bill in its Chamber. It is now time for the Republican leadership in this House to end their political grandstanding and bring up a clean DHS bill immediately.

DON'T SHUT DOWN OUR SECURITY

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because time is running out for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to act responsibly when it comes to our Nation's security. In 17 days, the money for our Homeland Security programs will be gone.

My Democratic colleagues and I are sending a very clear message to Speaker BOEHNER and the Republican majority. Don't shut down our security. It is as simple as that. Don't shut down our security.

Don't shut down the very agency that is trusted to protect the American people from threats of every kind. Don't hold our Homeland Security programs hostage until you get your way in deporting parents and families.

Don't put politics before people. That is exactly what they are doing. Seventeen days, there is no more time for these kinds of games.

At that point, thousands of vital workers will either be forced to work without pay or sent home, leaving their important jobs undone during a dangerous time in our world.

They are putting politics before people. They are putting politics before the safety of our country. Don't shut down our security. Don't shut down our security.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE APPROVAL ACT

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to S. 1.

Here we go again. For the 11th time, House Republicans are falsely promoting the idea that Keystone will improve the economy.

They say Keystone will create 42,000 jobs. False—Keystone will create 35 permanent jobs. Republicans say the pipeline will guarantee U.S. energy independence. False—there is no concrete assurance that oil produced by the pipeline will remain in the U.S.

Along with these economic shortcomings, U.S. taxpayers will bear 100 percent of the risk if a catastrophic spill occurs. America needs job growth, reliable energy, not hypotheticals. We must be focused on investments in clean energy and infrastructure projects that create jobs and boost our economy.

With no real impact on job creation or energy security, this bill is a losing deal for everyone except the foreign company, TransCanada.

The American people and our environment deserve better than to be collateral damage for an unfounded project. I stand opposed to the Key-

stone XL Pipeline Approval Act, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion 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 vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

AWARDING CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO THE FOOT SOLDIERS WHO PARTICIPATED IN BLOODY SUNDAY, TURNAROUND TUESDAY, OR THE FINAL SELMA TO MONTGOMERY VOTING RIGHTS MARCH IN MARCH OF 1965

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 431) to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Foot Soldiers who participated in Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, or the final Selma to Montgomery Voting Rights March in March of 1965, which served as a catalyst for the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 431

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) March 7, 2015, will mark 50 years since the brave Foot Soldiers of the Voting Rights Movement first attempted to march from Selma to Montgomery on "Bloody Sunday" in protest against the denial of their right to vote, and were brutally assaulted by Alabama state troopers.

(2) Beginning in 1964, members of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee attempted to register African-Americans to vote throughout the state of Alabama.

(3) These efforts were designed to ensure that every American citizen would be able to exercise their constitutional right to vote and have their voices heard.

(4) By December of 1964, many of these efforts remained unsuccessful. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., working with leaders from the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, began to organize protests throughout Alabama.

(5) On March 7, 1965, over 500 voting rights marchers known as "Foot Soldiers" gathered on the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama in peaceful protest of the denial of their most sacred and constitutionally protected right—the right to vote.

(6) Led by John Lewis of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and Rev. Hosea Williams of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, these Foot Soldiers began the march towards the Alabama State Capitol in Montgomery, Alabama.

(7) As the Foot Soldiers crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge, they were confronted by a wall of Alabama state troopers who brutally attacked and beat them.

(8) Americans across the country witnessed this tragic turn of events as news stations

broadcasted the brutality on a day that would be later known as "Bloody Sunday."

(9) Two days later on Tuesday, March 9, 1965, nearly 2,500 Foot Soldiers led by Dr. Martin Luther King risked their lives once more and attempted a second peaceful march starting at the Edmund Pettus Bridge. This second attempted march was later known as "Turnaround Tuesday."

(10) Fearing for the safety of these Foot Soldiers who received no protection from federal or state authorities during this second march, Dr. King led the marchers to the base of the Edmund Pettus Bridge and stopped. Dr. King kneeled and offered a prayer of solidarity and walked back to the church.

(11) President Lyndon B. Johnson, inspired by the bravery and determination of these Foot Soldiers and the atrocities they endured, announced his plan for a voting rights bill aimed at securing the precious right to vote for all citizens during an address to Congress on March 15, 1965.

(12) On March 17, 1965, one week after "Turnaround Tuesday", U.S. District Judge Frank M. Johnson ruled the Foot Soldiers had a First Amendment right to petition the government through peaceful protest, and ordered federal agents to provide full protection to the Foot Soldiers during the Selma to Montgomery Voting Rights March.

(13) Judge Johnson's decision overturned Alabama Governor George Wallace's prohibition on the protest due to public safety concerns.

(14) On March 21, 1965, under the court order, the U.S. Army, the federalized Alabama National Guard, and countless federal agents and marshals escorted nearly 8,000 Foot Soldiers from the start of their heroic journey in Selma, Alabama to their safe arrival on the steps of the Alabama State Capitol Building on March 25, 1965.

(15) The extraordinary bravery and sacrifice these Foot Soldiers displayed in pursuit of a peaceful march from Selma to Montgomery brought national attention to the struggle for equal voting rights, and served as the catalyst for Congress to pass the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which President Johnson signed into law on August 6, 1965.

(16) To commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Voting Rights Movement and the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, it is befitting that Congress bestow the highest civilian honor, the Congressional Gold Medal, in 2015, to the Foot Soldiers who participated in Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday or the final Selma to Montgomery Voting Rights March during March of 1965, which served as a catalyst for the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) PRESENTATION AUTHORIZED.—The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate shall make appropriate arrangements for the presentation, on behalf of Congress, of a gold medal of appropriate design to the Foot Soldiers who participated in Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, or the final Selma to Montgomery Voting Rights March during March of 1965, which served as a catalyst for the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For purposes of the presentation referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury (referred to in this Act as the "Secretary") shall strike a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary.

(c) AWARD OF MEDAL.—Following the award of the gold medal described in subsection (a), the medal shall be given to the Selma Interpretative Center in Selma, Ala-

bama, where it shall be available for display or temporary loan to be displayed elsewhere, as appropriate.

SEC. 3. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

The Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck pursuant to section 2 under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, and the cost of the gold medal.

SEC. 4. STATUS OF MEDALS.

(a) NATIONAL MEDALS.—The medals struck pursuant to this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

(b) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of sections 5134 and 5136 of title 31, United States Code, all medals struck under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous materials into the RECORD concerning H.R. 431, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this very important bill, H.R. 431, a bipartisan bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the foot soldiers, the courageous men and women who participated in historic days such as Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, and the final March from Selma to Montgomery to ensure voting rights for African Americans.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes, it is hard for people in today's society to realize the historical significance of the events that took place in the past. For younger people, it may seem like a lifetime ago, but for those who lived through those experiences, it may seem like it just happened yesterday.

One series of events that we cannot and must not allow to fade away are the historic marches that began in Selma in the spring of 1956. On March 7, 1965, led by two fearless men, the Reverend Hosea Williams and a man many in this Chamber know well, Representative JOHN LEWIS, 500 of those brave foot soldiers determined to have their voices heard and their right to vote be recognized as they bravely lined up at the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

These initial marchers were then brutally assaulted and beaten by Alabama State troopers as they attempted to cross the bridge, seeking to assert their constitutional right to vote. That

atrocious became known as Bloody Sunday.

Two days later, nearly 2,500 foot soldiers, led by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., peacefully assembled and again attempted to cross the Edmund Pettus Bridge. The group marched to where the attacks occurred a few days before on Bloody Sunday, and at Dr. King's request, they stopped and knelt in prayer. Following the prayer, the marchers turned around and returned to Selma.

Finally then, on March 21, under the protection of the U.S. Army, Federal marshals, and the federalized Alabama National Guard at that point, that group had swollen to 8,000 foot soldiers who were escorted safely for 54 miles from Selma to Montgomery.

By the time the march reached the steps of the State capitol, that group had grown to approximately 25,000 people strong there on those steps in Montgomery.

Mr. Speaker, instead of bringing the campaign to search for voting rights to a halt, 50 years ago, the photographs and blurry television images of that violent attack on Bloody Sunday on that bridge galvanized the national attention. In fact, the first march was a catalyst for action.

Just 5 short months after the first march, Congress had passed and President Johnson had signed into law the Voting Rights Act.

Mr. Speaker, we, as a Nation, must do more to ensure voting rights are protected for all Americans, and in doing so, we must remember the sacrifices of those individuals who came before us and worked so tirelessly to make a difference and to create voting rights equality.

It is truly a privilege for me personally to stand before you today as Congress recognizes these brave men and women and the historical significance of those marches that began in Selma and forever changed the direction of our great Nation.

I thank the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for highlighting these historic events, and I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 431.

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 431 and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan for joining me on the floor today to support H.R. 431. I have enjoyed our bipartisan working relationship on the House Financial Services Committee, and I am pleased today to share this debate time with him.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 431, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the foot soldiers who participated in Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, or the final Selma to Montgomery voting rights march in 1965.

March 7, 2015, will mark 50 years since the courageous foot soldiers of

the voting rights movement first attempted to march from Selma to Montgomery to protest the denial of their voting rights.

Led by our colleague JOHN LEWIS of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and Reverend Hosea Williams of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, these foot soldiers began the march towards the Alabama State Capitol in Montgomery. They pledged to keep on walking until they secured the freedoms promised to them by the U.S. Constitution.

As they crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge, a wall of Alabama State troopers were waiting at the foot of the bridge. News stations from across the country televised the brutality that followed as foot soldiers like Hosea Williams; JOHN LEWIS; Amelia Boynton Robinson; Reverend F.D. Reese; Bob Nance of Lowndes County; Albert Turner, Sr., of Perry County; and so many others were attacked on Edmund Pettus Bridge on what has become known as Bloody Sunday.

The journey of the foot soldiers we honor today was not an easy one. They were discriminated by Whites and ostracized by Blacks who were afraid to join them, but still, they persevered because they could no longer bear the burdens of second-class citizenship.

The president of the Dallas County Voters League, Reverend F.D. Reese, wasn't going to let nobody turn him around, he told me. He said that given the conditions that existed in Selma and the South at that time, he wanted to make sure that things were different.

He was willing to do whatever was necessary to ensure that people—no matter their race, color, or creed—would have the right to vote.

He said:

The Lord gave us determination to keep moving forward. We were determined to let the Lord lead us and direct us so that all people, regardless of their color, would have access to the political process.

He went on:

We were not at all afraid because we were determined that whatever it took, even if it meant our lives, we were going to move Alabama and the States and this Nation forward.

Amelia Boynton Robinson literally felt the blows of injustice as she was beaten on the bridge by Alabama State troopers and left for dead. Amelia's will and dignity suffered no damage, but it made her more resolved than ever to continue the fight for equal voting rights.

Two days after Bloody Sunday, over 2,500 foot soldiers, heeding the call from Dr. Martin Luther King, came to Selma to join the marchers. On March 9, 1965, led by Dr. King and Reverend Ralph Abernathy and many clergy from across this Nation, the foot soldiers once again left from the historic Brown Chapel AME Church and walked to the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

Dr. King stopped at the top of the bridge while a sea of State troopers

stepped aside. On bended knees, Dr. King began to pray as the thousands of marchers joined him. As if moved by the spirit, Dr. King turned around and walked back to the church. Tuesday was not to be the day to complete the 54-mile journey. The second march attempt was known as Turnaround Tuesday.

The fight for voting rights was fought both in the streets and in the courtrooms. Attorney Fred Gray helped pave the way for the final Selma to Montgomery march. He was a member of the legal team that represented Hosea Williams, John Lewis, and Amelia Boynton Robinson in *Williams v. Wallace*.

Because of his work and the courage of an Alabama Federal judge, Federal Judge Frank Johnson ruled that the foot soldiers had a First Amendment right to petition the government through peaceful protest and ordered Federal agents to provide full protection to the foot soldiers during the Selma to Montgomery March.

Under court order, the U.S. Army, the federalized Alabama National Guard, and countless Federal agencies and marshals escorted more than 8,000 foot soldiers on March 21, 1965, as these brave men and women began their historic 54-mile journey from Selma to the steps of the Alabama State Capitol in Montgomery, Alabama.

The extraordinary bravery and sacrifices these foot soldiers displayed in pursuit of a peaceful march from Selma to Montgomery brought national attention to the struggle for equal voting rights and served as a catalyst for Congress to pass the Voting Rights Act of 1965 which President Lyndon Johnson signed into law on August 6, 1965.

Mr. Speaker, as Alabama's first Black Congresswoman, I know that the journey that I now take was only made possible because of the courage and bravery of the foot soldiers of the voting rights movement.

As a proud native of Selma and the U.S. Representative who now represents Selma and parts of Montgomery, I am the direct beneficiary of their sacrifice.

During this 50th commemoration of the voting rights movement and the 50th anniversary of the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, it is befitting that this august body would bestow upon the foot soldiers of the voting rights movement our highest civilian honor, a Congressional Gold Medal, for their valor and determination in relentlessly pursuing the promise of our great Constitution, that all men and women were indeed created equal.

I am proud to be joined by my colleague MARTHA ROBY and the entire Alabama congressional delegation—Representatives ADERHOLT, ROGERS, BROOKS, BYRNE, and PALMER—as original cosponsors of this Congressional Gold Medal bill.

I want to thank the more than 300 colleagues who also signed on to the

bill and a special thanks to the leadership of both parties—Speaker BOEHNER, Majority Leader MCCARTHY, Minority Leader PELOSI, and Whip HOYER—for their support in getting this legislation on the floor today.

□ 1245

This would not have been possible without the help and support of Chairman HENSARLING and Ranking Member WATERS of the House Committee on Financial Services.

To the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), thank you. It is an honor to stand with you today to pay tribute to the foot soldiers of the voting rights movement.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 431, a bill that honors the foot soldiers who participated in Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, and the final march from Selma to Montgomery with a Congressional Gold Medal, which is Congress' highest civilian honor. I hope this medal serves as a powerful reminder of the many sacrifices that were made.

They say that the price of freedom is never free. Well, the foot soldiers of the voting rights movement paid the ultimate price so that this Nation could live up to the ideals of equality and justice for all. This Nation should never forget those who marched, prayed, and died in the pursuit of civil rights, voting rights, and social change.

I urge my colleagues to join us in voting in favor of H.R. 431.

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

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY), who is the lead cosponsor of this legislation.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I, too, want to echo the sentiments of my colleague from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) in thanking leadership and all the Members on both sides of the aisle for their willingness to jump right on this so that we could achieve passage both here in the House and in the Senate in time for this most important anniversary, the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday.

I am so proud just standing here listening to my colleague. I am so proud to have the privilege and the opportunity to cosponsor this bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the brave men and women who not only changed Alabama and America, but they changed the world.

So as we look toward the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday, it is certainly fitting to honor the brave individuals who, against brutality and oppression, took a stand for their God-given rights. So thank you to my colleague, Terry Sewell, for all your hard work on this very important, worthy legislation.

I have also been honored, Mr. Speaker, to serve alongside my colleague

from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) in recruiting Members of this body and the Senate to join us in the pilgrimage led by JOHN LEWIS to Alabama for the anniversary on the 6th, 7th, and 8th of next month. I am proud to say we have a record number of colleagues that are willing to participate because of the obvious significance of this important day.

I look forward to, alongside all of my colleagues in the Alabama delegation—who again I thank as well as Ms. SEWELL for their willingness to host our colleagues from all over the country in Birmingham, in Montgomery, and Selma, and other very important places to the civil rights movement—hearing from those who lived it.

One of the things that we did alongside this Congressional Gold Medal, Mr. Speaker, was to invite our colleagues to come to a screening of the movie “Selma.” I have to say, as a girl growing up in Montgomery, Alabama, that did not live through this very important time in our history, it was honestly one of the more moving moments in my time in Congress, to sit in the room with our colleague, Mr. LEWIS, and experience through that visual on the screen what he lived in his life. It was a unique and special moment and one that I will personally treasure for a very long time.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is Mr. LEWIS and all those that joined him in standing up for justice that we seek to honor with this Congressional Gold Medal. There is no higher honor that we as Members of Congress can bestow, yet it seems such a small token of gratitude compared to the magnitude of the endeavors of those who lived through those days.

My daughter, Margaret, Mr. Speaker, whom you often hear me talk about—I have Margaret and George, but Margaret is in fourth grade, and like in a lot of States, in fourth grade in Alabama you learn about Alabama history. This is such an important time in her life as she learns about our State and its history, and the civil rights movement is certainly an integral part, a very important part of our history. So she is coming with me on the pilgrimage next month. She will be able to meet and know firsthand the people that fought to change the world.

It is difficult for those of us who weren't alive during the civil rights movement sometimes to wrap our minds around it, but I, alongside my daughter, am very much looking forward to this special time as Members of Congress that we have to reflect on the importance of this history.

I am, again, honored, Mr. Speaker, to be a part of this bill, and I just thank, again, all of my colleagues who very quickly joined with us so that we could get this done to honor those brave foot soldiers that changed not just our country, but the world. I, too, ask that all my colleagues join me in voting in favor of H.R. 431.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. I want to thank Ms. SEWELL for having the foresight to bring this proposal. This is most fitting that we honor the foot soldiers. They were Americans, all races, who came together and saw injustice and wanted to right it. They risked their lives. Some died in the efforts. Miss Liuzzo was killed right after the march to Montgomery. Schwerner, Chaney, and Goodman were killed over in Mississippi in conjunction with this with the Freedom Riders.

Thousands of people came to the South to see that people got the right to vote. It is hard to believe that people were denied the right to vote in this country, but they were.

I was touched by the remarks of my colleague from Alabama. It was historic. But you don't just have to see the movie and experience it to honor these people and give them a Gold Medal; you need to live it.

People are being denied voting rights today in this country. The Supreme Court emasculated the Voting Rights Act just recently. It needs to be reinstated. There are civil rights that can be performed and enacted in America today. The movement isn't over. The movement continues. A medal is good, but the spirit must continue on this floor to see that all people have their right to vote, their right to participate, and their rights not to have State judges with their lips dripping with interposition tell probate clerks not to enforce a Federal law.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS), a member of the Committee on Financial Services, which has been dealing with this issue.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of this bipartisan legislation that will award a Congressional Gold Medal to the civil rights leaders who so bravely marched for voting rights and equality from Selma, Alabama, to the State capital of Montgomery in March of 1965.

As an adopted son of the great State of Alabama, having been educated at both Auburn University and Samford University's Cumberland School of Law, it is an absolute honor to recognize these peace-loving, God-fearing patriots. These marchers, led by civil rights leaders such as Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., and my colleague from Georgia, Representative JOHN LEWIS, changed the course of our Nation's history. Ultimately, their fearless efforts led to the enactment of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

The Congressional Gold Medal is the highest civilian award presented by Congress, and I can think of no better time than the 50th anniversary of this moment in our Nation's history to honor and recognize the civil rights leaders who sacrificed so greatly to bring equality to the voiceless across

the United States. May their sacrifice, diligence, and dedication to this cause stand as an example to all of us as we continue to serve in this Chamber and in every aspect of our lives.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS).

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 431, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the foot soldiers who participated in Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, and the final march from Selma to Montgomery, which was a catalyst for the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

I am proud to cosponsor this bill and to stand with Congresswoman SEWELL and her delegation and one of the greatest leaders in the civil rights movement, Congressman JOHN LEWIS.

It is important that we recognize the civil rights titans whose sacrifice is an essential part of American history. As we honor yesterday's foot soldiers with a Congressional Gold Medal, let us remember that we are still in the fight.

In my home State of North Carolina, we are battling a new rollback on voters' rights. It was one of the most regressive laws we have passed. To fully honor the foot soldiers' sacrifice, we must keep fighting and restore the important protections that have been stripped from the Voting Rights Act.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for joining me in honoring these American heroes.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished House majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I do want to thank the authors of this bill, Congresswoman ROBY and Congresswoman SEWELL, for their work on this. I appreciate it.

We are blessed in this Nation to enjoy the privileges of democracy and to exercise our freedoms without fear, but sadly, for millions of African Americans in our history, that has not been the case.

James Cooper, author of American works like “The Last of the Mohicans” and “The American Democrat,” once said: “The man who can right himself by a vote will seldom resort to a musket.”

The opposite is also true. People denied their rights might well resort to violence. It is not difficult to see why. With no established form of recourse, what choice do those denied their freedoms have?

But the people we honor today chose a different path. These nonviolent civil rights activists did not take the road of hate. In their generation's quest for freedom, they didn't corrupt themselves with the sins of those who worked against them. They fought for the rights due to every person—not with weapons, but with the force of rhetoric and virtue of peace.

I remember just a few years ago, I was walking with my friend Congressman JOHN LEWIS through Selma, Alabama. We walked on the same path of

the Selma to Montgomery march that JOHN led 50 years ago. We crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge in peace that day, but when JOHN led the march across the same bridge in 1965, he was beaten by a mob of State troopers and deputized citizens.

JOHN cannot remember who carried him, but wounded and bloodied, as JOHN told it to me, he was taken away to a church with a head injury. He did not know if he would even live.

Those marchers at Selma demonstrated physical courage, but they also demonstrated the highest moral courage. Under the onslaught of brutality and uncertainty, they did not match violence with violence. No. They demanded peace in the face of war, solidarity in the face of division, and love in the face of hate.

For all of America's shortcomings, these brave men and women demanded that the promise of America not be discarded but, instead, realized by being purified in practice. They held America to its promise. By doing so, they put their lives at risk, suffered ridicule and bodily harm, and yet in history they were vindicated.

□ 1300

We are gathered today in honor of those civil rights activists who suffered violence while standing in peace. We honor them for holding our Nation to the highest ideals, ensuring the true existence of liberty and justice for all and making this country keep to its promise that all men and women are created equal.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California, NANCY PELOSI, the honorable minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentlewoman from Alabama, Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL, for her leadership and for introducing and driving forth this legislation to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the foot soldiers of Selma who fought for African Americans' right to vote. I thank her for the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting and moving and inspiring to listen to the debate on this legislation, to hear the majority leader, to hear other Members of the Congress talk about how important what happened at Selma was to our country and what promise it made for the future of our country.

I would hope that the logical conclusion of that—when we see people who are beaten and, in some instances at that time, killed, fighting for the right to vote—is that we would truly honor them not only with a Gold Medal, as wonderful as that is, but by passing the Voting Rights Act on the floor of the House.

Today, listening to our colleagues, I am reminded of a day almost a year ago, around March of last year, when we dedicated the statue of Rosa Parks in the Capitol of the United States. How exciting—an African American

woman to join the ranks of all those men out there. Many more striving to bring diversity, recognizing the great leadership of Rosa Parks.

While we were there that very day, dedicating the statue of Rosa Parks, across the street at the Supreme Court they were hearing the arguments on the Voting Rights case. And it seems to me that it would have been so logical for us to be supporting the spirit of the Voting Rights Act.

Of course the Court acted, and the Congressional Black Caucus took the lead. Many of us stood on the steps while the oral arguments were going on and later came here to dedicate the statue.

But there seemed to be a total disconnect between those who were speaking in a bipartisan way about Rosa Parks and how important it was to our country and the fact that the Court was going to overturn a piece of the Voting Rights Act, and that we, 1 year later, have done nothing to correct that.

So while it is beautiful and lovely to hear all of the good words, and it is fabulous for us to be awarding this Gold Medal, frankly, I think that the foot soldiers of Selma bring added luster to the Gold Medal, as we honor them with it.

As we all know, this marks the 50th anniversary of two exceptional events in American history: the march on Selma and the passage of the Voting Rights Act. Fifty years ago, as we all know, thousands of people—students and scholars, homemakers and laborers, members of the clergy—the Greek Orthodox Church was very prominently there, and many other heroes—marched across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama.

Today, the undaunted courage and dignity of the men and women who marched continue to inspire our Nation—in fact, on the floor of the House today. Hopefully that inspiration will rise to a place in this House where we pass the Voting Rights Act.

The gentleman from Georgia, JOHN LEWIS, who was there, has been acclaimed by all of us as a national treasure and a national hero. What an honor it is to serve with him in Congress and to call him “colleague.”

The journey from Selma to Montgomery is more than 50 miles, but fatigue did not stop the marchers. State troopers used tear gas and nightsticks. Hatred, violence, and injuries did not stop them. Those brave foot soldiers, propelled by their faith in our country to live up to its promise, continued to march because they knew the power of the ballot.

How proud all of us are, again, to serve in the House alongside Congressman JOHN LEWIS, the conscience of the Congress, who was one of the young leaders of the march toward equality and opportunity, toward justice, toward the ballot box.

The bravery of the Selma marchers summoned this Nation to action. A

week after Bloody Sunday, President Lyndon Baines Johnson came to this Chamber—right there—to call on Congress to pass the Voting Rights Act. And he said at the time:

At times, history and fate meet at a single time in a single place to shape a turning point in man's unending search for freedom. So it was at Lexington and Concord. So it was at Appomattox. So it was in Selma, Alabama.

The courage of 8,000 marchers transformed the bridge into a national symbol of how justice can conquer the status quo. Today, that steel arch bridge over the Alabama River illustrates Dr. King's observation that we all quote all the time: “The arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends towards justice.”

Today we propose to honor the foot soldiers of the Selma marches with the Congressional Gold Medal and by accepting our own responsibility to keep bending, pulling, and nudging that arc toward justice. One way we can do it is by passing the Voting Rights Act.

Just to recall, Mr. Speaker, the last time we brought up the Voting Rights Act in 2006–2007, the Senate passed it unanimously. In the House, the vote was 390–33.

There is bipartisan legislation that has been introduced which can be brought to the floor, passed, and signed into law in time for the Selma anniversary next month. And it certainly must be passed before the 50th anniversary of the signing of the Voting Rights Act on August 6, the 50th anniversary.

We must do so to push back against the same old stale, dressed-up, and renamed efforts to hamper voting access and hinder progress.

Today, as we celebrate the foot soldiers—we pay homage, we reach deep inside of us to say how inspired we all were by it and isn't it wonderful—let's look to the now and say: Right now, to honor these people, we must pass the Voting Rights Act again to correct what the Court did.

So as we pay tribute to the foot soldiers who kept on marching, we move forward from a painful past and march into a brighter, fairer future for everyone.

Again, I thank the gentlewoman from Alabama, Congresswoman SEWELL, for her leadership on this important issue.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I have no interest in politicizing this great bipartisan Gold Medal act that we currently have before us. And let's not turn this important act into a debate that will be, frankly, held in the Judiciary Committee, rather than on the House floor.

We know that the Voting Rights Act—being a man who represents a significant part of Gerald R. Ford's congressional district, it was men like him that were hand-in-hand, arm-in-arm with those in that movement that helped create the original Voting Rights Act. And I know that this body

can rise again to do the right thing and move forward in a bipartisan manner.

With that, Mr. Speaker, recognizing that the other side has numerous requests for time on this bill, particularly from the Congressional Black Caucus, I ask unanimous consent that 7 minutes of the majority's time be transferred and placed under the control of my good friend and colleague from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL), who is the Democratic manager.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding us the time. I want to thank him for the opportunity to allow the members of the Congressional Black Caucus to speak out on this important bill.

Right now, I have the honor to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland, STENY HOYER, the honorable minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. I will say to my friend from Michigan, today we are all members of the Congressional Black Caucus, one people with one commitment and one idea.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill, of which I am a cosponsor, honoring the brave men and women who marched in Selma.

This will be my 10th year participating in the Faith and Politics Institute's pilgrimage to Selma with my friend from Georgia, JOHN LEWIS.

I thank the gentlelady from Selma for leading this debate.

Those folks who marched across that bridge on March 7, known as Bloody Sunday, were met with the power of the State to prevent them from voting.

This Gold Medal would be a tribute to John and to all those who marched alongside him and all those who marched along 2 weeks later with Martin Luther King, Jr., those thousands who walked that 5-day journey from Selma to Montgomery. We ought to pass it unanimously. I hope we will.

But Martin Luther King, Jr., would not be happy with us if we just looked back in awe and reverence and did not look at today—I tell my friend from Michigan—for he would say that Congress should go further than simply honoring those who fought for their rights a half a century ago. We should pay tribute to their sacrifices and the scars they still carry by restoring the full protections of the Voting Rights Act, which the Supreme Court weakened in 2013. Martin Luther King, Jr., was about principle, but he was also about ensuring that protections would be in place.

I hope that this House will allow bipartisan legislation to restore these protections, which is cosponsored by the gentleman from Wisconsin, JIM SENSENBRENNER, the former chairman of the Judiciary Committee on the Re-

publican side, and the gentleman from Georgia, JOHN LEWIS, a hero of Selma. These protections should move expeditiously through the House once the legislation is introduced.

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for giving the gentlewoman a minute to yield to me.

I thank Representative SEWELL for her leadership in making sure Congress honors those who shook the conscience of our Nation through their courageous actions in Selma 50 years ago and in so many other places—where many fought, some were badly injured, and, yes, some died—to redeem the promise of America that all of us are created equal, endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights. And certainly in a democracy, one of the most important—if not the most important—rights that we have is to vote, to select our representatives, to select the policies under which we will live.

I thank the Speaker and the majority leader for getting behind this effort. And, again, I thank the gentlelady from Selma. How proud she must be of her hometown and of the history that was made there, not just for African Americans but for all Americans.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time at this moment.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, how many more minutes do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Alabama has 12½ minutes remaining.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY).

Mrs. BEATTY. I thank the gentlewoman from Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL, my good friend, and my good friend from Alabama, MARTHA ROBY, in strong support of H.R. 431, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the foot soldiers who participated in the Selma freedom marches in March of 1965.

These foot soldiers, including our colleague from Georgia, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, and the men, women, and children who marched on Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, and in the final march from Selma to Montgomery, were met with attacks and dogs, beatings, and death along the way. But, Mr. Speaker, still they marched, as many of us will march in a few weeks, to fight for equal rights and voting rights.

Mr. Speaker, let us honor the 1965 foot soldiers for their bravery and for their equality, marching for equality. I urge all Members to vote "yes" on H.R. 431.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

□ 1315

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Alabama, and I thank her particularly for her persistent leadership and for her generosity with inviting so many Members to her district. We have enjoyed meeting her local officials, and we have enjoyed meeting the leadership of that great city and its great history.

We make a personal commitment to her that as we travel through Selma—and it captures the essence of a town of great history—that we recognize that there is a need to invest many dollars to preserve this great city and to preserve its history. We thank her for her leadership.

To the manager, the gentleman from Michigan, let me thank you very much for your eloquent statements. Isn't it important, Mr. Speaker, to see the number of leaders of our leadership—the majority leader, the minority leader, the whip, and the minority whip—here on the floor of the House joining us in this momentous occasion?

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of working for the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, obviously at a very, very young age. It was in that atmosphere, out of their office on Auburn Avenue in Georgia, that I got the sense and the feeling of the moment of the history of Selma.

In the fictional yet truthful movie "Selma," we are reminded of the song "Glory." Today is an example of "Glory." It is an example of the coming together of peoples around what is right, and it is a recognition that foot soldiers, though unknown even some 50 years later, are deserving of being pulled from the ashes of their last words to be able to say to them, "Thank you."

That is what this Congressional Gold Medal means to me and means to so many who were among the 600-plus that could be called the foot soldiers. Obviously, by working for the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, I knew at that time Ambassador Andrew Young, Hosea Williams, James Orange, and a litany of others.

Certainly, as our Congresswoman from Selma has done, we pay tribute to our leader JOHN LEWIS who, himself, was brutalized as he attempted to exercise a simple right protected by the Bill of Rights, and that is the right to freedom of speech, freedom of access, and freedom of movement.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I join in the words of President Johnson on March 15, 1965, looking back over Bloody Sunday. He said:

I speak tonight for the dignity of man and the destiny of democracy . . . At times, history and fate meet at a single time in a single place to shape a turning point in man's unending search for freedom. So it was at Lexington and Concord. So it was a century ago at Appomattox. So it was last week in Selma, Alabama.

Yes, it was simply just last week in the thinking of so many of us as we stand on the floor of the House.

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentlewoman.

Might I say, as we vote on this, we vote together. Might I say, as much as we vote, can we do it in action and vote to reauthorize the Voting Rights Act by simply restoring section 5, giving the Supreme Court what it needs, but recognizing the importance of protecting the right to vote?

In the name of Jimmie Lee Jackson who died trying to protect his mother and grandmother, in the name of Viola Liuzzo, and in the name of Reverend James Reeb, I ask that we stand here today and vote for this legislation to honor them, but vote for reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today not only as a proud supporter, but as a cosponsor, of H.R. 431, a bill authorizing the award of the Congressional Gold Medal to the "foot soldiers of Selma," those heroic souls who risked their lives for freedom and to secure the right to vote for all Americans by their participation in marches for voting rights on "Bloody Sunday," "Turnaround Tuesday," or the final, completed march from Selma to Montgomery in March 1965.

I thank my colleague, Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL of Alabama, for introducing this legislation paying fitting, and long overdue, tribute to those brave and determined men and women, boys and girls, persons of all races and creeds, who loved their country so much that they were willing to risk their lives to make it better, to bring it even closer to its founding ideals that all persons have dignity and the right to equal treatment under the law, and in the making of the laws, which is the fundamental essence of the right to vote. I also want to thank Congresswoman MARTHA ROBY.

Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1965, before a joint session of the Congress and the eyes of the nation, President Lyndon Johnson explained to the nation the significance of "Bloody Sunday":

"I speak tonight for the dignity of man and the destiny of democracy. . . .

"At times history and fate meet at a single time in a single place to shape a turning point in man's unending search for freedom.

"So it was at Lexington and Concord.

"So it was a century ago at Appomattox.

"So it was last week in Selma, Alabama."

The previous Sunday, March 7, 1965, more than 600 civil rights demonstrators, including our beloved colleague, Congressman JOHN LEWIS of Georgia, were brutally attacked by state and local police at the Edmund Pettus Bridge as they marched from Selma to Montgomery in support of the right to vote.

"Bloody Sunday" was one of the defining moments in American history because it crystallized for the nation the necessity of enacting a strong and effective federal law to protect the right to vote of every American.

No one who witnessed the violence and brutally suffered by the foot soldiers for justice who gathered at the Edmund Pettus Bridge will ever forget it; the images are deeply seared in the American memory and experience.

Mr. Speaker, what is so moving, heroic, and awe-inspiring is that the foot soldiers we honor today faced their heavily armed oppressors fortified only by their love for their country and each other and the audacious faith that their cause was just.

The example set by the foot soldiers of Selma showed everyone, here in America and around the world, that there is no force on earth as powerful as an idea whose time has come.

So it is fitting and proper, Mr. Speaker, that we honor today the heroes—the foot soldiers—who won the Battle of Selma and helped redeem the greatest nation on earth.

But we should not forget that this victory came at great cost and that many good and dear persons lost their lives to win for others the right to vote.

Men like Jimmy Lee Jackson, who was shot by Alabama state trooper as he tried to protect his mother and grandmother from being beaten for participating in a peaceful voting rights march in Marion, Alabama.

Women like Viola Liuzzo, a housewife and mother of five, who had journeyed to Selma from Detroit to join the protests after witnessing on television the events at Edmund Pettus Bridge on "Bloody Sunday" and who was shot and killed by Klansmen while driving back from a trip shuttling fellow voting rights marchers to the Montgomery airport.

Persons of faith, goodwill, and non-violence like the Reverend James Reeb of Boston, a minister from Boston who heeded the call of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. to come to Selma and who succumbed to the head injuries he suffered at the hands of his white supremacists attackers on March 9, two days after Bloody Sunday.

Mr. Speaker, in the face of all this hostility, violence, brutality, and hatred, the foot soldiers of Selma would not be deterred—would not be moved—would not be turned around.

They kept their eyes on the prize and held on.

And help came the very next week when President Johnson announced to the nation that he would send to Congress for immediate action a law designed to eliminate illegal barriers to the right to vote by striking down "restrictions to voting in all elections—Federal, State, and local—which have been used to deny Negroes the right to vote."

On August 6, 1965, that legislation—the Voting Rights Act of 1965—was signed into law by President Johnson and for the next 48 years did more to expand our democracy and empower racial and language minorities than any act of government since the Emancipation Proclamation and adoption of the Civil War Amendments.

But our work is not done; the dreams of Dr. King and of all those who gave their lives in the struggle for justice are not behind us but still before us.

In the wake of the Supreme Court's 2013 ruling in *Shelby County v. Holder*, which severely crippled the Voting Rights Act, we have seen many states across our nation move to enact legislation designed to limit the ability of women, the elderly, racial and language minorities to exercise their right to vote.

In Texas alone, new voter ID laws are estimated to have prevented or deterred as many as 600,000 citizens from registering to vote in 2014.

To honor the memory of the foot soldiers of Selma, we must rededicate ourselves to a

great task remaining before us—to repair the damage done to the Voting Rights Act by working to pass the Voting Rights Amendments Act of 2015, which I am proud to be one of the original cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, as I have stated many times, the 1965 Voting Rights Act is no ordinary piece of legislation.

For millions of Americans, and for many in Congress, it is sacred treasure, earned by the sweat and toil and tears and blood of ordinary Americans who showed the world it was possible to accomplish extraordinary things.

As we honor the foot soldiers of Selma by voting to pass H.R. 431 awarding them the Congressional Gold Medal, let us resolve also to restore the Voting Rights Act of 1965, so that it remains a lasting monument to their heroism and devotion to the country they loved.

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN).

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Alabama for bringing us together around this important issue.

It is my honor to be a cosponsor of this endeavor, to take this opportunity to demonstrate our appreciation and our respect for the sacrifices that were made by the foot soldiers who marched in the three marches. It is my honor always to be a part of this wonderful body that serves along with JOHN LEWIS, who happens to be one of my personal heroes.

This Congressional Gold Medal is not just simply an award. It is emblematic of a selflessness that was demonstrated by people who stood up and did the right thing and put their lives in jeopardy to ensure that we, as a democracy, had an opportunity to participate at the very highest level, and that is the level of voting.

As I stand here and thank each and every one of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle for supporting this initiative, I rise also to remind us that we have work still to be done, that the battle that was before us that we thought we won is still there to be won, and that we need to correct the actions of the Supreme Court and follow through on the actions of giving people the right to vote.

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. I thank the gentlewoman from Alabama and those others who have cosponsored this, including Congresswoman ROBY from Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is so vitally important. I take it as one of my life's greatest honors to have served for the last 20 years in the Congress with JOHN LEWIS. He literally changed our Nation through his bravery.

On a day like today, this is the date that 25 years ago, Nelson Mandela

walked out of prison and into the Presidency in South Africa, and as those foot soldiers walked across this bridge on Bloody Sunday, they helped create a circumstance in which we would have, as a President of the United States, Barack Obama. We cannot separate these issues. They are inextricably intertwined.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my colleague from Selma who represents so ably the new South that our Nation is so much better for the struggle in Selma, for the sacrifice, and not just in those who are famous like Dr. King or JOHN LEWIS, but I met at her side Ms. Boynton, a 105-year-old woman who walked across that bridge that day, just in this Capitol less than 20 days ago.

I want to thank her for her leadership on this issue and thank her as we celebrate and commemorate these 50 years and as we dedicate ourselves to fight for the right to vote for every single American without equivocation or compromise.

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, voting is the most fundamental right that we share as Americans. The foot soldiers who dared to march across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in the face of extreme racial hostility did so in the spirit of equality. We should never forget the sacrifices they made so that this Nation could live up to the ideals of equality and justice for all.

While we can never repay these foot soldiers for the sacrifices that they made, we can offer a down payment by continuing to fight against injustice wherever it exists. For as Dr. King so eloquently noted, "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere."

May we be moved by the valor and determination of these foot soldiers to stomp out modern-day inequities in the name of justice. The foot soldiers of the voting rights movement set forth a powerful precedent for all of us to follow.

Whenever the rights of any one man have been denied, the rights of all are in danger. The price of freedom, as has been said before, is not free. The foot soldiers paid the ultimate price to ensure equal voting rights for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that over 300 of my colleagues in Congress—both Democrats and Republicans—have agreed to cosponsor this bill. I am proud that my colleague from Alabama Senator SESSIONS and Senator BOOKER will introduce this bill on the Senate side today.

I am humbled by the strong bipartisan support of this bill, and I would like to thank Representative MARTHA ROBY and all of the members of the Alabama delegation for standing with me in support of this bill.

Today, I am especially proud to be from Alabama. I invite my colleagues, Republican and Democrat, and all Americans, to come to Selma during the first week of March to witness living history. You, too, can witness living history.

The city of Selma and the jubilee group will be doing a host of activities all week long. Of course, the commemorative march itself will be on Sunday, March 8, as well as our President will be speaking to us in Selma on March 7.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 431. I believe that bestowing the Congressional Gold Medal to the foot soldiers of the voting rights movement is a strong reminder of the power of ordinary Americans to collectively achieve extraordinary, extraordinary social change.

I want to again thank the gentleman from Michigan for sharing with me this wonderful 40 minutes of debate. I want you to know that it is one of the highlights of my life to have the opportunity to bestow this Congressional Gold Medal to the foot soldiers of the voting rights movement.

As a proud daughter of Selma and the Representative of Selma, Montgomery, Birmingham, and Tuscaloosa, I want you to know that those of us who are the direct beneficiaries of the movement, Black and White, we owe a debt of gratitude that we can never repay.

Today goes a long way in acknowledging those unsung and noted heroes like JOHN LEWIS, but there are so many, so many, that are in our midst, in our communities, that gave that sacrifice. Today, we honor them, the foot soldiers of the voting rights movement.

I want to say again to all of my colleagues: I hope that you will take seriously this bill and what its significance is to America.

I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan for sharing this time with me, and I want to thank the leadership of both parties for putting this bill on the floor in such a timely manner, so that we can get it on the President's desk before the March 7 and 8 wonderful, wonderful celebration.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I thank all of you for being here, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 431, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

To my friend, it is amazing to me today the irony as we talk about the Edmund Pettus Bridge, a man who served as the grand dragon of the Ku Klux Klan in Alabama, who just 100 years ago was serving in the U.S. Senate, and to have that be a symbol and discussed in the same breath as a man like JOHN LEWIS and Martin Luther King and so many others and in that short 50 years for us, even though we may be of a different political persuasion, for me to be here and witness the first African American to be President

of these United States, what an amazing journey this has been.

Gone are the poll taxes, gone are the reading and history tests, gone are a number of those legal impediments and formal legal impediments that were there both in the North and in the South that dictated to someone where they could or couldn't live.

What has not gone—I am struck by this time and time again—is sin and hatred in human hearts. As C.S. Lewis talks about in his book "Mere Christianity," by means of laws, a man can attempt to change a man's actions, but they will not succeed without a change to those men's hearts.

I think that is our legacy. I think that is our duty as Americans, and I think that is part of what we are doing here today—to honor, to recognize, and to celebrate, knowing that the journey is not done necessarily, knowing that we have other areas where we need to work on this as a society, but knowing that progress has been made.

It is truly an honor to be a part of this with you as well, my friend.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 431.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. 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.

□ 1330

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 1, KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE APPROVAL ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM FEBRUARY 16, 2015, THROUGH FEBRUARY 23, 2015

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 100 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 100

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 1) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; and (2) one motion to commit.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from February 16, 2015, through February 23, 2015—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to talk about House Resolution 100, which provides a closed rule for consideration of S. 1, the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act. Folks might find that a little unusual to talk about a bill that begins with the title S. 1, but there is a new day in Washington, D.C., that excites me, and it is that the “open for business” sign is there on the Senate side. It is not a function of Republicans doing this or Democrats doing that. It is a function of the process working the way that it should.

The first vote I took on the Keystone pipeline, Mr. Speaker, was back in 2011 when I was first elected to Congress. It passed the House by a wide bipartisan margin. It was never given the time of day in the United States Senate.

As we come here today, we are not just talking about approval of the Keystone XL pipeline in S. 1. We are talking about the inclusion of another bill that has passed time and time again, the Better Buildings Act. Mr. MCKINLEY from West Virginia has language that would promote energy conservation across this land, a bill that has passed time and time again in this House but has never been passed by the Senate.

It is an opportunity here today, Mr. Speaker. It is an opportunity to do those things that the American people sent us here to do: bipartisan votes, commonsense legislation for the first time in a long time, Mr. Speaker, and what I hope will be the beginning of a long trend here in the U.S. House of Representatives.

As you listened to the Clerk read, Mr. Speaker, you heard that there are a lot of different points in this bill. It is not just a bill for consideration of S. 1. It is also a bill so that when the House is not in session in D.C. next week, the Speaker will have the ability to call the House back into session to continue to conduct business because the business must continue to go on. I am glad the Rules Committee was able to include that provision as well.

Seven years ago is when the permit process started on the Keystone XL pipeline, Mr. Speaker. Since seven years ago, longer than it took to build the Hoover Dam, we have been trying to approve a small section of pipeline. I say “trying to approve” somewhat loosely. I think if we had been committed to getting it done, we could have absolutely gotten it done. Again, it is a commonsense piece of legislation that decides rather than building a pipeline across Canada to carry oil to Canadian refineries, which will provide lots of jobs for Canadians, if our partner to the north is willing, we will build that pipeline through America to deliver that oil to American refineries to create Americans jobs.

This is not a bill that mandates that, Mr. Speaker. The marketplace is going to control this construction decision. The marketplace is going to control where the oil is refined, and the marketplace is going to control whether or not the oil comes out of the ground to begin with.

Too often, I think we have been treating the Keystone XL pipeline approval process as if it were an environmental decision. There are those who wish the United States would reduce its reliance on fossil fuels. I am one of those. I don't think there is any advantage to be had by putting all your eggs in one energy basket. I am in favor of an all-of-the-above strategy that makes sure that America's energy security—North America's energy security—is based on multiple—multiple—avenues for energy production. But we do not get to decide in this Chamber whether or not the Canadians bring oil out of the ground. We only get to decide whether or not, once that oil comes out of the ground, it is moved with U.S. jobs and U.S. construction to U.S. refineries, or whether or not those jobs go elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, time and time again folks come to the floor and they say: Where are the jobs? Where is the jobs legislation? I am thrilled to be carrying this rule for the Rules Committee today, Mr. Speaker, because this is one of those jobs bills—bipartisan, common sense. And if we pass it here in the House today, Mr. Speaker, headed to the President's desk, that signature will change the lives of those hardworking Americans looking for jobs today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, you are not permitted to sing in the House of Representatives, and I shall not do that; but I will take this opportunity to do as my colleagues in the Rules Committee did yesterday, a little bit in advance of my friend's birthday. Today is the birthday of my friend, Mr. WOODALL. And as one who has had many more birthdays than he, I hope he has as many birthdays as me and many, many more. Happy birthday to you, ROB.

As my friends are already aware, the President has already said that he is going to veto this measure. We introduced last night the statement of the administration with reference thereto. That means that the likelihood that this bill will become law is highly improbable at best. I wish I was standing here under different circumstances. I wish that the House were about to vote on something it knows that the President will sign into law. I wish we were working on something that would actually help our economic recovery instead of hamstringing it.

I listened to my friend very attentively when he pointed out that the marketplace will dictate three different circumstances. One that he did not allude to that I will is that the marketplace will dictate where the oil, once refined if the Keystone pipeline is approved, the marketplace will dictate out there in that neverland where we don't participate, where the oil will go. Therefore, I want to make it very clear that I do not believe that it means that there will be cheaper prices in the United States of America.

I am standing here because House leadership would rather pass purely symbolic measures than work with the President. And I recognize that, as my friend has pointed out, that a long time has passed with reference to this measure. I did a little added research to determine what would Enbridge and the other companies up in Canada do in case there was no Keystone pipeline. In addition to rail, they also have plans to send oil east and west and plans to send it north. And, I might add, for all that same period of time, the resistance inside Canada, based on a number of circumstances having to do with the Beluga whale, all of the way back to farmers, having to do with environmentalists, the same as in our country, the same arguments, whether East, West, or North in Canada, have been going on while our debate has been going on here with reference to the Keystone pipeline.

The 113th Congress is going to be remembered, and I believe everyone now understands, as the least productive Congress ever. That is the one that we just came out of. However, it seems that the current Congress is going to take its best shot at accomplishing even less if we stay on the course that we are on. Virtually every bill that has come before the Rules Committee the House already passed in the 113th Congress. Most have no more hope of becoming law now than the last time around. We have yet to see one really new idea from the Republican leadership of this body, which has shown zero interest in actually doing its job, in my opinion.

How many more times are we going to have to vote to repeal so-called ObamaCare, a program that now unquestionably is improving the lives of some hardworking Americans. Instead, we are voting on bills handpicked for

their ability to demonstrate the Republicans' message of the week, regardless of chance of enactment, regardless of whether it is a good idea, regardless of whether it is something that will help everyday Americans. And because these bills are handpicked for specific purposes, most have come to the floor under a closed rule, which means that Members cannot change the measure in any way, not even to make it better and not even with bipartisan solutions.

A good example is so far this body has voted on 15 rules during this 114th Congress, of which 8 of those 15 have been closed. The closed rules we will pass this week will be numbers 9, 10, and 11. Listen, my friends, on this same measure last week and before, the United States Senate, operating under regular order that is now majority-led by Republicans, considered on this very same measure 18 amendments, six that were approved, and some of them that were offered were bipartisan.

Among the reasons I believe that the Senate majority leader determined that he would operate differently than the previous majority leader is so as to give his membership, smaller than ours, of course, an opportunity to participate in the process. All the more reason, I believe, that we should have open rules. We have new Members, too, as do they. We have Members that have ideas that may be bipartisan with reference to support and opposition to the Keystone pipeline. But no, we continue to operate under closed rules.

Do you know how many rules were closed at this same point in the last Congress? The most closed rules ever, six. The gavel might as well be a brick wall.

Furthermore, much of the legislation this Congress has voted on has evaded regular order, escaping the review, hearings, and markups that ensure appropriate deliberation and consideration. Those of us on the Rules Committee have a wonderful opportunity. We are becoming sort of like the place of first resort for legislation. It isn't coming from hearings. The American public doesn't get an opportunity to see the various committees. It just comes up to the Rules Committee and we massage it back and forth about what our views are, but it does not come under regular order.

□ 1345

Just like the original version of this bill, the House is considering the Senate version of this bill without a hearing or a markup.

These are not just academic procedural disagreements. It matters because Members are not able to represent their constituents. It matters because good ideas are being deliberately kept hidden.

I have been here a long time. I have seen some pretty great Congresses under Republican and Democratic control, and I have seen some pretty lousy ones.

But the last few years, this body has been like a hamster on a wheel, spin-

ning and spinning, but never getting anywhere. You don't have to look farther than a couple of amendments the Senate made to this bill to see my friends spinning their wheels.

Climate change is real. Because a few Senators decided to get cute in parsing a few words, it is in the bill. We are going to vote on it. And then what?

Just yesterday, Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack announced that the United States Department of Agriculture is making more than \$280 million available for rural agricultural producers and small business owners to apply for resources to purchase and install renewable energy systems or make energy efficiency improvements.

Once more, those funds were made available in the 2014 farm bill, which shows what Congress can accomplish when we work together. I might add, because farmers in this country have experienced a 37 percent reduction—and I, along with others, represent many of those rural areas—I am delighted that we were able to do that in the farm bill, and I am pleased that Secretary Vilsack made his announcement.

The Senate also included an amendment that finds that Congress should—as opposed to shall—require oil companies to pay an excise tax to fund oil spill cleanups.

While I appreciate this expression, the amendment effectively does nothing to mandate contributions to the oil liability trust fund. I would invite my colleagues on the other side to explain that. Tell us why it is that these oil companies should not be required to contribute in a mandatory manner to the oil liability trust fund. Instead, what is happening is we create the illusion that oil companies will actually be accountable in the event of a spill.

Alternatively, simply closing the tax loophole that allows oil and gas companies to deduct the cost of cleaning up oil spills would discourage oil spills and save hardworking American taxpayers an average of \$1.3 billion per year.

The American people were led to believe that changing control of the Senate would lead to an end of this gridlock. But sadly, this has not been the case.

My friends are not going to be able to, like the hamster, spin their wheels continuously. Even the hamster gets tired. And sooner or later, when that hamster gets tired of the nonsense of spinning going nowhere, he either gets off or he falls off.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank my friend for his well wishes and to tell him I am sympathetic to the hamster wheel scenario that he describes.

I don't particularly enjoy these opening weeks of a new Congress, Mr. Speaker, because committees haven't gotten organized, legislation hasn't started to flow, and it puts the com-

mittee in the very unfortunate situation of having to act as the legislator, as the authorizer, to begin moving pieces of legislation to the floor.

That is unfortunate. But that is not the situation we are talking about today, Mr. Speaker. What we are talking about today is a bill that not only passed the floor of the House but went to the Senate, a bill that not just went to the Senate but went through that wonderful open debate process that my friend from Florida described and has now come back to us today.

Four years we have been trying to move this bill forward, Mr. Speaker. It is a closed rule here today so that we can act on the same legislation that the Senate has passed, so we can send this bill to the President's desk, so we can get off the hamster wheel of futility that my friend from Florida describes.

I am optimistic, Mr. Speaker. But it doesn't happen by itself. It happens with years and years of work.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), whose advocacy and leadership have made having this bill on the floor today possible.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank my friends on the other side as well on the Rules Committee. I have been before them twice now on this topic and have enjoyed it immensely.

I might say as a word of encouragement with regard to the hamster wheel, because I share the same concerns, but I am also encouraged by the fact that we are actually passing the Senate bill today. As many times as we have tried to pass this, we have never been able to get it to the President's desk. That will happen soon. That is progress, and I think we ought to celebrate the progress of that.

With regard to being the least productive Congress, veto threats before voting on important things sort of leads to gridlock, I suppose. But I don't think that should stop us from doing our job and forwarding the ideas that our constituents have asked for. My constituents want the Keystone XL pipeline built.

What we are doing today, as was teed up by the gentleman from Georgia, is, of course, talking about a Senate bill. We passed H.R. 3 when I introduced it the first week in the House, a closed rule, as the gentleman from Florida said, a simple bill. We have passed similar bills in previous Congresses, well vetted. And my colleague from North Dakota, Senator HOEVEN, who is really the originator of this whole concept, introduced S. 1.

The other reason I think we should be encouraged is not only did the Senate have an open process, they voted on 47—at least 47—amendments. That is more than three times as many amendments on S. 1 as the Senate voted on in all of the bills last year. That is progress. That is not hamsters on the wheel.

I want to take a few minutes to describe the amendments that came over from the Senate and why I suggest to leadership—and I am pleased leadership accepted—that we just simply accept the Senate amendments and move this forward rather than going to conference, although I think that would have been a good exercise for a lot of us as well.

But there were a couple of amendments introduced that deal with energy efficiency programs, as the gentleman from Georgia pointed out, dealing with federally leased and owned property, as well as schools. It sets up programs and processes and gives authority to the Department of Energy to sort of coordinate energy efficiency issues in programs and projects, which I think is a noble goal.

There is that sense of the Senate that climate change is real and not a hoax. Now, we can throw that out as sort of meaningless. But the reality is that a statement like that passed 98-1 by the Senate is a pretty strong statement. I think the President ought to view that as currency—as currency. He argues that Keystone, because oil sands are somehow supposed to emit more greenhouse gas emissions than other production—I am here to tell you it is not true, and I will point out the very specific facts on that.

But in the spirit of compromise, he has this statement that I think provides currency for him to go to Paris next December and say: This is the sense of the Congress of the United States. I hope he views it as a positive.

Senator MIKULSKI has that amendment—which the gentleman from Florida spoke to—the sense of the Senate that all forms of unrefined and unprocessed petroleum should be subject to the nominal per-barrel excise tax associated with the spill fund.

While it says it is the sense of the Senate and it isn't put into law, I think it is important to note that we are talking about a tax, an excise tax that is placed on domestic crude, for sure, not placed on—if you can imagine this now—bitumen. Bitumen is the product that comes from the oil sands, and because bitumen is not in the Tax Code, it is not subject to the excise tax. That should be corrected. We should do that in the proper order, probably through the Ways and Means Committee.

That said, it is important to note that TransCanada is 100 percent responsible for spills and cleaning them up. I sited the first Keystone pipeline through the State of North Dakota, 600 landowners' land. They had some issues in the early going at one of the pumping stations. They did clean it up. It didn't contaminate water or the surrounding area. All of the tools worked properly.

My point is that they are responsible, and that is as per each State's law. This line will be permitted in each State, and they have to be responsible for cleanup.

Another one, Senator CORNYN had an amendment: Land or interest in land

for the pipeline may only be acquired through constitutionally appropriate means. That only makes sense. Maybe it doesn't need to be stated, but it is important to state, similar to the Barrasso amendment that clarifies that treaties with Indian tribes must remain in effect. That should be obvious as well, but it doesn't help to restate those important points.

I think that these amendments are important amendments, they are good amendments, and they help broaden the appeal of the bill.

I want to take this map down and I want to speak to just a few of the merits of the Keystone pipeline bill because I know them very well, the extraordinary benefits of Keystone XL.

Employment opportunities—Mr. Speaker, according to the U.S. State Department, 42,000 jobs will be supported by the construction. I can assure you, having been on the construction site of the original Keystone bill, it is true. These are real jobs. These are good jobs. Some people refer to them as temporary jobs. Referring to a pipeline project as temporary is like referring to a wind farm as only temporary construction.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the generosity of the gentleman from Georgia. Thank you.

But all construction jobs are temporary until the construction is done and you move on to the next project. There are thousands of miles of pipeline under the ground in the United States. The steel workers, the truck drivers, the backhoe operators, the welders, and the local hotels and restaurants and retailers benefit tremendously. This is the make-or-break in many cases for some of these smaller businesses that benefit from the construction of this dynamic economy.

Energy security—we can't overstate energy security. We are talking about displacing Venezuelan oil. We are talking about displacing Middle East oil. In fact, the 830,000 barrels per day that will run through the Keystone pipeline into U.S. refineries is equal to about 50 percent of what we import from the Middle East. That is security.

When we talk about energy independence, that is one thing. Security means that we have our security in our own hands, and we are not subject to bad guys from other parts of the world; that, in fact, we are part of the security solution. And it relates directly to national security, I might add.

Enhanced safety—I was a pipeline regulator for years. There is no safer way to move crude oil than by a pipeline. It is the most efficient and it is the safest by far.

We have seen some of the things that happened when we cluttered our highways. In fact, the Department of Transportation in North Dakota anticipates the saving of three to six fa-

talities on the roads in North Dakota if this pipeline is built because, remember, it is not all Canadian oil sands. About a quarter of this capacity is reserved for Bakken crude oil as well. That removes a lot of trucks from our roads. That is much safer for the traveling public.

Trains—another issue we have. We have a lot of trains. This would represent 10 trains a week that could be hauling food to hungry people rather than oil to the marketplace.

Environmental protection—we hear a lot about the environment and the issues pertaining to it, and rightfully so. The good news is that after 6½ years of study, this is the most environmentally studied pipeline and the most sophisticated and highest-tech pipeline in the history of the world.

In fact, moving oil by rail actually emits 1.8 times more CO₂ into the air than moving it by pipeline. Moving it by truck emits 2.9 times more CO₂ than does moving it by pipeline. Moving it by barge to China, where it will be refined with far lower environmental standards than the United States, that is priceless.

Exchange with Canada—I don't think we should understate the importance of our relationship. Our number one trading partner, \$2 billion a day of goods and services travels between our two countries—our top trading partner and best friend, Canada.

If we were doing this to Canadians and to Canadian companies, or if they were doing this to us, I can't imagine how we would respond. I have worked closely with the Embassy. I have worked closely with the new Premier, Premier Jim Prentice, from Alberta, who, by the way, just won the election this last fall on the pro-environmental stewardship platform.

Exchange with Canada is so important. We need to restore and care for that important relationship. I would rather enhance that relationship, quite frankly—and it gets right back to this energy security issue—than be fighting over oil or fighting to protect the transportation of oil in other places.

□ 1400

At the end of the day, with everything else that has gone on and with these other important issues, to me, the final thing is this, and it is what I would say to the President, Mr. Speaker:

You have asked for bipartisan bills. You have asked for us to work together. Here we have a bipartisan, bicameral solution, one that the American public supports in a big way, one that would create jobs, one that would lift up the middle class, Mr. President.

I would just beg, Mr. Speaker, that the President would reconsider his veto threat on this important bipartisan jobs bill and sign it when it goes to his desk so that we can get people back to work, can become less dependent on foreign sources of oil from across the sea, and can become more interdependent with our neighbors in Canada.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, would you be kind enough to tell both of us the remaining amount of time on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 18 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Georgia has 15 minutes remaining.

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

Here we are, only 17 days before the Republican Homeland Security shutdown and with just 6 legislative days left until the Department of Homeland Security shuts down on February 28, closing down many of the crucial Department of Homeland Security operations that have kept our country safe from terrorist attacks.

If we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up a clean version of the Department of Homeland Security funding bill. With such serious consequences, it is time to put politics aside in order to strengthen our homeland and protect American families.

To discuss our proposal, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), my good friend, the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge this House to immediately take up and pass a clean funding bill for the Department of Homeland Security. By defeating the previous question on the pending rule, we can immediately make in order a clean Homeland Security bill and stop the theatrics over the President's use of executive orders.

Madam Speaker, as of today, we are 134 days into what should have been the start of this fiscal year. The situation this House has caused is completely unacceptable. We simply cannot wait one more day to do the right thing, the responsible thing, and fund these critical agencies tasked with protecting this Nation.

As the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, I was involved in the bipartisan, bicameral negotiations on the omnibus spending bill that passed the House and the Senate and was signed by the President last December. That package could have contained all 12 annual spending bills because all 12 were negotiated in conference, and every one of them was ready to go.

An unfortunate decision was made by the leadership of this body to omit the Homeland Security bill, not because there were outstanding issues or continued disputes. That bill, negotiated by my good friend from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), was stripped from the omnibus because some in this body were upset by the President's executive order on immigration. They even admitted the President's actions had little to do with the Homeland Security appropriations bill. Yet that was the choice that was made on how to proceed, so the Homeland Security appro-

priations bill was forced to operate under a continuing resolution instead of having a full-year bill. Ironically, it meant Customs and Border Protection and Immigration and Customs Enforcement—two of the agencies tasked with defending our borders and enforcing our immigration laws—had to do without the nearly \$1 billion increase they would have gotten under the full-year bill.

Delaying the full-year bill, my colleagues: limits the Department's ability to advance the Secretary's Unity of Effort initiative, designed to improve coordination in our security missions; limits the ability of the Secretary to move ahead with the Southern Border and Approaches Campaign; creates uncertainty regarding ICE's capacity to detain and deport dangerous criminals; complicates the Department's ability to deal with another influx of unaccompanied children at our border stations; delays the implementation of the new security upgrades at the White House and of the hiring increases of the U.S. Secret Service; and delays terrorism preparedness and response grants for State and local public safety personnel.

I understand that many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle feel quite strongly about the President's use of executive orders on immigration policy, but I am compelled to remind those colleagues that they have every tool at their disposal to pass legislation changing the President's proposal.

This stunt, my friends, has gone on too long. It is time to admit these immigration policy decisions have little to nothing to do with the appropriations process. The Homeland Security bill should never have been held hostage in this fight.

Madam Speaker, just this week, Secretary of Homeland Security Jeh Johnson issued a sobering statement about the consequences of operating under a continuing resolution. Quite simply, "Border security is not free."

I couldn't agree more.

Madam Speaker, I would like to enter Secretary Johnson's statement in the RECORD.

[Department of Homeland Security Press Release, Feb. 10, 2015]

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY JEH C. JOHNSON ON THE CONSEQUENCES TO BORDER SECURITY WITHOUT A DHS APPROPRIATIONS BILL

I continue to stress the need for a DHS appropriations bill for FY 2015, unburdened by politically charged amendments that attempt to defund our executive actions on immigration reform. The President has made plain that he will veto a bill that includes such language.

At present, the Department of Homeland Security is operating on a continuing resolution that expires on February 27. As long as this Department is funded by a continuing resolution, there are a whole series of activities vital to homeland security and public safety that cannot be undertaken. The public must be aware of the real impacts to homeland security as long as DHS is funded by a continuing resolution, or, still worse, if Congress were to permit our funding to lapse al-

together and the Department of Homeland Security goes into government shutdown.

Last week I issued a statement noting the impact on DHS's grant-making activity to states, local and tribal governments as long as we are on a CR. Basically, we are prevented from funding all new non-disaster assistance grants.

The public must also be aware of the impact on our ability to secure the borders as long as we operate on a CR. As part of our executive actions to reform the immigration system, the President and I have emphasized increased border security. Added border security is also a key component of the President's FY 2015 and FY 2016 budget submissions to Congress. But, as long as this Department is on a CR, and not a full-year appropriations bill, our ability to strengthen border security, to include maintaining the resources we put in place to respond to the surge in illegal migration into south Texas last summer, is constrained.

Here are some concrete examples of things we need to do, but cannot, without a full-year DHS appropriations bill for FY 2015:

Important investments in border security technology cannot be initiated, including additional resources to upgrade obsolete remote video surveillance systems and mobile video surveillance systems in the Rio Grande Valley;

Investments to increase our ability to analyze geospatial intelligence cannot be made. This is a capability critical to enhancing situational awareness of illegal border crossings and prioritizing frontline personnel and capability deployments;

Non-intrusive inspection technology at ports of entry cannot be enhanced. This technology reduces inspection times while facilitating trade and travel, and is necessary to detect illegal goods and materials, such as potential nuclear and radiological threats;

Critical enhancements to the CBP National Targeting Center's operational and analytical systems cannot be made. These support our daily operations against transnational criminal organizations by identifying terrorist and criminal threats attempting to cross our borders via land, air and sea; and

More aggressive investigations by ICE of transnational criminal organizations responsible for human smuggling and trafficking, narcotics smuggling, and cybercrime involving child exploitation and intellectual property rights violations.

Border security is not free. The men and women of DHS need a partner in Congress to fund their efforts. Time is running out. I urge Congress to act responsibly and pass a clean appropriations bill for this Department.

For more information, visit www.dhs.gov.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROSELEHTINEN). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield the gentlewoman another 30 seconds.

Mrs. LOWEY. If my colleagues are finally serious about these programs and priorities, I urge them to join with me today. Defeat the previous question so that my colleague, Mr. HASTINGS, can offer an amendment to provide a clean, full-year appropriations bill for the Department of Homeland Security.

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

I was just reading an article from the AP, which is doing a fact check on whether or not a conversation about

the Department of Homeland Security is a fair and honest conversation. They say, in reality, most people will see little change if the Department's flow is halted, and some of the warnings of doom are as exaggerated as they are striking. They go on to list word after word of folks announcing those warnings.

What is striking to me, Madam Speaker, is that, if we had the same open process going on in the Senate right now that the gentleman from Florida described—the great process that brought S. 1 to the floor—we would be bringing the Department of Homeland Security bill to the floor of the Senate as well; but, as you know, the Senate minority leader today is filibustering any effort to even bring this conversation to the floor, going back to the hamster wheel my friend from Florida described earlier.

How often do we hear that? How often do we hear about the procedural stunts that get in the way of doing the business that every single one of us knows our constituents sent us here to do?

This bill, though, is one about which we can be proud. This bill, though, is one that gets to the heart of what our constituents have asked us to do. This bill, though, has been done right from the start in a bipartisan way, in an open way, and it can make a difference for people tomorrow if we pass it on the floor of the House today and send it on to the President.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, my colleague just said to me, as my friend was looking at the Associated Press' fact check, that it would seem that the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security would know a little bit more about what he is doing than would a reporter. I would hope that that is the case.

I am very pleased to yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD), my classmate and good friend.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question on the rule, to amend it, and to make in order the House consideration of the clean, bipartisan Homeland Security Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2015, negotiated in good faith last November.

Today is February 11, 134 days into fiscal year 2015. With only 17 days remaining until the current CR expires, the House is scheduled to be in session only 6 more days. Yet this Congress is no closer than it was last December to carrying out its basic responsibility to appropriately fund the Department of Homeland Security, whose primary mission is to protect us from terrorist attacks.

Secretary Johnson has warned us over and over again that the Republican leadership's refusal to allow a vote on the clean, bipartisan funding bill is threatening the national security of our country. He tells us that,

without a full-year budget, he is unable to move forward on key homeland security priorities, including new investments in border security technology; more aggressive investigations by ICE, related to drug smuggling, human smuggling, and trafficking; preparedness for responding to surges in illegal migration; security upgrades at the White House complex; and grants for State and local terrorism prevention and response capabilities; and the list goes on.

I am truly perplexed as to what it will take to convince the Republican leadership to do the right thing. Surely, before taking appropriate action, we don't need to experience attacks like those in Paris.

If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle believe the President has overreached, the answer is not to jeopardize our national security by delaying the 2015 funding for Homeland Security. If Republicans wish to circumscribe the President's discretion on immigration policy, the Constitution provides a clear path of action that runs through the authorizing committees, not through an appropriations bill.

Last week, the Senate definitively demonstrated three times that there are insufficient votes to bring up the DHS funding bill with the House-passed poison pill riders. Even if the Senate were to take up the bill, it would be vulnerable to a budget point of order because the poison pill riders have been scored by the Congressional Budget Office as having a net cost of \$7.5 billion.

Republicans control majorities in both the House and the Senate, and they control the agenda. By allowing a vote on the clean, full-year, bipartisan DHS funding bill, the leadership today has the opportunity to make clear that the Nation's security takes priority over unrelated policy debates over immigration enforcement strategy. This bill addresses the most pressing needs of the Department of Homeland Security's to protect our country from harm. It would pass both Houses and would be signed by the President today, and we should send it to him.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question to make in order the consideration of a clean Homeland Security funding bill.

□ 1415

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to take the gentleman from Florida's advice and yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS), an expert on the appropriations process.

Mr. HARRIS. I want to thank the floor leader for yielding the time.

Madam Speaker, there is no amendment necessary to this rule. Three weeks ago, we passed a fully funded Department of Homeland Security. Except for the President's illegal actions, the entire rest of the Department is funded: TSA, the Coast Guard; all these critical things.

Let's review how Congress really works. The House takes an action—we did 3 weeks ago—and then the Senate is supposed to take an action. What action did they take? HARRY REID and the Democrats have blocked three efforts to even debate the bill. They know if they didn't take that action, the Senate could debate the bill and they could strike those amendments. The Democrats are free to strike the amendments that we put on the bill that limit the President's illegal actions with regards to amnesty. They know they can.

Madam Speaker, let's be honest. The last time the President shut down the government, 87 percent of DHS was fully funded. TSA was there. The Coast Guard was on the job. Yeah, there were some administrators who didn't go to work for a few days, but let me tell you, after the unemployment problem we have had in this country, there are a lot of people outside the Federal Government who don't go to work for a lot more days. That is not what the American people expect from us.

The fact is that this bill is sitting over in the Senate. The President said 22 times he didn't have the authority to do what he did on amnesty. All we did is just made it quite clear the House position is he doesn't have the authority.

So, we are not going to spend the money. We take article I seriously. We have the authority over spending, and if we think the President is taking an illegal action, we have the authority to withhold that funding—and that is what we did, fund the entire Department except for that one illegal activity the President is doing in violation of article I of the Constitution. It gives us the authority over the law.

The President said he can't rewrite the law 22 times—and he did. We are just going to keep him to his word. He can't rewrite the law.

The previous speaker said you can't do authorizations on appropriations. That is nonsense. We do it all the time. We can correct the President's mistake in the bill. We did. That is the bottom line.

The Democrat leadership in the Senate has blocked even debate on the bill. What kind of country are we when one party, the party that is really holding this bill hostage in the Senate—not the Republicans; it is the Democrats—refuses to even debate the bill? I am shocked.

Americans expect the Senate to debate. That is what we are asking them to do. That is what they are not doing. I don't understand that. Why don't they want the Homeland Security bill to be funded? I don't get it.

Madam Speaker, I will close by saying we just need to move the motion on the previous question, pass the rule, and build the Keystone pipeline.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I would also take the opportunity to encourage the previous speaker to read Jefferson's Manual because some of the things he talked about on rules are not, at least, my understanding. So I accept his expertise on certain matters, but his ideas about what we can do in the minority strike me as strange.

Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY).

Mr. VEASEY. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, I want to talk about the rule. I am rising today against the rule. And although I believe that a pipeline is absolutely the most safest and environmentally conscious way that we can transport natural resources through North America—and natural resources, for that matter, that are going to be developed. It doesn't matter what the carrier ultimately is; these are resources that will be developed. But the underlying rule, much like the prior rules we have seen on any of the Keystone pipeline votes, does not allow for Member debate. It doesn't. It doesn't allow for Member debate, and that is not how we can best move forward. Only by having an open discussion can this body fully engage in creating sound public policy.

I want to give you an example of what I am talking about. I offered an amendment in the Rules Committee which said that if the Keystone pipeline is built, we would maximize the amount of American jobs that are created or sustained in this process.

My amendment would ensure that the iron, steel, and manufactured goods made in the construction of the Keystone pipeline and facilities are made here in America. If we are going to build the pipeline in America, let's make the materials in America. That will create more jobs. That will give people more opportunity.

There has been much discussion about how we have lost so many manufacturing jobs in this country, about how we have lost ground in that area, about how people can't take care of their families because these opportunities are no longer here. If we are going to build this pipeline, let's give people the opportunity to go back to work, roll up their sleeves, and let's build these in America. There is no reason to have materials made in China to build this pipeline.

Therefore, I believe that if Republicans want to follow a jobs-focused agenda, the amendment that I am offering will make sure that we keep Americans working and not workers in China.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say to the gentleman from Texas, my heart sits where his hearts sits—with American workers and American products. We build the best products in the world. There is absolutely no reason not to purchase the

best products in the world to build something particularly as important as our pipeline.

The box we find ourselves in is that, candidly, some of us—in fact, I dare say all of us—are a little surprised the Senate was even able to move through this bill. I have not seen the Senate move like it has moved in this open process, in this expedient process. In the entire 4 years I have served in this institution, I have never seen it happen before.

It is a good bill. I don't take issue with the work the Senate did. It looks substantially similar to what we passed here in the House. We may never get a chance to send this bill to the desk.

Again, we are just trying to debate a small part of the appropriations process and the Senate right now can't even move into debate because of filibusters in the Senate.

So I say to my friend from Texas, I am absolutely sympathetic to his amendment. I would like to have an opportunity to debate more amendments on the floor of this House.

I think back to my early days here 4 years ago. We had a 3½-day what I call festival of democracy. We came down here and worked night and day on H.R. 1 until every Member had a chance to be heard. That is the way it ought to be done. And I regret that in this situation we did not have a chance to make the gentleman's amendment in order because it was a good amendment and it would absolutely be worthy of debate and consideration here on the floor of the House.

Madam Speaker, with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, may I ask how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has 4½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I would also advise my friend from Georgia that I have no further speakers. I don't know whether my friend from Georgia does or not.

Mr. WOODALL. I also have no further speakers.

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

I earlier asked several questions. I believe Mr. CRAMER addressed one of them. I have yet another that I did not ask, and I am not asking him to respond.

I might add, I think those of us here in the body—and I said this to him when he was in the Rules Committee—I do believe Mr. CRAMER from North Dakota really does have a comprehensive understanding of this matter.

While I disagreed with him about many matters, I do believe that he points out something that we need to pay attention to, in that there are already, without Keystone, a lot of pipe-

lines in the United States of America, and in the period of time of this recent debate, there have been a lot of pipelines that have had spills and have caused major damage. Without getting into them, three of them have really been substantial. Shutoff valves become important.

We haven't discussed many of the things regarding the technology that has improved over time, but I keep hearing my colleagues talk about this being a jobs measure. Indisputably, if there were to be a pipeline built, there would be jobs.

I agree with my friends on the other side that most, if not all, construction jobs are temporary jobs, and there are those in labor unions who are very supportive of this matter for the reason that it would create jobs.

But I have in mind something that many of us have advocated for years. The greatest reminder occurred the night before last right here close to us, in Maryland, when a piece of concrete from a big, old bridge fell off and, fortunately, when I saw the lady on television, her car was damaged and she was frightened out of her wits. But she is alive and was unharmed. That is concrete off of a bridge.

There are thousands of bridges in this country, and all of us know that we could be about the business of dealing with our infrastructure, which would create a whole lot of jobs and not leave us to these ideological debates.

I might add, if we approve this matter, in order for people to litigate, they have to come here to the Federal Circuit in the District of Columbia. That does not make sense to me, and it precludes those who would want to bring actions from being able to do so. This legislation allows that as the only vehicle.

I might add, the litigation isn't concluded yet in many of the places where there may continue to be concerns—in South Dakota, where Mr. CRAMER is close to—Wyoming, Colorado, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Texas, and certainly in Nebraska.

In the midst of trying to combat all of the problems that we have here in this country, attaching conditions and ultimatums to fundamental legislation is not the way to go about addressing the policy that was earlier raised and that I will raise in the previous question with reference to immigration.

If my friends really want to debate immigration issues, they should work with us and the President to reach a comprehensive and bipartisan consensus. Perpetuating the Department of Homeland Security stalemate is as dangerous to our country's security as it is corrosive to our democratic process.

Please, let's stop the pointless politicking. Let's end these games of chicken with our national security. Pass a clean DHS funding bill, and let's get back to the business of the American people.

I didn't know that this was in the drawer in front of me. It kind of looks like a hamster. The wheel just keeps on spinning. But my little friend here is still with us and has, in many respects, like my friends, stopped, by virtue of his being inanimate, his spinning. And that is what the Republicans need to do: stop spinning like the hamster on the wheel and get on with the business of the United States of America.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question. I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I may be an unnatural optimist, but I believe these 2 years that we are about to have in this institution are going to be the finest that I have seen in my lifetime. The reason I believe that is exactly because we are responding to the plea that my friend from Florida has made to get on about the business of the people.

It is hard being in the minority around here. It is hard. My friends on the other side of the aisle may feel like they are in the minority today. For the last 4 years, we had the Speakership in this Chamber, but I sure felt like I was in the minority.

□ 1430

The Senate, held by the party on the other side; the White House, the party on the other side—and things got to be about party, day in and day out, and it wore on me, wore on me.

That is not why I ran for Congress, Madam Speaker. It is not why you ran for Congress. It is not why any of my colleagues here ran for Congress. They ran for Congress to get about the business of the people.

We are 1 month and a week into this new session of Congress, and the Senate has already managed to do what it hasn't been able to do for 4 years, and that is hold an open debate and move legislation where Members had a chance to have their voice heard.

We have that measure in front of us today. The only thing standing between us and considering that measure,

Madam Speaker, is passing this rule. I am excited about it. I am excited about it.

I am proud of what is in this underlying legislation. I am proud of the process that produced this legislation. I am proud of the leadership of folks like Mr. CRAMER who moved it through the House first.

Now, this is the Senate version, but this is the process that folks have worked in tandem. This is a process that folks back home can be proud of.

Now, that is not to say every Member of this Chamber supports this legislation, Madam Speaker. They don't, and they have myriad reasons for choosing not to support this legislation, but the majority is going to work its will.

I don't mean the majority, the Republican majority. I mean the majority—let's have a show of hands, see where people stand—and Republicans and Democrats are going to stand together and say, I support these American jobs. They are going to say, I support our largest trading partner, which is Canada. They are going to say, I support finality on a process that began 7 years ago.

I long for the debate we will have on this House floor, and I hope the gentleman from Florida and I get to manage the rule when we bring the surface transportation bill to the floor of this House because America needs that surface transportation bill. We need to build America, Madam Speaker.

What does it say when getting approval for this pipeline consumed more time than the entire construction of the Hoover Dam? Have we so hamstrung ourselves with bureaucracy that we can no longer do those great building projects as a Nation?

I hope that the answer is no, but if the answer is yes, we have the ability in this Chamber to change it to no. We are a society that does great, great things. We do have responsibilities that are great, great responsibilities, and we cannot accomplish those in a partisan way. We cannot accomplish those without partnership and cooperation.

For the next 2 years, Madam Speaker, we have an opportunity to move bills out of a Republican-led Congress that get signed by a Democratic-led White House. That is kind of the way the Founding Fathers envisioned it, and I am pleased to be a small part of it today.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 100 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 861) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled

by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 861.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal

to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clauses 8 and 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 100, if ordered, and approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 183, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]

YEAS—242

Abraham	Culberson	Hensarling
Aderholt	Curbeo (FL)	Herrera Beutler
Allen	Davis, Rodney	Hice (GA)
Amash	Denham	Hill
Amodei	Dent	Holding
Babin	DeSantis	Hudson
Barletta	DesJarlais	Huelskamp
Barr	Diaz-Balart	Huizenga (MI)
Barton	Dold	Hultgren
Benishek	Duffy	Hunter
Bilirakis	Duncan (SC)	Hurd (TX)
Bishop (MI)	Duncan (TN)	Hurt (VA)
Bishop (UT)	Ellmers	Issa
Black	Emmer	Jenkins (KS)
Blackburn	Farenthold	Jenkins (WV)
Blum	Fincher	Johnson (OH)
Bost	Fleischmann	Johnson, Sam
Boustany	Fleming	Jolly
Brady (TX)	Flores	Jones
Brat	Forbes	Jordan
Bridenstine	Fortenberry	Joyce
Brooks (AL)	Fox	Katko
Brooks (IN)	Franks (AZ)	Kelly (PA)
Buchanan	Frelinghuysen	King (IA)
Buck	Garrett	King (NY)
Bucshon	Gibbs	Kinzinger (IL)
Burgess	Gibson	Kline
Byrne	Gohmert	Knight
Calvert	Goodlatte	Labrador
Carter (GA)	Gosar	LaMalfa
Carter (TX)	Gowdy	Lamborn
Chabot	Granger	Lance
Chaffetz	Graves (GA)	Latta
Clawson (FL)	Graves (LA)	LoBiondo
Coffman	Graves (MO)	Long
Cole	Griffith	Loudermilk
Collins (GA)	Grothman	Love
Collins (NY)	Guinta	Lucas
Comstock	Guthrie	Luetkemeyer
Conaway	Hanna	Lummis
Cook	Hardy	MacArthur
Costello (PA)	Harper	Marchant
Cramer	Harris	Marino
Crawford	Hartzler	Massie
Crenshaw	Heck (NV)	McCarthy

McCaull	Ratcliffe	Stefanik
McClintock	Reed	Stewart
McHenry	Reichert	Stivers
McKinley	Renacci	Stutzman
McMorris	Ribble	Thompson (PA)
Rodgers	Rice (SC)	Thornberry
McSally	Rigell	Tiberi
Meadows	Roby	Tipton
Meehan	Rogers (AL)	Trott
Messer	Rogers (KY)	Turner
Mica	Rohrabacher	Upton
Miller (FL)	Rokita	Valadao
Miller (MI)	Rooney (FL)	Wagner
Moolenaar	Ros-Lehtinen	Walberg
Mooney (WV)	Roskam	Walden
Mullin	Ross	Walker
Mulvaney	Rothfus	Walorski
Murphy (PA)	Rouzer	Walters, Mimi
Neugebauer	Royce	Weber (TX)
Newhouse	Russell	Webster (FL)
Noem	Ryan (WI)	Wenstrup
Nugent	Salmon	Westerman
Nunes	Sanford	Westmoreland
Olson	Scalise	Whitfield
Palazzo	Schock	Williams
Palmer	Schweikert	Wilson (SC)
Paulsen	Scott, Austin	Wittman
Pearce	Sensenbrenner	Womack
Perry	Sessions	Woodall
Pittenger	Shimkus	Yoder
Pitts	Shuster	Yoho
Poe (TX)	Simpson	Young (AK)
Poliquin	Smith (MO)	Young (IA)
Pompeo	Smith (NE)	Young (IN)
Posey	Smith (NJ)	Zeldin
Price (GA)	Smith (TX)	Zinke

NAYS—183

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

Wasserman	Watson Coleman	Yarmuth
Schultz	Welch	
Waters, Maxine	Wilson (FL)	
NOT VOTING—7		
Cartwright	Lee	Sanchez, Loretta
Duckworth	Roe (TN)	
Fitzpatrick	Ruiz	

□ 1500

Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. DESAULNIER changed their votes from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. JONES and COFFMAN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 248, noes 177, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 72]

AYES—248

Abraham	Duffy	Jordan
Aderholt	Duncan (SC)	Joyce
Allen	Duncan (TN)	Katko
Amash	Ellmers	Kelly (PA)
Amodei	Emmer	King (IA)
Babin	Farenthold	King (NY)
Barletta	Fincher	Kinzinger (IL)
Barletta	Fleischmann	Kline
Barr	Fleming	Knight
Barton	Flores	Labrador
Benishek	Forbes	LaMalfa
Bilirakis	Fortenberry	Lamborn
Bishop (MI)	Fox	Lance
Bishop (UT)	Franks (AZ)	Latta
Black	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo
Blackburn	Garrett	Long
Blum	Gibbs	Loudermilk
Bost	Gibson	Love
Boustany	Gohmert	Lucas
Brady (TX)	Goodlatte	Luetkemeyer
Brat	Gosar	Lummis
Bridenstine	Gowdy	MacArthur
Brooks (AL)	Granger	Marchant
Brooks (IN)	Graves (GA)	Marino
Buchanan	Graves (LA)	Massie
Buck	Graves (MO)	McCarthy
Bucshon	Green, Gene	McCaull
Burgess	Griffith	McClintock
Byrne	Grothman	McHenry
Calvert	Carter (GA)	Guinta
Calvert	Carter (TX)	Guthrie
Carter (GA)	Chabot	Hanna
Carter (TX)	Chaffetz	Hardy
Chabot	Clawson (FL)	Harper
Chaffetz	Coffman	Harris
Clawson (FL)	Cole	Hartzler
Coffman	Collins (GA)	Heck (NV)
Cole	Collins (NY)	Hensarling
Collins (GA)	Comstock	Herrera Beutler
Collins (NY)	Conaway	Hice (GA)
Comstock	Cook	Hill
Conaway	Cooper	Holding
Cook	Costa	Hudson
Crawford	Costello (PA)	Huelskamp
Crenshaw	Cramer	Huizenga (MI)
Culberson	Crawford	Hultgren
Curbeo (FL)	Crenshaw	Hunter
Davis, Rodney	Culberson	Hurd (TX)
Denham	Curbeo (FL)	Hurt (VA)
Dent	Davis, Rodney	Issa
Dent	Denham	Jenkins (KS)
DeSantis	Dent	Jenkins (WV)
DesJarlais	DeSantis	Johnson (OH)
Diaz-Balart	DesJarlais	Johnson, Sam
Dold	Dold	Jolly
		Jones
		Peterson

Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell

Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner

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

NOES—177

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu (CA)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle (PA)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard

Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler

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

NOT VOTING—7

Cartwright
Duckworth
Fitzpatrick

Lee
Roe (TN)
Ruiz

Sanchez, Loretta

□ 1508

Ms. JACKSON LEE changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IN MEMORY OF KAYLA JEAN MUELLER

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

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, we, the Arizona delegation, rise today to honor the life of one of our own, one of our young, and one of our very best.

Kayla Jean Mueller of Prescott, Arizona, was a young woman full of youthful exuberance, optimism about peace and humanity, and was willing to put her life on the line to help others halfway around the world. Kayla stood as a beacon of light and hope in a time that is too often filled with darkness. She was a beautiful soul, and I know she is with God now.

While all of our hearts are heavy with the sadness of Kayla's passing, we stand here unified and strengthened to carry on her spirit, courage, and compassion that has touched millions. We must endeavor to remain brave and strong in the face of those who wish to terrify, just as Kayla did.

No parent should ever have to endure the pain and suffering of losing a child so early, but now, let us look back fondly upon her life and the many ways she made our lives better by the words she spoke: “I find God in the suffering eyes reflected in mine. If this is how you are revealed to me, this is how I will forever seek you.”

I now yield to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK).

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, we are here today to honor Kayla Mueller, her courage, and her undying spirit and determination; and we are here to offer our hearts and prayers in comfort to her grieving family and friends.

In Arizona, in Flagstaff and in Prescott, we are all neighbors, and we are all friends. Kayla went to Northern Arizona University, which is in my hometown, Flagstaff. In talking to her friends and her professors, everyone talked about her dedication to serving others. Even if it meant going to faraway places that were dangerous, she was driven by a compassion to help the suffering.

We know that her short life is proof that one dedicated soul can touch a thousand others. Let us all keep Kayla's family in our prayers and her legacy in our hearts.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, I now ask the House to join my colleagues and me for a moment of silence to honor the immortal spirit of Kayla Mueller.

There was no objection.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 263, nays 156, answered “present” 1, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 73]

YEAS—263

Abraham	Fortenberry	McMorris
Aderholt	Foster	Rodgers
Allen	Frankel (FL)	McNerney
Amodei	Franks (AZ)	McSally
Barletta	Frelinghuysen	Meadows
Barr	Gabbard	Meeks
Barton	Gibbs	Meng
Beatty	Goodlatte	Mica
Becerra	Gosar	Miller (FL)
Bilirakis	Gowdy	Miller (MI)
Bishop (GA)	Graham	Moolenaar
Bishop (MI)	Granger	Mooney (WV)
Bishop (UT)	Graves (LA)	Moore
Black	Grayson	Mullin
Blackburn	Green, Al	Murphy (PA)
Blum	Nadler	Napoliitano
Blumenauer	Griffith	Neugebauer
Bonamici	Grothman	Newhouse
Boustany	Guinta	Noem
Brady (TX)	Guthrie	Nugent
Brat	Hahn	Nunes
Bridenstine	Hardy	Harper
Brooks (AL)	Harper	Harris
Brooks (IN)	Heck (WA)	Olson
Brown (FL)	Hensarling	Pascrell
Buchanan	Higgins	Payne
Buck	Himes	Pelosi
Bucshon	Hinojosa	Perlmutter
Bustos	Huelskamp	Pingree
Butterfield	Huffman	Pitts
Byrne	Hultgren	Pocan
Calvert	Hurd (TX)	Polis
Capps	Hurt (VA)	Pompeo
Cárdenas	Issa	Posey
Carney	Jeffries	Price (NC)
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Carter (GA)	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Carter (TX)	Johnson, Sam	Ribble
Castro (TX)	Jolly	Rice (SC)
Chabot	Kaptur	Richmond
Chu (CA)	Katko	Roby
Cicilline	Keating	Rogers (KY)
Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)	Rohrabacher
Clay	Kelly (PA)	Rokita
Cole	Kennedy	Rooney (FL)
Collins (NY)	Kildee	Ross
Comstock	King (IA)	Rothfus
Conaway	King (NY)	Royce
Cook	Kline	Ruppersberger
Cooper	Knight	Russell
Courtney	Kuster	Ryan (WI)
Cramer	Labrador	Salmon
Crawford	LaMalfa	Sanford
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Scalise
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Culberson	Larson (CT)	Schweikert
Davis (CA)	Latta	Scott (VA)
DeGette	Lieu (CA)	Scott, Austin
DeLauro	Lipinski	Sensenbrenner
DelBene	Loeb sack	Serrano
Dent	Lofgren	Sessions
DeSaulnier	Long	Sherman
DesJarlais	Loudermilk	Shimkus
Deutch	Lowey	Shuster
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Simpson
Doyle (PA)	Luetkemeyer	Sinema
Duncan (SC)	Lujan Grisham	Smith (MO)
Duncan (TN)	(NM)	Smith (NE)
Edwards	Lummis	Smith (NJ)
Ellison	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Ellmers	Marino	Smith (WA)
Emmer	Massie	Speier
Engel	Matsui	Stefanik
Eshoo	McCarthy	Stewart
Esty	McClintock	Stivers
Farr	McCollum	Stutzman
Fattah	McHenry	Takai
Fleischmann		Takano
Forbes		Thornberry

THE JOURNAL

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

Titus	Walz	Williams
Tonko	Wasserman	Wilson (FL)
Tsongas	Schultz	Wilson (SC)
Upton	Waters, Maxine	Womack
Van Hollen	Webster (FL)	Yarmuth
Wagner	Welch	Yoho
Walden	Wenstrup	Young (IA)
Walker	Westerman	Young (IN)
Walorski	Westmoreland	Zeldin
Walters, Mimi	Whitfield	Zinke

NAYS—156

Adams	Gutiérrez	Palmer
Aguilar	Hanna	Paulsen
Amash	Hartzler	Pearce
Ashford	Hastings	Perry
Babin	Heck (NV)	Peters
Bass	Herrera Beutler	Peterson
Benishkek	Hice (GA)	Pittenger
Bera	Hill	Poe (TX)
Beyer	Holding	Poliquin
Bost	Honda	Price (GA)
Boyle (PA)	Hudson	Ratcliffe
Brady (PA)	Huizenga (MI)	Reed
Brownley (CA)	Hunter	Reichert
Burgess	Israel	Renacci
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Castor (FL)	Jenkins (KS)	Rigell
Chaffetz	Jenkins (WV)	Rogers (AL)
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Clawson (FL)	Jones	Rouzer
Cleaver	Jordan	Royal-Allard
Clyburn	Joyce	Rush
Coffman	Kilmer	Ryan (OH)
Cohen	Kind	Sánchez, Linda
Collins (GA)	Kinzinger (IL)	T.
Connolly	Kirkpatrick	Sarbanes
Conyers	Lance	Schakowsky
Costa	Langevin	Schock
Costello (PA)	Lawrence	Schrader
Crowley	Levin	Sewell (AL)
Cummings	Lewis	Sires
Curbelo (FL)	LoBiondo	Slaughter
Davis, Danny	Love	Swailwell (CA)
Davis, Rodney	Lowenthal	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (MS)
Delaney	(NM)	Thompson (PA)
Denham	Lynch	Tiberi
DeSantis	MacArthur	Tipton
Dingell	Maloney,	Torres
Dold	Carolyn	Trott
Duffy	Maloney, Sean	Turner
Farenthold	McDermott	Valadao
Fincher	McGovern	Vargas
Fleming	McKinley	Veasey
Flores	Meehan	Vela
Foxx	Messer	Velázquez
Fudge	Moulton	Viscosky
Garamendi	Mulvaney	Walberg
Garrett	Murphy (FL)	Watson Coleman
Gibson	Neal	Weber (TX)
Graves (GA)	Noian	Wittman
Graves (MO)	Norcross	Woodall
Green, Gene	Palazzo	Yoder
Grijalva	Pallone	Young (AK)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Gohmert

NOT VOTING—12

Cartwright	Gallego	Roskam
Doggett	Hoyer	Ruiz
Duckworth	Lee	Sanchez, Loretta
Fitzpatrick	Roe (TN)	Scott, David

□ 1518

Mr. PALMER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote today because of a serious illness in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted: rollcall No. 71—"yea", rollcall No. 72—"aye", rollcall No. 73—"yea."

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE APPROVAL ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Mem-

bers have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on S. 1.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 100, I call up the bill (S. 1) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 100, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1

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 "Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act".

SEC. 2. KEYSTONE XL APPROVAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P. may construct, connect, operate, and maintain the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in the application filed on May 4, 2012, by TransCanada Corporation to the Department of State (including any subsequent revision to the pipeline route within the State of Nebraska required or authorized by the State of Nebraska).

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State in January 2014, regarding the pipeline referred to in subsection (a), and the environmental analysis, consultation, and review described in that document (including appendices) shall be considered to fully satisfy—

(1) all requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

(2) any other provision of law that requires Federal agency consultation or review (including the consultation or review required under section 7(a) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536(a))) with respect to the pipeline and facilities referred to in subsection (a).

(c) PERMITS.—Any Federal permit or authorization issued before the date of enactment of this Act for the pipeline and cross-border facilities referred to in subsection (a) shall remain in effect.

(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Except for review in the Supreme Court of the United States, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction over any civil action for the review of an order or action of a Federal agency regarding the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a), and the related facilities in the United States, that are approved by this Act (including any order granting a permit or right-of-way, or any other agency action taken to construct or complete the project pursuant to Federal law).

(e) PRIVATE PROPERTY SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this Act alters any Federal, State, or local process or condition in effect on the date of enactment of this Act that is necessary to secure access from an owner of private property to construct the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a).

(f) PRIVATE PROPERTY PROTECTION.—Land or an interest in land for the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a) may only be acquired consistently with the Constitution.

SEC. 3. COORDINATION OF ENERGY RETROFITTING ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOLS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) SCHOOL.—The term "school" means—

(A) an elementary school or secondary school (as defined in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801));

(B) an institution of higher education (as defined in section 102(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002(a));

(C) a school of the defense dependents' education system under the Defense Dependents' Education Act of 1978 (20 U.S.C. 921 et seq.) or established under section 2164 of title 10, United States Code;

(D) a school operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

(E) a tribally controlled school (as defined in section 5212 of the Tribally Controlled Schools Act of 1988 (25 U.S.C. 2511)); and

(F) a Tribal College or University (as defined in section 316(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059c(b))).

(2) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Energy.

(b) DESIGNATION OF LEAD AGENCY.—The Secretary, acting through the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, shall act as the lead Federal agency for coordinating and disseminating information on existing Federal programs and assistance that may be used to help initiate, develop, and finance energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects for schools.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out coordination and outreach under subsection (b), the Secretary shall—

(1) in consultation and coordination with the appropriate Federal agencies, carry out a review of existing programs and financing mechanisms (including revolving loan funds and loan guarantees) available in or from the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Energy, the Department of Education, the Department of the Treasury, the Internal Revenue Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate Federal agencies with jurisdiction over energy financing and facilitation that are currently used or may be used to help initiate, develop, and finance energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects for schools;

(2) establish a Federal cross-departmental collaborative coordination, education, and outreach effort to streamline communication and promote available Federal opportunities and assistance described in paragraph (1) for energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects that enables States, local educational agencies, and schools—

(A) to use existing Federal opportunities more effectively; and

(B) to form partnerships with Governors, State energy programs, local educational, financial, and energy officials, State and local government officials, nonprofit organizations, and other appropriate entities to support the initiation of the projects;

(3) provide technical assistance for States, local educational agencies, and schools to help develop and finance energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects—

(A) to increase the energy efficiency of buildings or facilities;

(B) to install systems that individually generate energy from renewable energy resources;

(C) to establish partnerships to leverage economies of scale and additional financing mechanisms available to larger clean energy initiatives; or

(D) to promote—

(i) the maintenance of health, environmental quality, and safety in schools, including the ambient air quality, through energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofit projects; and

(ii) the achievement of expected energy savings and renewable energy production through proper operations and maintenance practices;

(4) develop and maintain a single online resource website with contact information for relevant technical assistance and support staff in the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy for States, local educational agencies, and schools to effectively access and use Federal opportunities and assistance described in paragraph (1) to develop energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects; and

(5) establish a process for recognition of schools that—

(A) have successfully implemented energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects; and

(B) are willing to serve as resources for other local educational agencies and schools to assist initiation of similar efforts.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing the implementation of this section.

SEC. 4. CONSULTATION WITH INDIAN TRIBES.

Nothing in this Act relieves the United States of its responsibility to consult with Indian nations as required under executive order 13175 (67 Fed. Reg. 67249) (November 6, 2000).

SEC. 5. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING CLIMATE CHANGE.

It is the sense of the Senate that climate change is real and not a hoax.

SEC. 6. SENSE OF SENATE REGARDING THE OIL SPILL LIABILITY TRUST FUND.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) Congress should approve a bill to ensure that all forms of bitumen or synthetic crude oil derived from bitumen are subject to the per-barrel excise tax associated with the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund established by section 9509 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

(2) it is necessary for Congress to approve a bill described in paragraph (1) because the Internal Revenue Service determined in 2011 that certain forms of petroleum are not subject to the per-barrel excise tax;

(3) under article I, section 7, clause 1 of the Constitution, the Senate may not originate a bill to raise new revenue, and thus may not originate a bill to close the legitimate and unintended loophole described in paragraph (2);

(4) if the Senate attempts to originate a bill described in paragraph (1), it would provide a substantive basis for a “blue slip” from the House of Representatives, which would prevent advancement of the bill; and

(5) the House of Representatives, consistent with article I, section 7, clause 1 of the Constitution, should consider and refer to the Senate a bill to ensure that all forms of bitumen or synthetic crude oil derived from bitumen are subject to the per-barrel excise tax associated with the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund established by section 9509 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

DIVISION B—ENERGY EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENT

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the “Energy Efficiency Improvement Act of 2015”.

TITLE I—BETTER BUILDINGS

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Better Buildings Act of 2015”.

SEC. 102. ENERGY EFFICIENCY IN FEDERAL AND OTHER BUILDINGS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of General Services.

(2) COST-EFFECTIVE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURE.—The term “cost-effective energy efficiency measure” means any building product, material, equipment, or service, and the installing, implementing, or operating thereof, that provides energy savings in an amount that is not less than the cost of such installing, implementing, or operating.

(3) COST-EFFECTIVE WATER EFFICIENCY MEASURE.—The term “cost-effective water efficiency measure” means any building product, material, equipment, or service, and the installing, implementing, or operating thereof, that provides water savings in an amount that is not less than the cost of such installing, implementing, or operating.

(b) MODEL PROVISIONS, POLICIES, AND BEST PRACTICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy and after providing the public with an opportunity for notice and comment, shall develop model commercial leasing provisions and best practices in accordance with this subsection.

(2) COMMERCIAL LEASING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The model commercial leasing provisions developed under this subsection shall, at a minimum, align the interests of building owners and tenants with regard to investments in cost-effective energy efficiency measures and cost-effective water efficiency measures to encourage building owners and tenants to collaborate to invest in such measures.

(B) USE OF MODEL PROVISIONS.—The Administrator may use the model commercial leasing provisions developed under this subsection in any standard leasing document that designates a Federal agency (or other client of the Administrator) as a landlord or tenant.

(C) PUBLICATION.—The Administrator shall periodically publish the model commercial leasing provisions developed under this subsection, along with explanatory materials, to encourage building owners and tenants in the private sector to use such provisions and materials.

(3) REALTY SERVICES.—The Administrator shall develop policies and practices to implement cost-effective energy efficiency measures and cost-effective water efficiency measures for the realty services provided by the Administrator to Federal agencies (or other clients of the Administrator), including periodic training of appropriate Federal employees and contractors on how to identify and evaluate those measures.

(4) STATE AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE.—The Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, shall make available model commercial leasing provisions and best practices developed under this subsection to State, county, and municipal governments for use in managing owned and leased building space in accordance with the goal of encouraging investment in all cost-effective energy efficiency measures and cost-effective water efficiency measures.

SEC. 103. SEPARATE SPACES WITH HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle B of title IV of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17081 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 424. SEPARATE SPACES WITH HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURES.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURE.—The term ‘high-performance energy efficiency measure’ means a technology, product, or practice that will result in substantial operational cost savings by reducing energy consumption and utility costs.

“(2) SEPARATE SPACES.—The term ‘separate spaces’ means areas within a commercial building that are leased or otherwise occupied by a tenant or other occupant for a period of time pursuant to the terms of a written agreement.

“(b) STUDY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary, acting through the Assistant Secretary of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, shall complete a study on the feasibility of—

“(A) significantly improving energy efficiency in commercial buildings through the design and construction, by owners and tenants, of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures; and

“(B) encouraging owners and tenants to implement high-performance energy efficiency measures in separate spaces.

“(2) SCOPE.—The study shall, at a minimum, include—

“(A) descriptions of—

“(i) high-performance energy efficiency measures that should be considered as part of the initial design and construction of separate spaces;

“(ii) processes that owners, tenants, architects, and engineers may replicate when designing and constructing separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures;

“(iii) policies and best practices to achieve reductions in energy intensities for lighting, plug loads, heating, cooling, cooking, laundry, and other systems to satisfy the needs of the commercial building tenant;

“(iv) return on investment and payback analyses of the incremental cost and projected energy savings of the proposed set of high-performance energy efficiency measures, including consideration of available incentives;

“(v) models and simulation methods that predict the quantity of energy used by separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures and that compare that predicted quantity to the quantity of energy used by separate spaces without high-performance energy efficiency measures but that otherwise comply with applicable building code requirements;

“(vi) measurement and verification platforms demonstrating actual energy use of high-performance energy efficiency measures installed in separate spaces, and whether such measures generate the savings intended in the initial design and construction of the separate spaces;

“(vii) best practices that encourage an integrated approach to designing and constructing separate spaces to perform at optimum energy efficiency in conjunction with the central systems of a commercial building; and

“(viii) any impact on employment resulting from the design and construction of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures; and

“(B) case studies reporting economic and energy savings returns in the design and construction of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures.

“(3) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall publish a notice in the Federal Register requesting public comments regarding effective methods, measures, and practices for the design and construction of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures.

“(4) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall publish the study on the website of the Department of Energy.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 423 the following new item:

“Sec. 424. Separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures.”.

SEC. 104. TENANT STAR PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle B of title IV of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17081 et seq.) (as amended by section 103) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 425. TENANT STAR PROGRAM.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURE.—The term ‘high-performance energy efficiency measure’ has the meaning given the term in section 424.

“(2) SEPARATE SPACES.—The term ‘separate spaces’ has the meaning given the term in section 424.

“(b) TENANT STAR.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, shall develop a voluntary program within the Energy Star program established by section 324A of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6294a), which may be known as ‘Tenant Star’, to promote energy efficiency in separate spaces leased by tenants or otherwise occupied within commercial buildings.

“(c) EXPANDING SURVEY DATA.—The Secretary of Energy, acting through the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, shall—

“(1) collect, through each Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey of the Energy Information Administration that is conducted after the date of enactment of this section, data on—

“(A) categories of building occupancy that are known to consume significant quantities of energy, such as occupancy by data centers, trading floors, and restaurants; and

“(B) other aspects of the property, building operation, or building occupancy determined by the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, in consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, to be relevant in lowering energy consumption;

“(2) with respect to the first Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey conducted after the date of enactment of this section, to the extent full compliance with the requirements of paragraph (1) is not feasible, conduct activities to develop the capability to collect such data and begin to collect such data; and

“(3) make data collected under paragraphs (1) and (2) available to the public in aggregated form and provide such data, and any associated results, to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency for use in accordance with subsection (d).

“(d) RECOGNITION OF OWNERS AND TENANTS.—

“(1) OCCUPANCY-BASED RECOGNITION.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which sufficient data is received pursuant to subsection (c), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall, following an opportunity for public notice and comment—

“(A) in a manner similar to the Energy Star rating system for commercial buildings, develop policies and procedures to recognize tenants in commercial buildings that voluntarily achieve high levels of energy efficiency in separate spaces;

“(B) establish building occupancy categories eligible for Tenant Star recognition based on the data collected under subsection (c) and any other appropriate data sources; and

“(C) consider other forms of recognition for commercial building tenants or other occupants that lower energy consumption in separate spaces.

“(2) DESIGN- AND CONSTRUCTION-BASED RECOGNITION.—After the study required by section 424(b) is completed, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Secretary and following an opportunity for public notice and comment, may develop a voluntary program to recognize commercial building owners and tenants that use high-performance energy efficiency measures in the design and construction of separate spaces.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 424 (as added by section 103(b)) the following new item:

“Sec. 425. Tenant Star program.”.

TITLE II—GRID-ENABLED WATER HEATERS

SEC. 201. GRID-ENABLED WATER HEATERS.

Part B of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act is amended—

(1) in section 325(e) (42 U.S.C. 6295(e)), by adding at the end the following:

“(6) ADDITIONAL STANDARDS FOR GRID-ENABLED WATER HEATERS.—

“(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

“(i) ACTIVATION LOCK.—The term ‘activation lock’ means a control mechanism (either a physical device directly on the water heater or a control system integrated into the water heater) that is locked by default and contains a physical, software, or digital communication that must be activated with an activation key to enable the product to operate at its designed specifications and capabilities and without which activation the product will provide not greater than 50 percent of the rated first hour delivery of hot water certified by the manufacturer.

“(ii) GRID-ENABLED WATER HEATER.—The term ‘grid-enabled water heater’ means an electric resistance water heater that—

“(I) has a rated storage tank volume of more than 75 gallons;

“(II) is manufactured on or after April 16, 2015;

“(III) has—

“(aa) an energy factor of not less than 1.061 minus the product obtained by multiplying—

“(AA) the rated storage volume of the tank, expressed in gallons; and

“(BB) 0.00168; or

“(bb) an equivalent alternative standard prescribed by the Secretary and developed pursuant to paragraph (5)(E);

“(IV) is equipped at the point of manufacture with an activation lock; and

“(V) bears a permanent label applied by the manufacturer that—

“(aa) is made of material not adversely affected by water;

“(bb) is attached by means of non-water-soluble adhesive; and

“(cc) advises purchasers and end-users of the intended and appropriate use of the product with the following notice printed in 16.5 point Arial Narrow Bold font:

“IMPORTANT INFORMATION: This water heater is intended only for use as part of an electric thermal storage or demand response program. It will not provide adequate hot water unless enrolled in such a program and activated by your utility company or another program operator. Confirm the availability of a program in your local area before purchasing or installing this product.”.

“(B) REQUIREMENT.—The manufacturer or private labeler shall provide the activation key for a grid-enabled water heater only to a utility or other company that operates an electric thermal storage or demand response

program that uses such a grid-enabled water heater.

“(C) REPORTS.—

“(i) MANUFACTURERS.—The Secretary shall require each manufacturer of grid-enabled water heaters to report to the Secretary annually the quantity of grid-enabled water heaters that the manufacturer ships each year.

“(ii) OPERATORS.—The Secretary shall require utilities and other demand response and thermal storage program operators to report annually the quantity of grid-enabled water heaters activated for their programs using forms of the Energy Information Agency or using such other mechanism that the Secretary determines appropriate after an opportunity for notice and comment.

“(iii) CONFIDENTIALITY REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall treat shipment data reported by manufacturers as confidential business information.

“(D) PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In 2017 and 2019, the Secretary shall publish an analysis of the data collected under subparagraph (C) to assess the extent to which shipped products are put into use in demand response and thermal storage programs.

“(ii) PREVENTION OF PRODUCT DIVERSION.—If the Secretary determines that sales of grid-enabled water heaters exceed by 15 percent or greater the quantity of such products activated for use in demand response and thermal storage programs annually, the Secretary shall, after opportunity for notice and comment, establish procedures to prevent product diversion for non-program purposes.

“(E) COMPLIANCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraphs (A) through (D) shall remain in effect until the Secretary determines under this section that—

“(I) grid-enabled water heaters do not require a separate efficiency requirement; or

“(II) sales of grid-enabled water heaters exceed by 15 percent or greater the quantity of such products activated for use in demand response and thermal storage programs annually and procedures to prevent product diversion for non-program purposes would not be adequate to prevent such product diversion.

“(ii) EFFECTIVE DATE.—If the Secretary exercises the authority described in clause (i) or amends the efficiency requirement for grid-enabled water heaters, that action will take effect on the date described in subsection (m)(4)(A)(ii).

“(iii) CONSIDERATION.—In carrying out this section with respect to electric water heaters, the Secretary shall consider the impact on thermal storage and demand response programs, including any impact on energy savings, electric bills, peak load reduction, electric reliability, integration of renewable resources, and the environment.

“(iv) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out this paragraph, the Secretary shall require that grid-enabled water heaters be equipped with communication capability to enable the grid-enabled water heaters to participate in ancillary services programs if the Secretary determines that the technology is available, practical, and cost-effective.”.

(2) in section 332(a) (42 U.S.C. 6302(a))—

(A) in paragraph (5), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in the first paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(C) by redesignating the second paragraph (6) as paragraph (7);

(D) in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (7) (as so redesignated), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”;

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) for any person—

“(A) to activate an activation lock for a grid-enabled water heater with knowledge that such water heater is not used as part of an electric thermal storage or demand response program;

“(B) to distribute an activation key for a grid-enabled water heater with knowledge that such activation key will be used to activate a grid-enabled water heater that is not used as part of an electric thermal storage or demand response program;

“(C) to otherwise enable a grid-enabled water heater to operate at its designed specification and capabilities with knowledge that such water heater is not used as part of an electric thermal storage or demand response program; or

“(D) to knowingly remove or render illegible the label of a grid-enabled water heater described in section 325(e)(6)(A)(ii)(V).”;

(3) in section 333(a) (42 U.S.C. 6303(a))—

(A) by striking “section 332(a)(5)” and inserting “paragraph (5), (6), (7), or (8) of section 332(a)”;

(B) by striking “paragraph (1), (2), or (5) of section 332(a)” and inserting “paragraph (1), (2), (5), (6), (7), or (8) of section 332(a)”;

(4) in section 334 (42 U.S.C. 6304)—

(A) by striking “section 332(a)(5)” and inserting “paragraph (5), (6), (7), or (8) of section 332(a)”;

(B) by striking “section 332(a)(6)” and inserting “section 332(a)(7)”.

TITLE III—ENERGY INFORMATION FOR COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS

SEC. 301. ENERGY INFORMATION FOR COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS.

(a) REQUIREMENT OF BENCHMARKING AND DISCLOSURE FOR LEASING BUILDINGS WITHOUT ENERGY STAR LABELS.—Section 435(b)(2) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17091(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraph (1)”;

(2) by striking “signing the contract,” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following:

“signing the contract, the following requirements are met:

“(A) The space is renovated for all energy efficiency and conservation improvements that would be cost effective over the life of the lease, including improvements in lighting, windows, and heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems.

“(B)(i) Subject to clause (ii), the space is benchmarked under a nationally recognized, online, free benchmarking program, with public disclosure, unless the space is a space for which owners cannot access whole building utility consumption data, including spaces—

“(I) that are located in States with privacy laws that provide that utilities shall not provide such aggregated information to multitenant building owners; and

“(II) for which tenants do not provide energy consumption information to the commercial building owner in response to a request from the building owner.

“(ii) A Federal agency that is a tenant of the space shall provide to the building owner, or authorize the owner to obtain from the utility, the energy consumption information of the space for the benchmarking and disclosure required by this subparagraph.”.

(b) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy, in collaboration with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, shall complete a study—

(A) on the impact of—

(i) State and local performance benchmarking and disclosure policies, and any associated building efficiency policies,

for commercial and multifamily buildings; and

(ii) programs and systems in which utilities provide aggregated information regarding whole building energy consumption and usage information to owners of multitenant commercial, residential, and mixed-use buildings;

(B) that identifies best practice policy approaches studied under subparagraph (A) that have resulted in the greatest improvements in building energy efficiency; and

(C) that considers—

(i) compliance rates and the benefits and costs of the policies and programs on building owners, utilities, tenants, and other parties;

(ii) utility practices, programs, and systems that provide aggregated energy consumption information to multitenant building owners, and the impact of public utility commissions and State privacy laws on those practices, programs, and systems;

(iii) exceptions to compliance in existing laws where building owners are not able to gather or access whole building energy information from tenants or utilities;

(iv) the treatment of buildings with—

(I) multiple uses;

(II) uses for which baseline information is not available; and

(III) uses that require high levels of energy intensities, such as data centers, trading floors, and television studios;

(v) implementation practices, including disclosure methods and phase-in of compliance;

(vi) the safety and security of benchmarking tools offered by government agencies, and the resiliency of those tools against cyber attacks; and

(vii) international experiences with regard to building benchmarking and disclosure laws and data aggregation for multitenant buildings.

(2) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—At the conclusion of the study, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report on the results of the study.

(c) CREATION AND MAINTENANCE OF DATABASE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act and following opportunity for public notice and comment, the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with other relevant agencies, shall maintain, and if necessary create, a database for the purpose of storing and making available public energy-related information on commercial and multifamily buildings, including—

(A) data provided under Federal, State, local, and other laws or programs regarding building benchmarking and energy information disclosure;

(B) information on buildings that have disclosed energy ratings and certifications; and

(C) energy-related information on buildings provided voluntarily by the owners of the buildings, only in an anonymous form unless the owner provides otherwise.

(2) COMPLEMENTARY PROGRAMS.—The database maintained pursuant to paragraph (1) shall complement and not duplicate the functions of the Environmental Protection Agency's Energy Star Portfolio Manager tool.

(d) INPUT FROM STAKEHOLDERS.—The Secretary of Energy shall seek input from stakeholders to maximize the effectiveness of the actions taken under this section.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to the Committee on Energy

and Commerce of the House of Representatives and Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report on the progress made in complying with this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1, the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act. S. 1 passed the Senate by a bipartisan vote of 62–36. This bill is based on H.R. 3 which, last month, the House passed by a bipartisan vote of 266–153. S. 1 does not change any of the House provisions regarding the Keystone pipeline.

Here we are again on the floor with a bill that has been approved on a bipartisan basis three times in the last 4 months. It is time for the President to approve the Keystone pipeline.

His own administration has found the pipeline would have minimal impact on the environment. Congress has shown that there is Republican and Democrat support for the pipeline. The last remaining excuse for delay—pending litigation in Nebraska—has been resolved. I hope the President reconsiders his veto threat on this bill.

I think he should sign this bill because we all agree we need to invest in our Nation's infrastructure, and pipelines are critical to the economy. America's pipeline network is immense—2.6 million miles of pipe transporting natural gas, oil, and other hazardous materials.

Pipelines transport more energy product than any other mode of transportation in this country. Keystone will be a critical addition to the pipeline network, increasing our Nation's supply of oil and enhancing our energy independence.

This project will create good-paying American jobs. As the President has stated, “First-class infrastructure attracts first-class jobs.” Indeed, six unions representing over 3 million workers support this project, including the United Association of Plumbers and Pipefitters, the International Union of Operating Engineers, the Laborers' International Union of North America, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, the building and construction trade, and the Teamsters.

It is simply time to move forward on this project, so I urge all my colleagues

on both sides of the aisle to vote for S. 1, and I urge the President to sign this bill and allow infrastructure to be built in this country.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, for anyone watching this debate for the 11th time who isn't familiar with the substantive reasons to oppose this legislation, I would refer them to my earlier remarks numerous times on the floor of the House because, in the interest of time, I am not going to repeat them.

I am going to say that I am pleased that this is actually a big step forward for the other side of the aisle in the House because there are two critical changes that the Senate made which go to a raging debate on the Republican side of the aisle here in the House, and that is whether or not climate change is real or a hoax.

By voting for this bill today, you are going to endorse language saying that climate change is real and not a hoax. I think that is tremendous progress for the Republican side of the aisle, who I expect will be supporting this bill to accept the reality of climate change. I am thrilled that that is in there, and their votes will be reflected in the RECORD as endorsing that language.

Secondly, Madam Speaker, one of the other substantive issues we have raised numerous times is that this foreign corporation will not—because of a bizarre ruling by the Internal Revenue Service—will not be paying into the trust fund which goes to mitigate pipeline spills, breaks, and cleanups: the oil spill liability trust fund.

We have offered that as a motion to recommit numerous times here on the floor, thinking it would be a reasonable thing to level the playing field between U.S. producers shipping oil and a Canadian company shipping oil which is going to be exported from the United States perhaps after it is refined.

Again, this will be a shift on the Republican side of the aisle because you will be voting for language that says, "Congress should approve a bill to ensure that all forms of bitumen or synthetic crude oil derived from bitumen are subject to the per-barrel excise tax associated with the oil spill liability trust fund," which would be I think the first time the Republican side has endorsed any sort—well, no, there was a tax increase for inland waterways users buried in that bill in December—but this will be only the second time that Republicans here have voted to increase a tax.

I am really thrilled to see that and the fact that we will be righting that inequity, and essentially, the Republicans will be endorsing something that we have offered numerous times on the floor.

The third thing—which really isn't an improvement—is some Senators stuck in language saying that when

this foreign corporation takes American citizens' private property against their will, they have to follow the Constitution.

Well, unfortunately, because of the Kelo decision—which we did try a number of years ago to clarify and overturn—the Supreme Court, in its wisdom, has ruled that you can yield the right, for economic development purposes, to a private entity to take peoples' private property.

We are going one step—or you are going one step further here by actually giving that authority to a foreign corporation. As far as I know, this is the first time in the history of the United States of America that a foreign corporation will have the right to take private property from an American citizen against their will. That isn't an improvement, just saying "follow the Constitution," because of the ruling by the Supreme Court.

But the other two are great. Climate change exists. You are endorsing that implicitly by voting for this bill. We should increase taxes and impose taxes on this tar sands oil.

Again, I think this is a big breakthrough for the other side. I still won't be voting for the bill. I stand on the previous concerns I have raised. Those are all still extant, but these things will be worthy of noticing.

With that, Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) be allowed to control the balance of my time in addition to the time controlled by the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials.

□ 1530

Mr. DENHAM. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1, the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act, which passed bipartisan not only in the House with 266 votes, but also bipartisan in the Senate with 62 votes. As Chairman SHUSTER noted, this is a jobs bill that will create jobs, enhance our energy independence, and strengthen our national economy.

This pipeline will transport over 800,000 barrels of oil per day. That is according to the Department of Energy. It will also help create good paying jobs, over 40,000 jobs, according to the State Department.

We held a hearing in our subcommittee last week regarding the need for more transportation infrastructure for energy projects. One witness testified we will need 12,000 to 15,000 miles of new pipeline over the next 5 to 10 years. Keystone XL is just one of those new projects.

This is the most studied pipeline in our history. This is no reason to con-

tinue to stall this project. This is a safe project. America has 2.6 million miles of pipeline, providing an extremely safe way to transport energy products. The Keystone pipeline will be built the safest pipeline ever with 95 special mitigation measures, including nearly 60 recommended by the Department of Transportation, the most extensively studied and vetted pipeline project in the history of our country.

Finally, as amended in the Senate, this bill will make important strides towards greater energy efficiency. In conclusion, the Keystone XL has been under review for over 6 years and debated and voted on in the House and Senate numerous times. We need these jobs. We need this energy. We need it now.

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

Today we are voting once again to grant special treatment to TransCanada's Keystone tar sands pipeline. It is the 11th time we are voting on a special deal for the Canadian company's pipeline since Republicans took control of the House of Representatives. This Congress has much work to do on energy. Our situation is changing rapidly, and each energy-related decision we make can have long-term consequences for our environment, our economy, and our national security. But the President has made clear that he will veto this legislation, so we should stop wasting our time on it.

The Senate added many provisions to this version of the Keystone bill. Some of the provisions on energy efficiency are provisions that I and many of my colleagues can support and have supported in the past, but those provisions should be considered separately, preferably as stand-alone bills in the House and Senate. They should not be held hostage by another doomed Keystone approval bill, and they in no way come close to offsetting the harm that would be caused by Congress deeming Keystone pipeline approved.

We don't need this Canadian tar sands oil. Worldwide crude oil prices are at their lowest level in 5 years, and gasoline prices are down, too. Domestic oil production is up. Last week EPA noted that low oil prices means approval of the Keystone pipeline could be a critical factor in the economic viability of Canadian tar sands expansion. And tar sands are among the dirtiest and carbon intensive of all fossil fuels. The Keystone pipeline will create a dependence on tar sands crude, reversing the carbon pollution reductions that we need.

This pipeline is a terrible deal for America. We get all of the risks while the oil companies reap the rewards. If this pipeline spills, like Enbridge pipeline in Michigan, the heavy tar sands that flow onto the ground and into our waters, our groundwater and our surface water, will be even harder to clean up than regular oil.

Unfortunately, if there is such a spill, it will be cleaned up at U.S. taxpayer expense and the polluter won't have to pay. Why is that? Because tar sands are not considered crude oil for purposes of contributing to the oil spill liability trust fund. We have repeatedly pointed out this egregious and unjustified loophole to the majority, and we have repeatedly received assurances that it will be addressed—yet it has still not been addressed. In fact, three times in this Chamber alone, we have offered amendments to solve this problem, but the Republican majority voted each one of them down.

Now there is this new “sense of the Senate” language that was put into the bill by the Senate that promises further action on this issue, but it is no substitute for real legislation to protect the American taxpayer from the financial consequences of a tar sands spill. Make no mistake, this language, this sense of Congress or sense of the Senate, does nothing to change the equation and end the tar sands oil subsidy.

Recently, the President stood in this Chamber and noted that 21st century businesses need 21st century infrastructure. He said that we should “set our sights higher than a single oil pipeline.” Yet here we are again voting on that single oil pipeline.

It is my hope that we are nearing the end of this long cycle of futile votes to grant special treatment to this single pipeline; and it is my hope that sooner rather than later we can get back to trying to find agreement on a moderate energy policy, one that is sustainable, one that helps the U.S. economy, and one that moves us forward, not backward, in the fight against climate change. In the meantime, I urge my colleagues once again to vote “no” on this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS).

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS. Madam Speaker, it was 2008 when TransCanada first submitted an application to construct the Keystone XL pipeline. Six years later, the Keystone pipeline is still awaiting approval.

What does construction of the Keystone pipeline mean for our Nation? Over 40,000 jobs, energy security, and increased economic growth. Furthermore, the State Department found that construction of the Keystone pipeline would pose little environmental risk. In fact, there would be greater environmental and safety risks from not building the pipeline.

Despite the obvious benefits and bipartisan support, the President has continued to block Keystone's approval. Now he threatens to veto the bill, effectively killing the entire Keystone program. After 6-plus years, the President has run out of excuses. It is clear that the construction of the Keystone pipeline is in our Nation's best interests, and we cannot afford to delay any longer.

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

I wanted to reference again this provision in the bill that the Senate put in. The Senate bill contains a provision boldly stating that “climate change is real and not a hoax.” I couldn't agree more with that, Madam Speaker, but let's be clear: the Senate Republican majority in the same breath rejected another amendment stating that climate change is caused by human activity.

Senators who voted against those amendments are out of step with the American people, including many Republicans. In a recent poll, an overwhelming majority of Americans, including almost half of Republicans, stated support for government action to fight climate change and disagreed with those who question that climate change is caused by human activity.

Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have become fond of saying that they are not scientists, and I think that we can generally agree that is true. But even though they admit they are not scientists, it doesn't stop them from questioning the science. Now, I am not a scientist either, but when actual scientists speak and say there is an overwhelming body of evidence that man-made climate change is real and happening now, I listen to the actual scientists. And saying that you are not a scientist is, in my opinion, just a way of dodging the facts.

I have to say, Madam Speaker, when I go home to New Jersey, and my district was probably more impacted by Superstorm Sandy than any other district, I don't see any disagreement between Democrats and Republicans in my district. It doesn't matter whether they are State legislators or county legislators or mayors or on the council. And I have almost as many Republican mayors and councilmen and councilwomen as I do Democrats, but all of them agree that climate change is real and caused by human activity because they are listening to the scientists and they understand that science is important and that we should pay attention to it.

In any event, the “sense of the Senate” language affirming that climate change is not a hoax does not fix any of the problems with the bill before us, and its inclusion doesn't mean that voting “yes” today will help us in the fight against climate change. In fact, voting “yes” today will move us backward in that fight because one of the major concerns that I have and opponents have of Keystone is because it will exploit tar sands, it will actually increase greenhouse gas significantly. And it is very possible that, without the pipeline, those tar sands will simply not be developed or exploited.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR).

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Madam Speaker, it is time to build the Keystone pipeline. Building Keystone will create jobs, expand economic opportunity, and provide our country with energy from a reliable trading partner. It is estimated that the pipeline will carry more than 30 million gallons of oil per day, and the State Department has concluded the pipeline is the safest way to transport it to market. Keystone will support job creation by moving oil to American refineries where American workers will process it. Thousands of products using refined oil are manufactured and purchased by Americans every day, and this pipeline has the potential to make those products less expensive.

The House has passed Keystone policy time and again. Ten times, in fact, the House has stood with American workers and consumers. Today, we stand with hardworking Americans looking for good-paying jobs. Today, we stand with American consumers who will see more of their hard-earned money go further at the gas pump.

Keystone helps secure our country's energy independence, lowers energy costs for every American, and supports jobs without raising taxes or adding to our debt.

It is time to pass this bill. I urge my colleagues to vote “yes.”

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

Again, I want to make this point about the impact of low oil prices on Keystone and on exploitation of tar sands. The price of oil has dropped precipitously in the past few months and is expected to stay in the \$65 to \$75 per barrel range for the foreseeable future. Just last month, the price of oil actually dipped below \$50 per barrel, and gas prices have fallen below \$2 per gallon in some areas. Obviously, this is good news for the American consumer but bad news for tar sands producers who are struggling to remain profitable in the face of rising production costs and limited transportation options.

In a scenario where tar sands are less profitable due to low oil prices and transportation constraints, the State Department concluded that the construction of Keystone will play a pivotal role in future tar sands development and increased carbon pollution that comes from it. So just last week, EPA made clear that low oil prices mean that the pipeline's impact on future tar sands production could be substantial, with significant implications for climate change.

Now, when I was at Rules, some of my colleagues on the Republican side said: Well, if you don't build the pipeline, this tar sands oil is going to be transported by rail or by some other means, and so what is the difference if we build Keystone?

Well, the bottom line is that it is very likely that, with low oil prices, there wouldn't be the investment in tar

sands. If tar sands had to be transported by means other than the pipeline, investment would not be there. Therefore, the argument is made, obviously, that without Keystone, you might not be exploiting these tar sands and you wouldn't increase the greenhouse gases and force the major change in climate that would result from it.

So again, the point that the EPA is making that with low oil prices, a decision to approve the pipeline could be a significant factor in increased tar sands production and increased greenhouse gas emissions, and the President and the Congress need to look at this development carefully and assess its impact.

One of the reasons—and there are others, like the impact of the pipeline if there was a spill on groundwater and other things. This is one of the reasons why the President has said that the decision of whether this is in the national interest still has to be weighed, and it shouldn't be dictated to by Congress and just deemed approved because the Canadian company or others think this is appropriate. This is something that the President needs to continue to review, as he has said. That is why he is vetoing the bill. And that is, again, Madam Speaker, why we are wasting our time today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY).

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Madam Speaker, on a variety of issues, from the Environmental Protection Agency's war on coal jobs in West Virginia to the designation of ANWR in Alaska as permanent wilderness, the President has used unilateral executive action to stifle domestic energy production. It is time for the President to stop pandering to radical environmentalists and do what is right for hardworking American families.

□ 1545

The business community, organized labor, partisan majorities in Congress, and a clear majority of the American people support construction of the Keystone XL pipeline.

The President's own State Department concluded that the project is in the best economic interest of our Nation and that the project would have no impact on carbon emissions and no negative impact on the environment.

Mr. President, enough is enough. It is time to create 42,000 jobs and reduce energy prices for hardworking families. Sign this bill into law. It is time to build the Keystone XL pipeline. I ask that you do this not only for the hardworking taxpayers I represent in West Virginia but for all Americans struggling in this economy.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I, again, yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, I listened to the previous speaker on the Republican side and I

don't understand how he can say that the President is trying to prevent domestic production. Domestic oil production is at a 29-year high. Whether it is oil or it is natural gas, we have never seen production of this magnitude.

Under this administration, there has been such an increase in both oil and natural gas production in comparison to any previous administration for as long as I have been here. To suggest otherwise boggles the mind, in my opinion.

I wanted to go back to another issue that we are concerned about in terms of the environment and why Keystone needs to continue to be reviewed by the President and not just be deemed approved, and that has to do, again, with oil spills and the impact on aquifers.

Again, our first priority, Madam Speaker, must be to ensure public safety. The proposed Keystone pipeline is a massive project that would carry tar sand sludge throughout the middle of America. Even supporters agree that it should not be built until we have some assurance that it will be safe.

Keystone poses real risks. Over the last few years, a litany of tragic failures have reinforced the need for strong pipeline safety standards.

In 2011, another ExxonMobil pipeline ruptured in Montana, spilling crude oil into the Yellowstone River. The oil was carried hundreds of miles down the river, threatening the livelihoods of ranchers.

In July 2010, a pipeline carrying tar sands oil ruptured near Marshall, Michigan. Over 800,000 gallons of oil spilled into the Talmadge Creek and then flowed into the Kalamazoo River. The cleanup will cost hundreds of millions of dollars. Because the diluted bitumen is heavier than water and sinks to the bottom of the river, it has proven harder to clean up than conventional crude oil.

TransCanada and its supporters have repeatedly assured the public and the Congress that we shouldn't worry about this pipeline carrying tar sand sludge through the middle of America and across the Ogallala Aquifer. They say it will be an ultra-safe state-of-the-art pipeline.

The problem, though, is that we have heard this before. TransCanada's first Keystone pipeline, which brings Canadian tar sands oil to refineries in Illinois and Oklahoma, shouldn't inspire confidence. This was a brand-new, supposedly state-of-the-art pipeline. It was predicted to spill no more than once every 7 years. But in its first year of operation, it reported 14 separate oil spills.

The largest spill occurred on May 7, 2011, when approximately 20,000 gallons of oil erupted from the pipeline in North Dakota. There was literally a 64-high geyser of oil. Amazingly, this spill was not detected by TransCanada but was reported by a local farmer.

In response to this spill and others, the pipeline safety agency issued a corrective action order temporarily shut-

ting down the original Keystone pipeline. The agency based this action on a finding that the continued operation of the pipeline without corrective action would be hazardous to life, property, and the environment.

With this track record, we need a thorough review of whether the standards necessary to safely transport tar sands oil are in place. The proposed route of this tar sands pipeline would cross the Ogallala Aquifer.

Millions of Americans depend on this aquifer for their drinking water and for their livelihoods. If there is an oil spill, the consequences would be devastating to the Americans who depend on this precious water resource.

Again, this is another reason why we shouldn't be approving this and deem this pipeline approved.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my soon-to-be-friend from New Jersey for bringing up the oil spill issue.

In my home State of Louisiana, we actually have hundreds of thousands of barrels of oil that are unaccounted for as a result of the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. We have tens of miles of shoreline that remain oiled as a result of an oil spill that happened over 4 years ago, and this administration is doing absolutely nothing to hold the responsible parties accountable for removing that oil.

To hide behind some of these issues, such as the threat of oil spills, is absolutely absurd when at the same time they are not doing anything to protect the environment and hold responsible parties accountable.

Secondly, there is nothing that this pipeline project is going to do to further threaten the environment. In fact, it is going to make it worse if we don't build it because the oil will be transported by barge, by rail, and other less safe means of transportation.

We saw recently where the EPA released a letter contrary to what the State Department's EIS found, stating that this was going to cause a greater impact to climate change. Whatever the reality is, this pipeline does nothing to address consumption of oil. It does nothing to increase consumption. It is an absurd approach.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. And lastly, Madam Speaker, I will just say that this President for years has embraced an all-of-the-above energy strategy, all-of-the-above. This pipeline fits that criteria—it is all of the above. Perhaps I misunderstood and they were talking geographically above. It is coming from Canada. It fits that one too.

Madam Speaker, this project needs to move forward. It has been delayed far

too long. All it is going to do by not building this project is cause us to rely upon Venezuela and other non-allies for energy to power this Nation's economy.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), the ranking member of the Energy and Power Subcommittee.

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, this is *deja vu* all over again, as for the umpteenth time the majority party is trying to jam the Keystone XL pipeline through this Congress despite the fact that President Obama has made it pretty clear to all who will listen that this bill is headed to a veto if it ever reaches his desk.

Madam Speaker, instead of going through regular order and the committee process and working on bipartisan legislation that would ultimately create hundreds of thousands of good-paying American jobs, such as building up our infrastructure, fixing our roads and bridges, and modernizing our energy grid, instead of looking at the interests, the real interests of the American people, and working to provide the American people much-needed jobs, my friends on the other side of the aisle have repeatedly spent valuable time, time that this Congress will never, ever see again, trying to grant a regulatory earmark to the TransCanada Corporation by short-circuiting the normal permitting process and forcing President Obama's hand.

This is not a jobs bill. Madam Speaker, we need a jobs bill. But where are the jobs in this bill? Every time we talk about jobs, every time jobs develop on the floor of this House, the Republicans all run to one place: that all we need is to build the Keystone XL pipeline and that will solve America's job problem. I beg to differ with my friends on the other side of the aisle.

The State Department—our State Department—consulted with TransCanada and found out that the construction of this pipeline would directly result in about 4,000 jobs in the early stages just to build the pipeline. These jobs, Madam Speaker, will last no more than 12 months—365 days of work provided to the American people. What kind of jobs bill are we trying to perpetrate on the American people?

In addition, Madam Speaker, by building the pipeline, 42,100 1-year jobs will be created indirectly across the United States.

After the Keystone XL pipeline is completed, operation, where the permanent jobs are, the real operation where the lasting jobs are, the jobs that will provide a future for American families—college education, mortgages to pay for their home, put dinner on the table—these jobs would only amount to about 35 permanent jobs in this Nation—35. A franchise burger joint on the corner will provide more permanent jobs than this whole Keystone XL pipeline is purported to do.

Let's put these figures into perspective.

In 2014, the U.S. economy created nearly 50,000 jobs per week—50,000 per week in 2014; 230,000 jobs per month. So even taking the most favorable estimates for all the indirect and direct jobs, the Keystone XL pipeline will produce fewer jobs than the economy is already creating on its own in just 7 days—in just one week.

Taking the lowest estimate for the 35 permanent jobs again, the Keystone XL pipeline will produce even fewer jobs, in all of its massiveness, in all of the hyperbole that comes from the other side, than the economy is already creating in just 1 hour. In the next hour, Mr. Speaker, the American economy will produce more jobs than the entire Keystone XL pipeline in all of its duration—in just the next hour.

This is not a jobs bill. Where are the priorities for the other side? Why are we wasting time on this?

Let me remind my friends on the other side, in just 2 weeks—just 2 weeks—the Homeland Security Department will run out of money, putting all of the American people, our entire Nation, at risk, in just 2 weeks.

Where are your priorities? Doesn't that make more sense than wasting our time on creating 35 jobs—35 permanent jobs? We are going to be out of this place at the end of the week. Where is the priority for American security? Where is the priority for us to spend our time? What are the priorities of the majority if we are going to waste our time?

Here we go again, valuable time. Homeland Security running out of money, folks being laid off, our borders are being compromised, terrorists are going to have or could have a field day because we have not funded Homeland Security.

□ 1600

Yet we are here, wasting valuable time. Let's use this time to fund the Department of Homeland Security, and let's get off some of this nonsense that makes no sense at all.

I cannot believe, Mr. Speaker, that the American people have sent us here to work on behalf of TransCanada and to ignore the Department of Homeland Security. I can't in my wildest imagination believe that they didn't even know, that they didn't even imagine, that they didn't even think that we are here with the Department of Homeland Security on one side and the Keystone XL on the other side. Go figure. Where are their priorities?

Mr. Speaker, this bill is unnecessary. This bill will be vetoed by President Obama, and it will be sent back here DOA. We have far more important work that we should be doing on behalf of the American people.

I urge all of my colleagues to turn down this unnecessary, ill-timed, ill-conceived notion that we should be spending our valuable time on the Keystone XL and ignoring the funding for the Department of Homeland Security.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my friend from Chicago

that all infrastructure jobs are temporary. Based on that argument, we shouldn't build roads, bridges, highways, or pipelines. All infrastructure jobs—construction jobs—are temporary. Second, I would like to remind my colleague that he voted against the appropriations bill to fund Homeland Security.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act.

It comes into my district, by the way. It comes into my district on the gulf coast of Texas. Over 6 years has passed since the permit was applied for. The iPad was not even introduced at that time. That is how long it has been. In contrast, this Congress is acting in less than 2 months to approve the most studied pipeline in the Nation's history. The President is creating jobs all right. It is called studying pipelines so you can deny the permit.

The State Department has concluded that this pipeline will be safe and environmentally sound. Indeed, that was the first amendment I got passed on the floor of this House in Lee Terry's bill—the State Department's own language.

The pipeline strengthens our relationship with an important ally, and it creates thousands of jobs for the American people.

The other side is saying some funny things:

They say that drilling and oil production is at a 29-year high. Great. Let's continue this process. Let's make it better. Let's make it longer. I didn't even think about that. You are right. Energy independence is right around the corner. You are onto something here, so let's continue that;

The other side says there is danger from oil spills. The truth is that the pipeline industry has a 99 percent safety rating. You cannot say that about trucking. You cannot say that about rail. You cannot say that about barge;

They say this is the umpteenth time the Republicans have passed this bill. On November 4, as I recall, the Americans elected some umpteen new Republicans. I think they are sending a message that they want energy independence, that they want a change. They understand that the Keystone Pipeline means energy independence.

Yes, this House will pass this bill. We will send it to the President. A little over a year ago, the President said, if Congress wouldn't act, he had a phone and a pen, and he would. Now Congress is acting, and he is saying: I have got a pen, and I am going to veto.

Which way is it, Mr. President? You can't have it both ways.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. YODER). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Maybe, if the people on the other side of the aisle don't vote for this bill, we will get it passed, and the President will veto it. Then maybe Americans will elect some umpteen more Republicans.

It is time to move this bill and get it done.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania has 3½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I want to thank our ranking member for allowing me to have 2 minutes to talk about how I support the Keystone pipeline. We have a little diversity on our side.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1, the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act.

I represent a refinery and chemical plant community in Houston, east Harris County, Texas. We have five refineries in my area alone, which would use that Keystone crude oil. In fact, Congressman WEBER has the eastern leg of it, and I have the western leg that actually stops in our district. We have two, big, old, huge tanks in Channelview, Texas, which are ready to get that oil and distribute it to our refineries. We have refineries, literally, from Corpus Christi over to Pascagoula in the Gulf of Mexico, on the gulf coast, that could use that crude oil. They are already using heavier crude from other parts of the world.

It has taken 6 years to get this permit for the pipeline's development. This is the longest study of any cross-border pipeline that I have ever seen. Unfortunately, because of the backlog, we have 11 other cross-border projects that have not moved through the process. Some of these are just a simple name change, and that is the problem. The Presidential permitting process has broken down. That is why Congress needs to act. The State Department has studied the project four different times. Each time, they have come back and have said that the environmental and climate impacts would be negligible.

Let me talk about the jobs issue.

We will have a year of high-paid pipefitters, teamsters, laborers, electrical workers—you name it. Those are great jobs, and they are high paying for a year. Construction jobs are temporary. Then they will go on to another job, and, frankly, in Texas, we have no shortage of need for pipelines even though I have never not lived on a pipeline easement in Houston, Texas.

The bill is not as perfect as I would like, but we need to send this bill to the President—it got out of the Senate—and give the President a chance to

do it. We need cross-border pipelines whether it is Canada to the United States, Texas to Mexico, or the United States to Mexico, or back.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1, the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act. I represent a refinery/chemical plants. The refineries on the Gulf Coast will use the crude oil.

I rise in support of this bill because I support North American energy development.

The pipeline has been in development and waiting for approval for six years. This is the longest study of any cross-border pipeline that I have ever seen.

Unfortunately, because of this backlog, there are now 11 other cross-border projects that have not moved through the process.

Some of these projects are as simple as a name change.

The Presidential Permitting Process has become nothing more than a political game.

Opponents of domestic infrastructure projects use the process to delay projects endlessly in an attempt to raise money under the guise of environmental protection.

The State Department has studied this project four different times.

Each time, the Department reported back that the environmental and climate impacts would be negligible.

However, opponents of the project do not like that answer so they continue their attack until the project is deferred.

Opponents of the project now decry that because oil prices are low, more studies should be conducted.

Opponents cite low oil prices as a reason the federal government shouldn't approve the project.

Last time I checked, the federal government wasn't involved in private business decisions.

If oil prices remain low, the market will dictate which projects remain viable and which do not.

The federal government has one job to do and should complete its work in a timely fashion.

Further, opponents claim that Keystone XL will only result in 35 permanent jobs.

What they fail to address is that Keystone XL, along with the majority of other cross-border facilities, will create thousands of construction jobs.

Those who oppose the project say, those are only temporary jobs.

Well, to my friends who oppose the project, construction jobs by their very nature are temporary jobs.

But I can tell you this, the pipefitters, operating engineers, electrical and Teamster laborers that work on their segment of the pipeline are darn happy to have that job.

That is a large paycheck to help support his or her family.

I continue to urge support for the Keystone XL pipeline.

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

Once again, I ask my colleagues to support this bill, this pipeline, that is said to have been the most studied and will be the safest pipeline. It will help out one of our great allies, and it will help us keep energy costs down in this country. It will create over 40,000 infrastructure jobs. Yes, they are temporary, but as we all know, those jobs will go to helping the families of the

construction workers. They will move on to other jobs, and these will also be a spinoff to other jobs to help keep this pipeline viable for years to come.

Let me finish with a final quote from a well-known American—an American respected by the other side of the aisle, an American trusted by the other side of the aisle, an American listened to by the other side of the aisle. He says:

The pipeline increases the diversity of available supplies among the United States' worldwide crude oil sources in a time of considerable political tension in other major oil producing countries and regions; it shortens the transportation pathway for crude oil supplies; and it increases crude oil supplies from a major non-Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries producer. Canada is a stable and reliable ally and trading partner of the United States with which we have free trade agreements which augment the security of this energy supply.

The approval of the permit sends a positive economic signal, in a difficult economic period, about the future reliability and availability of a portion of the United States' energy imports, and in the immediate term, this shovel-ready project will provide construction jobs for workers in the United States.

That American, ladies and gentlemen, is President Barack Obama. He said that in 2009, but he was talking about the Enbridge Alberta Clipper. I don't know what has changed, but this quote could go right towards this pipeline. It does all of the same things, and it has all of the positive impact that that pipeline has. I urge my colleagues to support this bill, to send it to the President, and to ask the President to reconsider his veto threat.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) control the remainder of my time.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Here we are, once again, to debate legislation on the Keystone XL pipeline. For the past 6 years, this project has been thoroughly vetted by the Congress and the administration. There is no question in my mind that the Keystone XL is in the national interest, so let's look again at the facts:

It is a jobs project. The President's own State Department has confirmed that Keystone is going to support 42,000 jobs across the country;

Keystone is going to be safe. Yes, it is. Pipelines remain one of the very safest and most efficient ways to transport energy, and Keystone is going to rank at the top of the class when it comes to safety. The pipeline, in fact, is going to incorporate some 59 additional safety standards proposed by

PHMSA, and it will adhere to the rigorous new pipeline safety standards on which I worked with John Dingell to get signed into law in the last Congress;

Keystone is better for the environment. Yes, it is. We know that Canada is going to continue to develop its rich oil sands regardless of whether we build the pipeline. If we don't build it, that oil is going to continue to get to the marketplace through other, more carbon-intensive means;

Keystone is going to enhance our energy security and help energy prices stay stable and affordable. We know this respite from high gas prices won't last forever, and prices have already begun to tick back up. By bringing more North American energy to the market, the pipeline can help protect us against future price spikes and overseas disruptions. We want as much certainty in the marketplace as we can.

The President said last week that, again, another reason he is against this is that gas prices are low. Yesterday's Wall Street Journal headline above the fold reads: "Oil-Price Rebound Predicted." That is right. They are going to go up. Americans understand supply and demand. The Keystone pipeline is very positive for us in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the RECORD a letter that we received just an hour or so ago from the Canadian Embassy.

CANADIAN EMBASSY,
February 10, 2015.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY, I was quite disappointed to read the comments from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) with respect to the Keystone XL (KXL) application.

The EPA derives its greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) calculations from a study using data from 2005, two years before iPhones existed, completely neglecting the innovation and emissions reductions that have since occurred in the oil sands.

Just as communication technology has advanced in the last ten years, so too has scientific analysis of the oil sands. There are more recent credible scientific numbers on oil sands emissions reductions. Canadian government data show that per barrel emissions have fallen 28% from 1990 to 2012. In 2014, both IHS-CERA (Dan Yergin's consultancy) and the California Air Resources Board data showed that average oil sands GHG emissions are in the same range as Venezuelan and Californian heavy oil and lower than several types of Venezuelan and Californian crudes. Furthermore, IHS-CERA has determined that 45% of the crude oils consumed in the United States are within the same GHG intensity range as those of the oil sands.

The EPA selected the highest GHG value among four studies considered by the State Department, and then assumed that KXL flows at capacity over fifty years, that KXL transports only oil sands crude, and most egregiously that the only crude displaced is Saudi light. By contrast, the State Department reported oil sands incremental emissions as a range from 1.3 to 27.4 megatonnes annually. The lower figure compared oil sands to Venezuelan and Mexican heavy crudes that would be displaced. The higher figure compared oil sands to Saudi light crude, an international benchmark, which

your Department noted, is not a direct competitor for heavy crude oil refineries. Clearly, the correct comparison is to the lower figure, not the higher figure.

In its April 22nd, 2013 comments on the same data, the EPA calculated an oil sands incremental GHG value some 46% lower than it is now claiming, and made no effort to explain why its calculation has now increased by 46%.

The EPA chose to ignore that the oil sands are produced in the only jurisdiction supplying oil to the United States that has imposed a carbon fee which is used to fund clean energy technologies.

The EPA questions the State Department's finding that, absent KXL, incremental volumes of Canadian oil will move to the U.S. Gulf Coast by rail. The EPA chose rather conveniently not to examine data for the last two years. Since the KXL application was first delayed in November 2011, crude oil by rail exports from Canada to the U.S. have jumped ten-fold, and continue to expand.

The EPA neither discusses nor disputes the State Department's findings that rail represents 28-42% higher GHG emissions than KXL.

The EPA neither discusses nor disputes the State Department's findings on safety. The State Department originally reported that KXL would represent one injury and no fatalities annually, as compared to 49 injuries and six fatalities for rail, then revised the rail figures from 49 to 189 injuries, and from six to 28 fatalities.

The EPA chose to ignore that Canada, an ally, has committed to an absolute reduction in our GHG emissions. No other major oil supplier to the United States can make this statement. In 2012, Canada's GHG emissions were down 5.1%, with more work ahead of us.

One is left with the conclusion that there has been significant distortion and omission to arrive at the EPA's conclusions.

There is no significant difference between the GHG emissions from oil sands crude oil and from other heavy crude oils that would be displaced at the U.S. Gulf Coast. As compared to rail, KXL represents lower GHG emissions, as well as lower environmental and public safety risks.

We would be pleased to discuss the gap between the EPA comments and the scientific analysis of the State Department.

Thank you for the opportunity to raise this issue with you.

Sincerely,

GARY DOER,
Ambassador.

Mr. UPTON. In the letter from the Ambassador of Canada, he makes a number of good points, but he concludes by saying this:

"There is no significant difference between the GHG emissions from oil sands crude oil and from other heavy crude oils that would be displaced at the U.S. Gulf Coast. As compared to rail, KXL represents lower GHG emissions, as well as lower environmental and public safety risks."

The evidence is in. The case ought to be closed. There is no good reason for President Obama not to join with Republicans and Democrats to say, yes, it is time to build.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, how much time is now on the Republican side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 13½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Jersey has 2 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the sponsor of the House-passed bill.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I spent several minutes articulating the details of the benefits of this bill. I am grateful to Senator HOEVEN, my Senator from North Dakota, for introducing it in the Senate.

I want to answer just a couple of the questions because I think there are legitimate concerns being raised by my friends on the other side.

With regard to the price of oil being about \$50 and being low and that it, therefore, somehow negates the need for the pipeline, there are two things I would say. 2,336 days ago, the price of oil was approaching \$50, and Trans-Canada still applied for the pipeline. In fact, at low prices, the cost of transportation is an even more important consideration, and oil transported by rail costs about \$10 a barrel more than it does by pipeline. The pipeline is even more important in this environment.

□ 1615

With regard to the pump station spill in North Dakota, on the original pipeline, I know it well. I sited that line. The good news was that everything worked. The alarms went off. The bells shut down. The farmer even called the company. There was a spill. It was corrected. There was no negative environmental impact.

With regard to the types of jobs, I saw them firsthand. These are permanent jobs. Yes, they are temporary on that particular job, but 88 percent of the steel used in the Keystone XL pipeline has been sourced from North Carolina. That is 88 percent.

I want to finish by reading this quote from Danny Hendrix. Danny says this with regard to what kind of jobs will be created by the XL:

They've got health care for another year. They've got a pension credit for when they retire. It means that those families have got health care, dental care—so it means a lot. It means they can make a house payment. It means they can send their kids to college.

Danny Hendrix is a business manager for Pipeliners Local 798 in Tulsa, Oklahoma.

These are real jobs, and to belittle them in any way, Mr. Speaker, to degrade them in any way, is intellectually dishonest and disrespectful.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Keystone XL pipeline. It is going to create 42,000 jobs. By the way, those jobs that you are talking about that will be part-time, I guarantee you the Department of Labor will include them in their numbers when they talk about how great we are becoming.

This is the most federally reviewed pipeline in U.S. history—it is 6 years—

and the thing about this that is most impressive is it doesn't cost the American taxpayer one single penny. It is privately funded. And I would guarantee you that along that pipeline, as it is constructed, all those communities are going to benefit from the fact they have people working there, staying in their hotels, buying their food, enhancing their local economy.

How many more times do we have to talk about this? This is not a Republican issue, by the way. This is an American issue. A majority of the American people support this, and Democrats and Republicans in both the House and the Senate. It is bipartisan and bicameral. My goodness, how rare is that? Business groups and labor unions. You know what? Even President Bill Clinton and President Bush agree this is something that needs to be done.

News outlets from Bloomberg to The Washington Post to USA Today all say: Build it.

USA Today gets it right. They say:

On the merits, the Obama administration should long ago have said yes . . . but the White House seems to have been paralyzed by its fear of angering our ally Canada if it says no or infuriating Democratic environmentalists if it says yes . . . It is long past time to say yes.

President Obama must say "yes" to new jobs, he must say "yes" to bipartisanship, he must say "yes" to good government, he must say "yes" to America, and he must say "yes" to the Keystone pipeline. It is long past due, my friends.

Let's move American forward, let's become energy self-sustaining, and let's be the leader in the world when it comes to energy. This debate is way past time, and the thought that we shouldn't do it now because the oil market is down, my goodness, nothing could be further from the truth.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I am having kind of a *deja vu* moment and a holy cow moment both at the same time. It is *deja vu* because we already passed a Homeland Security funding bill. So that bill has shifted to the Senate. Somebody apparently didn't get that memo. I am having this holy cow moment because I can't believe I am standing up here in support of the Senate-passed Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act.

Mr. Speaker, the broad support for building the Keystone XL pipeline is truly remarkable. This bill is bipartisan. It is bicameral. In fact, it commanded a supermajority in the Senate. A majority of the American people want to see the pipeline constructed. The pipeline has been studied and studied and studied again, in fact, way up to the State Department, which approved the pipeline more than a year ago.

This kind of support for a piece of legislation is a rarity in Washington. It

doesn't get any better than this. And that is because the pipeline has unquestionable merit. It directly creates jobs. It is a shot in the arm for our energy economy. It will make America more energy secure, an aspiration of Presidents and Congresses for decades. And it is now within our grasp if we choose to seize it. Why our President would choose to veto this bill is beyond rational explanation. Its economic benefits could not be more evident.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope the President reconsiders his threat to veto this so American workers can finally start to construct and reap the benefits for the American people.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of approving the Keystone XL pipeline. The pipeline is widely supported by Americans and by a bipartisan majority in this House and in the Senate.

In the more than 6 years since the application to build the pipeline, the President has refused to authorize it, citing two reasons. Number one, environmental challenges. But, Mr. Speaker, the pipeline has undergone numerous environmental assessments, and the U.S. State Department's Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement confirms the minimal impact of the pipeline on the environment.

Number two, legal challenges. But, Mr. Speaker, on January 9, 2015, the Nebraska Supreme Court approved the pathway of the pipeline.

The President has no more excuses to deny the completion of the Keystone XL, and I urge him to rescind his veto threat of this critical energy and infrastructure bill.

Americans want a true all-of-the-above energy policy that boosts our goal of North American energy independence, benefits consumers, creates jobs, protects our environment, and preserves our natural resources.

This bill accomplishes all of those goals. However, Mr. Speaker, the President continues to block this essential energy and infrastructure project and the jobs it would provide to our hardworking American families.

Further, due to the bureaucratic delays of the past 6 years, this project is now costing 50 percent more than its original announcement.

In my district alone, the pipeline has supported over 600 jobs at Welspun Tubular, headquartered in Little Rock, Arkansas, where 700 miles of this pipe are stacked up at the rail head ready to put in the ground.

Mr. Speaker, if approved, this project will provide thousands more jobs and over \$3.4 billion for our Nation's economy. The President is out of excuses. It is time to approve this project.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman said this is the time to pass it.

It is not the time to pass it. The time to pass it is after all the reports and studies are in. The State Department hasn't completed its study.

It is kind of like what we are doing in this Congress. We are not going by our regular procedures. We are not having bills in committee and opportunities for amendments on the floor because we bring things up here to make it the political issue du jour.

This is not the time for the bill, just like it is not the time for the Prime Minister to come and speak from that well. It should be after his election and after the negotiations with Iran are over. This should be after the State Department has told us what their opinion is, and then let the President make his decision.

We should go back to regular order. I hope the House will return to regular order.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act.

I think on both sides all we talk about is creating jobs. For 6 years, this project has been studied. We hear that over and over again. Every environmental report has been favorable. In fact, the President's own State Department says that the construction of this pipeline will create tens of thousands of jobs.

At a time when millions of Americans are struggling, this is a project that is ready to go. As we said, we have pipeline stacked up and ready to put in the ground.

The Keystone pipeline is not just important to growing our economy. This project is critical to securing North American energy independence and reducing our dependence on foreign oil.

Congress has taken action with bipartisan support, and finally we will put this priority on the President's desk. I urge the President to listen to the American people who support this project and reconsider his threat to veto this critical legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding time and the work you have done on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1 to approve the Keystone XL pipeline after what has turned out to be an unacceptable 6-year delay by the Obama administration.

Many have stated that this bill is about creating jobs. And guess what? They are right. The pipeline would create over 40,000 jobs without a dime of taxpayer funding, helping to pull eager American workers out of the unemployment line.

Approval of the pipeline would also bring down energy costs here at home, lifting a huge burden on hardworking families, small businesses, and farmers.

Moreover, clearing the construction of the Keystone pipeline puts us closer to North American energy independence to reduce our dependence on oil from foreign sources that are all too often at odds with America's interests and our national security.

So the bill we debate today is about jobs. It is about making energy more affordable. But it is also about making our country safer. This bill will help us stop funding both sides of the war on terror.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that we have any further speakers. I am willing to close, if the gentleman goes first.

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

The bill grants a regulatory earmark to TransCanada Corporation, effectively exempting TransCanada's Keystone tar sands pipeline from all Federal permitting requirements, including requirements that apply to every other construction project in the country.

Keystone will increase carbon pollution and threaten critical water resources. Tar sands are a dirty, high-polluting fuel. On a lifecycle basis, tar sands crude produces up to 40 percent more carbon pollution than conventional oil. And even with the current proposed route, leaks from the highly corrosive crude in the pipeline would still threaten the aquifer, a critical resource for drinking water and irrigation.

Mr. Speaker, we don't need this dirty oil. Since Keystone was proposed, we have cut U.S. oil demand. We have dramatically boosted less-polluting U.S. oil production. In fact, much of the tar sands oil will not go to America but will go through America and be exported overseas. This leaves the United States with all the risk and no reward.

I would urge my colleagues once again to vote "no" on this legislation. It is not good for this country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is not new science. We have got existing oil and gas pipelines that cross the border. We have got a million miles of pipeline or so within the United States. Safety standards, rightly so, are a lot higher than they used to be, and we will continue to oversee this.

Canada is our friend. We get oil and gas from Canada today. We have expanded many of our refineries by billions of dollars trying to get prepared for new pipeline commodities coming from the north.

It is time to build this. It has been 6 years. I remember well Secretary of

State Hillary Clinton a number of years ago saying that they would be ready before the end of that year to complete their studies to get this thing done. Well, 6 years has now come, and it is time for us to act.

The Nebraska Supreme Court has ruled the way that they did in support of this. We know that the carbon footprint is less by putting it in a pipeline, and we know that it is safer than other means of transportation.

Again, we know that Canada is going to sell this oil somewhere. And if they don't get it in a pipeline here to the U.S., that pipeline is going to go 2,000 miles to the east and get on a boat or a barge—a higher carbon footprint. Isn't it better to do it here, to build it, put it in a pipeline here in the U.S.?

□ 1630

This bill, we were accepting the Senate bill. Yes, they finally passed this bill. Let's pass this bill this afternoon. Let's send it to the President. Let's hope that he might reconsider a proposed veto on this bill, and let's deal with the issue, and let's get it done.

There is a reason why better than 65 percent of Americans support this. They understand it. They understand supply and demand. We want gas prices to stay stable. We know that this oil that we get from Canada will displace oil coming either from the Middle East or from Venezuela. Why is that not a good thing?

Please vote "yes."

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 100, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

MOTION TO COMMIT

Mrs. CAPPES. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to commit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. CAPPES. Yes, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to commit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Capps moves to commit the bill S. 1 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

After section 2, insert the following (and redesignate subsequent sections accordingly):

SEC. 3. REQUIREMENT THAT TRANSCANADA KEYSTONE PIPELINE, L.P. PAY FOR ANY OIL SPILL CLEANUP ON AMERICAN SOIL.

In the approval process authorized under section 2, TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P. shall certify to the President that diluted bitumen and other materials derived from tar sands or oil sands that are transported through the Keystone XL pipeline will be treated as crude oil for the purposes of determining contributions that fund the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.

Mr. UPTON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to commit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Mrs. CAPPES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer the final amendment to this bill.

Passage of this amendment will not prevent passage of the underlying bill. If it is adopted, my amendment will simply be incorporated into the bill, and the bill would be immediately voted upon.

Mr. Speaker, no matter if you support or oppose Keystone XL, we can all agree that extracting and transporting oil has some serious risks. It only takes one small crack, one small mistake, to cause a major oil spill and a catastrophe, irreparable damage to the surrounding communities and to the environment.

History has shown us that there is simply no such thing as a spillproof well or pipeline. Accidents happen, and they will continue to happen, regardless of what we are told by the oil companies building and maintaining the pipelines.

In fact, accidents have already happened 14 times on the existing section of the Keystone pipeline, and these oil spills don't just devastate the surrounding environment. They harm lives and livelihoods as well.

In 1969, my home district in California experienced one of the worst oil spills in American history. I saw, firsthand, the devastating damage to our local economy, to human health, to property, to natural resources. We have sadly seen this happen far too many times since then in communities all around this country.

The Deepwater Horizon disaster cost 11 lives, billions of dollars in economic damages, and untold devastation to the delicate ecosystem of the gulf. That very same year, we saw as well a terrible spill in Kalamazoo, Michigan. This spill was particularly noteworthy because it involved tar sands oil, which is the same type of oil that would flow through the Keystone pipeline.

Tar sands oil is much harder to clean up than standard crude, which is one of the reasons the spill took nearly \$1 billion and several years to clean up.

Mr. Speaker, despite numerous assurances that Keystone XL will be safer and that the risk of a spill will be minimal, safer simply does not equal safe. That is why we have the oil spill liability trust fund, to ensure that the oil companies that create these messes will also pay for them to clean them up.

This trust fund is financed by an 8 cents per-barrel fee on crude oil and petroleum products, but TransCanada is currently not even required to contribute to the trust fund for Keystone

because tar sands oil is not considered crude oil for purposes of this program—a loophole, if I have ever heard of one.

If there is a spill, taxpayers and local communities, not those responsible, could be stuck paying for this cleanup. That is why I am offering this straight-forward amendment.

My amendment would simply require TransCanada to certify that it will pay the same per-barrel fee for its tar sands oil as it does for its regular crude. It would ensure that TransCanada—and not taxpayers—pay to clean up its own mess in the event of a spill.

I have offered this amendment several times before, both in committee and here on the floor, so the majority should be quite familiar with this issue. In fact, the majority has assured us on several occasions that they would work with us, on Ways and Means Committee as well, to resolve this issue; yet the majority has failed to even propose a meaningful solution, let alone bring one to the floor for a vote.

Mr. Speaker, this is a straight-forward issue that should have bipartisan support. We taxpayers, if we are going to bear 100 percent of the risk of an oil spill from this Keystone pipeline, the least we can do is to ensure that those that are responsible for it also pay to clean it up.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment, to protect American taxpayers, and hold oil companies accountable.

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I might just start off by asking my dear friend from California a quick question: If this motion was adopted, would she be voting for the bill? Yes or no.

I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. CAPPs. As I said in my opening remarks, I would not, but as we know, the bill would still pass.

Mr. UPTON. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentlelady's interest on this, and I share her concern.

I would note, and I know that I would also speak for my colleague, Chairman SHUSTER, as we did write then-chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Dave Camp, back in 2012, May 21, I sent a letter to the Ways and Means chair encouraging that this exemption be—loophole—be fixed.

As you know, meaningful tax reform did not emerge from the last Congress. I remain absolutely committed to resolving this, as I know BILL SHUSTER has said so on the RECORD.

Besides that though, it has been years that we have been debating this,

and we finally have a bill out of the Senate. They took a whole month on the other side. They considered lots of amendments. They adopted three. We are accepting those three amendments when this bill passes today, as we did not go to conference.

As we know, this is a jurisdictional issue, that neither our committee nor Transportation has jurisdiction over tax issues. That is why we were not able to include that provision here, and that is, frankly, why the Senate was not able to adopt it on the Senate side either, because it would have been a blue slip issue.

We view this on our side as a procedural issue. We don't want to send it back to the Senate. Who knows when we are going to get it back after the last month that they had.

I would urge my colleagues on our side to vote "no" on this procedural vote. To the folks on your side that are voting, just know that we remain committed to closing this loophole.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to commit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to commit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to commit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered; and the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 431.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 181, nays 241, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 74]

YEAS—181

Adams	Connolly	Garamendi
Aguilar	Conyers	Graham
Ashford	Cooper	Grayson
Bass	Courtney	Green, Al
Beatty	Crowley	Green, Gene
Becerra	Cuellar	Grijalva
Bera	Cummings	Gutiérrez
Beyer	Davis (CA)	Hahn
Bishop (GA)	Davis, Danny	Hastings
Blumenauer	DeFazio	Heck (WA)
Bonamici	DeGette	Higgins
Boyle (PA)	Delaney	Himes
Brady (PA)	DeLauro	Hinojosa
Brown (FL)	DelBene	Honda
Brownley (CA)	DeSaunier	Huffman
Bustos	Dingell	Israel
Butterfield	Doggett	Jackson Lee
Capps	Doyle (PA)	Jeffries
Capuano	Duncan (TN)	Johnson (GA)
Cárdenas	Edwards	Johnson, E. B.
Carney	Ellison	Jones
Carson (IN)	Engel	Keating
Castor (FL)	Eshoo	Kelly (IL)
Castro (TX)	Esty	Kennedy
Chu (CA)	Farr	Kildee
Ciulline	Fattah	Kilmer
Clark (MA)	Poster	Kind
Clarke (NY)	Frankel (FL)	Kirkpatrick
Clay	Fudge	Kuster
Cleaver	Gabbard	Langevin
Clyburn	Gallego	Larsen (WA)
Cohen		Larson (CT)

Lawrence	Nolan	Sewell (AL)
Levin	Norcross	Sherman
Lewis	O'Rourke	Sinema
Lieu (CA)	Pallone	Sires
Lipinski	Pascarell	Slaughter
Loeb sack	Payne	Smith (WA)
Lofgren	Pelosi	Speier
Lowenthal	Perlmutter	Swalwell (CA)
Lowe y	Peters	Takai
Lujan Grisham (NM)	Peterson	Takano
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Pingree	Thompson (CA)
Lynch	Pocan	Thompson (MS)
Maloney, Carolyn	Polis	Titus
Maloney, Sean	Price (NC)	Tonko
Matsui	Quigley	Torres
McCullum	Rangel	Tsongas
McDermott	Rice (NY)	Van Hollen
McGovern	Richmond	Vargas
McNerney	Roybal-Allard	Veasey
Meeks	Ruppersberger	Vela
Meng	Rush	Velázquez
Moore	Ryan (OH)	Visclosky
Moulton	Sánchez, Linda T.	Walz
Murphy (FL)	Sarbanes	Wasserman Schultz
Nadler	Schakowsky	Waters, Maxine
Napolitano	Schiff	Watson Coleman
Neal	Schrader	Welch
	Scott (VA)	Wilson (FL)
	Serrano	Yarmuth

NAYS—241

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

Simpson	Turner	Whitfield	Joyce	Nolan	Sewell (AL)	Thompson (CA)	Van Hollen	Waters, Maxine
Smith (MO)	Upton	Williams	Katko	Norcross	Shimkus	Thompson (MS)	Vargas	Watson Coleman
Smith (NE)	Valadao	Wilson (SC)	Kelly (PA)	Nugent	Shuster	Titus	Velázquez	Welch
Smith (NJ)	Wagner	Wittman	King (IA)	Nunes	Simpson	Tonko	Vislosky	Wilson (FL)
Smith (TX)	Walberg	Womack	King (NY)	Olson	Sires	Torres	Wasserman	Yarmuth
Stefanik	Walden	Woodall	Kinzinger (IL)	Palazzo	Smith (MO)	Tsongas	Schultz	
Stewart	Walker	Yoder	Kline	Palmer	Smith (NE)			
Stivers	Walorski	Yoho	Knight	Paulsen	Smith (NJ)			
Stutzman	Walters, Mimi	Young (AK)	Labrador	Pearce	Smith (TX)			
Thompson (PA)	Weber (TX)	Young (IA)	LaMalfa	Perry	Stefanik	Cartwright	Hoyer	Ruiz
Thornberry	Webster (FL)	Young (IN)	Lamborn	Peterson	Stewart	Doggett	Kaptur	Sanchez, Loretta
Tiberi	Wenstrup	Zeldin	Lance	Pittenger	Stivers	Duckworth	Lee	
Tipton	Westerman	Zinke	Latta	Pitts	Stutzman	Fitzpatrick	Roe (TN)	
Trott	Westmoreland		Lipinski	Poe (TX)	Thompson (PA)			

NOT VOTING—10

Cartwright	Kaptur	Sanchez, Loretta
Duckworth	Lee	Scott, David
Fitzpatrick	Roe (TN)	
Hoyer	Ruiz	

□ 1704

Messrs. FINCHER, NEUGEBAUER, and MARCHANT changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. JONES, CICILLINE, POLIS, and SWALWELL of California changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to commit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 270, nays 152, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

YEAS—270

Abraham	Collins (NY)	Gosar
Aderholt	Comstock	Gowdy
Allen	Conaway	Graham
Amodei	Cook	Granger
Ashford	Cooper	Graves (GA)
Babin	Costa	Graves (LA)
Barletta	Costello (PA)	Graves (MO)
Barr	Cramer	Green, Al
Barton	Crawford	Green, Gene
Benishek	Crenshaw	Griffith
Bilirakis	Cuellar	Grothman
Bishop (GA)	Culberson	Guinta
Bishop (MI)	Curbelo (FL)	Guthrie
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Rodney	Hanna
Black	Denham	Hardy
Blackburn	Dent	Harper
Blum	DeSantis	Harris
Bost	DesJarlais	Hartzler
Boustany	Diaz-Balart	Heck (NV)
Brady (PA)	Dold	Hensarling
Brady (TX)	Doyle (PA)	Herrera Beutler
Brat	Duffy	Hice (GA)
Bridenstine	Duncan (SC)	Hill
Brooks (AL)	Duncan (TN)	Hinojosa
Brooks (IN)	Ellmers	Holding
Buchanan	Emmer	Hudson
Buck	Farenthold	Huelskamp
Bucshon	Fincher	Huizenga (MI)
Burgess	Fleischmann	Hultgren
Bustos	Fleming	Hunter
Byrne	Flores	Hurd (TX)
Calvert	Forbes	Hurt (VA)
Carter (GA)	Fortenberry	Issa
Carter (TX)	Fox	Jackson Lee
Chabot	Franks (AZ)	Jenkins (KS)
Chaffetz	Frelinghuysen	Jenkins (WV)
Clawson (FL)	Garrett	Johnson (OH)
Clyburn	Gibbs	Johnson, Sam
Coffman	Gibson	Jolly
Cole	Gohmert	Jones
Collins (GA)	Goodlatte	Jordan

Adams	Esty	Maloney
Agular	Farr	Carolyn
Amash	Fattah	Matsui
Bass	Foster	McCollum
Beatty	Frankel (FL)	McDermott
Becerra	Fudge	McGovern
Bera	Gabbard	McNerney
Beyer	Gallego	Meeks
Blumenauer	Garamendi	Meng
Bonamici	Grayson	Moore
Boyle (PA)	Grijalva	Moulton
Brown (FL)	Gutiérrez	Nadler
Brownley (CA)	Hahn	Napolitano
Butterfield	Hastings	Neal
Capps	Heck (WA)	O'Rourke
Capuano	Higgins	Pallone
Cárdenas	Himes	Pascrell
Carney	Honda	Payne
Carson (IN)	Huffman	Pelosi
Castor (FL)	Israel	Perlmutter
Castro (TX)	Jeffries	Peters
Chu (CA)	Johnson (GA)	Pingree
Ciulline	Johnson, E. B.	Pocan
Clark (MA)	Keating	Polis
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Price (NC)
Clay	Kildee	Quigley
Cleaver	Kennedy	Rangel
Cohen	Kilmer	Rice (NY)
Connolly	Kirkpatrick	Roybal-Allard
Conyers	Kuster	Ruppersberger
Courtney	Langevin	Rush
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda
Davis (CA)	Lawrence	T.
Davis, Danny	Levin	Sarbanes
DeFazio	Lewis	Schakowsky
DeGette	Lieu (CA)	Schiff
Delaney	Lofgren	Scott (VA)
DeLauro	Lowenthal	Serrano
DelBene	Lowe	Sherman
DeSaulnier	Lujan Grisham	Sinema
Deutch	Edwards	Slaughter
Dingell	Engel	Smith (WA)
Edwards	Eshoo	Speier
Elison		Swalwell (CA)
Lujan, Ben Ray		Takai
(NM)		Takano
Lynch		

NAYS—152

Adams	Esty	Maloney
Agular	Farr	Carolyn
Amash	Fattah	Matsui
Bass	Foster	McCollum
Beatty	Frankel (FL)	McDermott
Becerra	Fudge	McGovern
Bera	Gabbard	McNerney
Beyer	Gallego	Meeks
Blumenauer	Garamendi	Meng
Bonamici	Grayson	Moore
Boyle (PA)	Grijalva	Moulton
Brown (FL)	Gutiérrez	Nadler
Brownley (CA)	Hahn	Napolitano
Butterfield	Hastings	Neal
Capps	Heck (WA)	O'Rourke
Capuano	Higgins	Pallone
Cárdenas	Himes	Pascrell
Carney	Honda	Payne
Carson (IN)	Huffman	Pelosi
Castor (FL)	Israel	Perlmutter
Castro (TX)	Jeffries	Peters
Chu (CA)	Johnson (GA)	Pingree
Ciulline	Johnson, E. B.	Pocan
Clark (MA)	Keating	Polis
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Price (NC)
Clay	Kildee	Quigley
Cleaver	Kennedy	Rangel
Cohen	Kilmer	Rice (NY)
Connolly	Kirkpatrick	Roybal-Allard
Conyers	Kuster	Ruppersberger
Courtney	Langevin	Rush
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda
Davis (CA)	Lawrence	T.
Davis, Danny	Levin	Sarbanes
DeFazio	Lewis	Schakowsky
DeGette	Lieu (CA)	Schiff
Delaney	Lofgren	Scott (VA)
DeLauro	Lowenthal	Serrano
DelBene	Lowe	Sherman
DeSaulnier	Lujan Grisham	Sinema
Deutch	Edwards	Slaughter
Dingell	Engel	Smith (WA)
Edwards	Eshoo	Speier
Elison		Swalwell (CA)
Lujan, Ben Ray		Takai
(NM)		Takano
Lynch		

NOT VOTING—10

Cartwright	Hoyer	Ruiz
Doggett	Kaptur	Sanchez, Loretta
Duckworth	Lee	
Fitzpatrick	Roe (TN)	

□ 1713

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AWARDING CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO THE FOOT SOLDIERS WHO PARTICIPATED IN BLOODY SUNDAY, TURNAROUND TUESDAY, OR THE FINAL SELMA TO MONTGOMERY VOTING RIGHTS MARCH IN MARCH OF 1965

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 431) to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Foot Soldiers who participated in Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, or the final Selma to Montgomery Voting Rights March in March of 1965, which served as a catalyst for the Voting Rights Act of 1965, 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 Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 76]

YEAS—420

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

□ 1730

HONORING THE LIFE OF COACH
JERRY TARKANIAN

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a heavy heart to mourn the loss and honor the life of my friend, Coach Jerry Tarkanian, who passed away this morning.

A leader and a role model, both on and off the court, “the Shark” was not only a legendary collegiate men’s basketball coach, but a pillar in the Las Vegas community.

As coach at UNLV, he led the Running Rebels to a 509–105 record over 19 seasons, four Final Four appearances, and an NCAA championship in 1990. In 2013, he was inducted into the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame, and a statue of him was placed outside UNLV’s Thomas & Mack Center, which houses the basketball court bearing his name.

Coach Tarkanian was known for giving young players a second chance. He supported numerous charities and programs that helped build character, life skills, and talent that fostered success in later life.

My thoughts go out to his wife and his family, and I am sure the coach is looking down and chewing on that famous towel in Heaven.

STEELWORKERS REFINERY
STRIKE

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Members, last Friday and Saturday I visited and walked with United Steelworkers union members who are on strike for health and safety issues in our east Houston congressional district.

Their jobs are very dangerous. They produce refined products and chemicals that our Nation needs. We have, sadly, lost lives recently in the industry, and to have men and women working 10-plus straight days for shifts of 10 hours is not reasonable.

These men and women work hard in a dangerous occupation, and they should not have to go on strike for safety. Safety is important to employees and companies. Let’s settle the strike with new safety standards so that no family has to worry that their loved one will not come home from work.

HONORING JEROME “BIG DUCK”
SMITH

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

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in my continuing recognition of

Black History Month to honor Freedom Rider and civil rights legend Jerome “Big Duck” Smith. An active mentor of youth in New Orleans, he earned his nickname because there is usually a line of children waddling behind him.

From a young age, Big Duck was not intimidated by what he viewed as the racial norms in New Orleans. When he was 10 years old, he removed a screen that acted as a barrier between Black and White passengers on a New Orleans streetcar, causing some uneasiness. An older Black woman riding the streetcar took him off the car and told him “never, ever stop” and that she was proud of him for what he had done. This show of support would light a fire within him to fight for racial justice.

Jerome Smith would go on to become part of the Freedom Riders, a group that looked to desegregate bus terminals across the Deep South. Also, he helped found the New Orleans chapter of the Congress of Racial Equality, one of the big four civil rights organizations.

Today, Big Duck is the director of Tambourine and Fan, a youth organization in New Orleans that engages young people on the civil rights movement, leadership, and the importance of political engagement. His work for the civil rights movement and with youth throughout the city is an inspiration not only to me, but to the entire region. Big Duck embodies the never-ending struggle for justice and equality of opportunity.

ELIMINATING ISIS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, over the last 24 hours, we have heard that a wonderful young woman from Arizona, whose family is now mourning, lost her life somewhere in Syria at the hands of a violent and barbaric group by the name of ISIS. I hope that it brings all Americans together around the importance of eliminating this dastardly group, and to begin to look inwardly to make sure that we attack this cancer at its beginning and to be able to stop the radicalization that comes about through the Internet and many of the young people in this country.

I introduced earlier this year the No Fly Foreign Soldiers Act to ensure that those who may leave this country and then attempt to fly back are, in fact, detected. There are many things we can do on the end of passing law, but we must also respond that we not attack any religion for just its beliefs and begin to educate people about the values of many different religions.

That is what this young American sought to do. She went to save the vulnerable. And so we must isolate ISIS as it is and stand with those who recognize the greatness of America and the

diversity of our religions and the diversity of the people.

I sadly offer my sympathy for the Muslims that were killed at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. We must fight those who are here attempting to do harm and must recognize that we have a goodness in our country and emphasize the fact that we live and can live in harmony. But ISIS must be our target, not those whose faith may be considered a faith that we do not understand or maybe even disagree with.

STOP OBAMA’S EXECUTIVE
AMNESTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOOLENAAR). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LOUDERMILK. 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 topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BRAT).

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Speaker, on November 4, the American people spoke loudly and clearly on illegal immigration and President Obama’s repeated overreaches of his authority. Yet within weeks of the election, the President tried to singlehandedly rewrite America’s immigration laws by granting amnesty by executive decree to 5 million illegal aliens already in this country. It was a move that he previously said he had no constitutional authority to execute. He also acknowledged that only Congress could rewrite the laws. But he did it anyway.

In response, the House took a firm stand last month to pass a bill to stop the President’s illegal and unconstitutional decree that grants amnesty, work permits, and Federal benefits to illegal aliens. The bill fully funds the Department of Homeland Security for the rest of the year, but it also prohibits the Department from carrying out the President’s illegal act. Let me repeat that last line. This bill fully funds the Department of Homeland Security. It just says that in order to get that funding, the Department cannot break the law.

That is just common sense. The American people don’t want the Federal Government breaking the law, and it is up to Congress to make sure that no Federal funds are used illegally.

Yet today, Senate Democrats are currently united in opposing this bill. Recent polling shows that Americans overwhelmingly oppose the President’s

executive immigrations actions 58 to 36. I call on my Senate colleagues to support the Constitution and the rule of law and pass H.R. 240 as it was passed in the House.

The President's amnesty scheme is not only illegal, it is patently unconstitutional. It creates a dangerous precedent where future Presidents can ignore laws they don't agree with and expand their own power beyond its legal boundaries, threatening the very liberty of the American people.

Our constitutionally guaranteed liberties, our rule of law and economic opportunities are precisely the things that immigrants come to America to experience. Our Constitution, rule of law, and economic prosperity are precisely the things that we will be giving up if we allow the President to break our laws to give amnesty and work permits to those who are here illegally.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS).

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, about 5 weeks ago, Members of this body stood on the House floor and we all raised our hands and we all swore an oath of office to support and defend the Constitution. It is the same oath that Members in the other body, in the Senate, take. I think it is an oath that means something. It is not just window dressing. We have a responsibility to conform the actions of this body and to counteract actions of other branches of government if those actions are not consistent with the Constitution.

And so here we have an instance in which the President is on record 22 different times saying he does not have the authority to grant work permits unilaterally, 5 million of them, to people in the country illegally. He can't give Social Security numbers or benefits without an act of Congress. And yet, after losing the election, he did it. When he did it, a number of Members in his own party in the Senate said they were concerned about what he did, and they didn't think that it could be done by executive fiat and that changes to immigration law had to happen through Congress.

And so we are in a curious situation now because the House has passed a bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security but to constrain the President from acting illegally, because the government has to follow the law just like any other citizen. And you have a situation in the Senate in which the Democrats, including those seven Senators who said that this is problematic, they are blocking even having a debate on the bill. Forget about being opposed to the bill in its final form or if you don't get an amendment, they will not even let it come to the floor so it can be debated.

To me, this is the most important type of debate, when it goes to the central purpose of our oath: to support and defend the Constitution. I think they need to go on record about why they think this is constitutional. What lim-

its are there for the President in terms of exercising this executive power? Can he legislate lower tax rates? Can he legislate in the field of environmental law or workplace safety law that the Congress doesn't support?

I think what you are seeing is a dereliction of duty by those Senators who are unwilling to have a discussion and they are unwilling to debate. They are putting protecting the political interests of a President in their own party over their duty to support and defend the Constitution of the United States.

If you were right on the issues and you knew that what he did was constitutional, then you should have no problem going to the floor and making that case to the American people. The fact that they are unwilling to do that, I believe, is proof positive that they know that case cannot be made, and, in fact, they would not be able to make it.

So I appreciate my friend from Georgia reserving this time. I think this is something that absolutely needs to have a thorough debate; and the American people overwhelmingly are opposed to what the President did, so let's debate it. If you don't like what we did, offer your suggestion, but the idea that you can go run and hide is something that is not consistent with our duties or with our oath of office.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fine remarks by the gentleman from Florida.

I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), the State from which our Declaration of Independence was passed and the very Constitution we are speaking about was debated and proposed to this great Union.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank my colleague from Georgia for organizing this very important discussion that we are having here today.

Three weeks ago, this House passed a bill to fund the lawful operations of the Department of Homeland Security. Our bill provides nearly \$40 billion for the protection of our Nation, with a \$100 million increase for border security and \$600 million more for Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

Democrats in the Senate, however, now refuse to vote on funding these important programs because they are insisting on funding President Obama's unlawful amnesty order for 5 million illegal aliens.

The dollars that hardworking taxpayers send to Washington should not be used to fund any unlawful order, including President Obama's amnesty order.

And how do we know that the President's action is unlawful? Well, I remember what the President said repeatedly. For example, in 2011, the President said:

With respect to the notion that I can just suspend deportations through executive order, that is just not the case because there are laws on the books that Congress has passed. For me to simply, through executive order, ignore those congressional mandates

would not conform with my appropriate role as President.

Funding for the Department of Homeland Security runs out in 16 days. The House acted 21 days ago. It is time for the Senate to act.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS).

□ 1745

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Georgia, BARRY LOUDERMILK, for the leadership that he has shown in putting this event together where we on the House floor can try to help explain to the American people what is at stake here with the President's executive amnesty.

Mr. Speaker, in that vein, I rise to speak in opposition to President Obama's illegal and unconstitutional executive amnesty for illegal aliens. Why? Because I was elected by Americans to represent Americans in Washington, D.C. While, clearly, protecting the United States Constitution is the number one reason to fight President Obama's illegal and unconstitutional conduct, a close second reason is the economic welfare of American families searching for jobs that will empower them to take care of their own families.

In that vein, a report by the Center for Immigration Studies is very instructive. The Center for Immigration Studies did a report based on Federal Government data. It was collected from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Department of Homeland Security, and the Census Bureau. And this is what they found.

From the first quarter of the year 2000 to the first quarter of the year 2014, a 14-year period, with respect to people in America who are ages 16 to 65—and I will repeat that—ages 16 to 65, which is far and away the largest block by age of working Americans, the American economy for that 16 to 65 age group created 5.6 million net new jobs. Some would say that is pretty good—5.6 million net new jobs.

But do you know how many of those jobs went to American-born citizens? Do you know the answer to that question? Well, I would submit to you that every American citizen should—and they ought to be outraged by the answer. Of those 5.6 million net jobs created over a 14-year period in the United States of America for people ages 16 to 65, American-born citizens had a net loss of 127,000 jobs.

And you wonder why the polling data shows that Americans still believe they are in a recession. The answer is American-born citizens are still in a recession.

Well, who got those jobs? Well, according to the Center for Immigration Studies report, 5.7 million net job gains were by two groups: illegal aliens, plus lawful immigrants.

So look at the priorities of our Federal Government over the last 14 years.

Look at the priorities established by President Obama's executive amnesty. The priorities do not lie with American citizens. Rather, they lie with people of all kinds other than American citizens.

We had 127,000 net job losses, but that doesn't really tell the whole picture. We also had population growth in the 16 to 65 age bracket for American-born citizens during that 14-year period of time.

So do you know how many more Americans are unemployed today—jobless—in the 16 to 65 age bracket because of America's faulty, porous like a sieve immigration policies? Seventeen million.

And you wonder why our youth are despondent, you wonder why they are depressed with the job circumstances they face, you wonder why American families cannot earn a living with the wages that are now being paid. It is because there are so many people in the White House, on K Street, and other places who are lobbying the United States Congress to dramatically increase the labor supply by bringing in illegal aliens and lawful immigrants to suppress wages and to take jobs from American families. That is wrong.

Now, you have heard the argument often raised: Well, Americans won't do those jobs. Let me tell you about those jobs for a moment. We have got two categories: illegal aliens and lawful immigrants.

Well, you can make the argument that illegal aliens are seeking the blue collar jobs and that perhaps Americans won't do them at the suppressed wages now being paid.

With respect to lawful immigrants it is a different picture. Over those 14 years, in that 16 to 65 age bracket, American-born citizens lost jobs while lawful immigrants gained jobs in these fields: engineering, architecture, health care, sales, office staff. Those are good-paying jobs that when I was growing up American citizens used to be able to compete for and get but which are now being denied because of immigration policies.

Those are sobering numbers, those are startling numbers. So sobering, so depressing, that I challenged my staff. I said, This report can't be right.

So my congressional staff went to the raw data from the Census Bureau, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and the Department of Homeland Security, and they confirmed that the Center for Immigration Studies data was correct. Which brings us back to President Obama's executive amnesty that does so much damage to American citizens.

The House has done its job. We have passed legislation to defund executive amnesty to prevent the President from doing what he has been doing. The problem, as has been the last 4 years that I have been in the United States Congress and hopefully won't be the case for the next 2 years, lies with the United States Senate.

Media reports say that we are in an impasse, that the Democrats are stand-

ing with illegal aliens and shunning American families and filibustering. And the Republican leadership is professing: We don't have the firepower, we don't have the 60 votes, we are stymied, we can't end this filibuster.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is another option.

Let's think back for a moment and let's look at HARRY REID when he was Senate majority leader and the power that he wielded. And what did he do? He said: I am not going to let the filibuster stop me from achieving my political goals. And he exercised the nuclear option. And then under HARRY REID you did not need 60 votes for appointments of Barack Obama-submitted appointees; rather, a mere majority would work.

Well, if HARRY REID and the Democratic majority can do that, if they can stand up for their beliefs, however wrong those beliefs may be, then where is our Republican Senate leadership, and why aren't they doing the same thing? We have 54 Republican Senators. MITCH MCCONNELL last time I checked is the Senate Republican majority leader.

All of our Senators have said they object to executive amnesty. Why don't they do the same thing in respect to bills that we have to pass to prevent government shutdowns, bills dealing with spending matters, and say only 51 votes are needed; no longer can a minority with a filibuster shut down the United States Government?

And so with that, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that it is time for the United States Senate to change their rules to reflect the will of the American people. And certainly if those rules can be changed for mere appointments by a President, they can also be changed to protect the United States Constitution and the separation of powers.

Mr. Speaker, I can't speak for any Senators or, for that matter, any elected officials in Washington, D.C., but I can speak for me and I can speak for the people of the Tennessee Valley of the State of Alabama. I vote to put the jobs and wage interests of struggling American families over the interests of illegal aliens. I encourage all Senators of both parties to do the same. Respect the wishes of the American people, act on behalf of the American people, and if you do that America will continue to prosper and the rule of law in America will continue to prevail.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for those passionate words.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield a portion of my time to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY), my freshman colleague.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues, Congressman JIM JORDAN and Congressman BARRY LOUDERMILK, for arranging this special session tonight to address a critical issue looming before our Nation.

Senator HARRY REID and the President are currently risking the full funding of our national security to protect the President's unilateral and unconstitutional executive action on amnesty.

On 22 occasions, President Obama himself said he did not have the authority to grant executive amnesty before flipping and denying the will of the American people and taking unilateral action anyway. This attitude follows a pattern of unilateral action, executive action, including the President's war on coal, and it must be stopped.

Now, Senator REID and his allies continue to block any consideration of the bill passed by the House to fund the Department of Homeland Security. This obstruction is intended to protect the President's unconstitutional executive amnesty.

Sadly, no one is surprised that this President would use this unlawful, unilateral action to pursue his own radical agenda. But now Senator REID and the President are edging closer to putting the American people in danger to protect that agenda.

The Constitution clearly gives the power of the purse to the United States House of Representatives—this Chamber right here. And the American people said clearly last year that they expect us to use our authority over spending to keep government operating in a responsible manner.

I call upon Senator REID, President Obama, and their Democrat allies to end this political gamesmanship. Instead, bring up the bill to fund Homeland Security for consideration and passage.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from West Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, as you can tell, we have people from all over this great Union that have risen here today to speak, not just from the South. I would like to yield a portion of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), my great friend.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman leading tonight's discussion on the floor. As we do so, we think about the people back at home and across this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, Americans are hurting. Americans are hurting because they are out of work, Americans are hurting because they lost jobs, they find they can't find new jobs. Families are hurting because of this. Families, Mr. Speaker, are also hurting because they are waiting for other fellow family members to be able to join them here in this country through the legal immigration process. They are patiently going through all the processes that we have set up in this country to process it, and they are hurting as they wait for their family members to join them.

As we come here to the floor today as Members of Congress, we understand that this government has to ensure that everyone plays by the rules, including this administration.

As Members of Congress, we are obligated to uphold the Constitution, and that is exactly what this House has done by defunding the President's unconstitutional actions in which he granted amnesty. Added to that, he provided working permits to over 5 million illegal immigrants, thereby creating additional problems for those Americans who are out of work and creating additional problems for those Americans who are waiting for their fellow family members to come into this country through the legal immigration process.

Mr. Speaker, the House has done its job. We have acted. We have fully funded—this is important—we have fully funded the Department of Homeland Security while at the same time undoing the damage the President's unprecedented executive amnesty is having on our Republic and, more important, on our American families.

The President's actions to grant de facto amnesty has broad-reaching consequences for many of my constituents and constituents all across the United States as well.

It is unfair. It is not only unfair, it is irresponsible to divert resources away from legal applications of those who, as I said before, are patiently waiting and going through the legal process of immigration to give it to those who have broken the law.

It is also reckless to reward those who have blatantly broken the law with work permits, allowing them to compete directly with those Americans and those American families who are hurting because they are out of work today and are finding themselves in a hard position to find work.

So because of this, Mr. Speaker, I call on our Senators who are blocking a vote on the bill: do not turn your backs on the millions of Americans who are struggling to find work, do not turn your back on those who have immigrated here legally, and do not turn your back on those who are still waiting to try to immigrate into this country legally as well.

□ 1800

It is time, Mr. Speaker, for the Senate to act. It is time for the Senate to end its obstruction. It is time to move this bill.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. I thank my friend from New Jersey for those appropriate words.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my good friend and freshman colleague from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER).

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, we are rapidly approaching a crossroads regarding the President's executive actions that provide de facto amnesty for millions of illegal immigrants.

On February 27, the appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security runs out. Here are the facts:

The House has done exactly what the American people have asked. We have passed a bill that fully funds the De-

partment of Homeland Security, including broadly supported amendments that would defund the President's illegal executive orders.

Now the time has come for the Senate to engage. Sadly, they are not even debating the issue. Senate Democrats are now blocking the consideration of the bill. I strongly urge the Senate majority leader, MITCH MCCONNELL, to hold the line and to work diligently.

The President's overreach needs to be stopped. This is a constitutional issue, not an immigration one. Are we not outraged at such abuse? The President has violated his own words, attempting to enforce authoritative actions he repeatedly said he did not have. In fact, 22 times he has said he did not have the constitutional privilege to do so. This administration's opinion on other issues may continue to evolve or change, but may I remind him the Constitution has not changed.

I am calling on not only my constituents but on our fellow citizens across this land to let your voices be heard. Demand results from your leaders.

I would like to thank my colleague from Georgia for organizing this meeting to allow our voices to be heard in a very loud manner.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate all of the comments that have been made here today. As you can tell, this is not a party issue. This is not about Republicans or Democrats or conservatives. This is about our Constitution. This is about American principles and the rule of law, but, more importantly, it is about fairness. It is about the American Dream. It is about those who are working hard every day. It is about the children and our future.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the beautiful State of Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I certainly thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I have cherished the privilege to chair the Subcommittee on the Constitution in this body, and throughout the Obama administration, I have been bewildered many times by this President's many casual dismissals of constitutional principle and the respect for the rule of law, itself, in America.

However, I now believe that the President's recent actions related to illegal immigration constitute a fundamental and seminal abrogation of his sworn oath to the Constitution. If left unchallenged, Mr. Speaker, this President's unconstitutional act could create a precedent that could threaten to place a permanent crack in the very foundations of this Republic. Consequently, the issue before us now is about far more than illegal immigration—it is about protecting the Constitution of the United States of America.

Now it is both the prerogative and the solemn responsibility of this House and of the U.S. Senate to uphold our own collective oath to the Constitution. Through the constitutional power

of the purse, we must stand with and for the American people and refuse to fund this unconstitutional action by this President. We must call upon the Senate to continue to hold multiple votes for cloture so that this Nation can discover and understand who it is who prevents us from doing our constitutional duty.

Mr. Speaker, failing that, we must now call upon the United States Senate to subordinate its own cloture rules to the United States Constitution and to use their rules to change their rules for that purpose if it becomes a choice between the Senate cloture rules and the United States Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, Daniel Webster once said:

Hold on, my friends, to the Constitution and to the Republic for which it stands, for miracles do not cluster; and what has happened once in 6,000 years may never happen again. So hold on to the Constitution, for, if the American Constitution should fail, there will be anarchy throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, our duty is clear.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. I thank my good friend from the Grand Canyon State. No truer words have ever been spoken.

Mr. Speaker, many of us sat in this very room back in January, and we listened to the President as he gave his State of the Union Address. He outlined a complete program, from the cradle to the grave, of what government would do—take over the rights of individuals. Many of us heard from citizens across the Nation that they were opposed to that. Mr. Speaker, if we allow this President to continue on legislating from the Oval Office, I would submit there is nothing standing in the way for him to implement every one of his plans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for bringing this key issue to us on the floor tonight.

Mr. Speaker, in November, the voters sent a very loud message to Washington, D.C. Now, they elected a lot of Republicans, but I tell my Republican friends that they weren't affirming our principles so much as they were desperate for a check and a balance against a President whose policies were frightening to them but also whose actions lay outside the bounds of laws that he was constrained by and constitutional constraints on his actions also. He, himself, admitted that multiple times, maybe more than 20 times, saying: I don't have the right to do it—as his own party chastised him and tried to force him into these executive actions, which he ultimately took. He said at one point: I am not the emperor.

Are we now to believe that he declares himself to be such? That is the basic question that faces us now.

The people of America want this institution called Congress—the House and the Senate together—to operate properly. I think, as much as anything else, the voters were expressing discontent that 380-plus bills from this

House were stalled on the other side of the Capitol, never making their way in any form to the floor of the Senate.

The people expect to see the issues up here and wrangled about. They want the tension between the two parties' different ideological points of view pulling at the fabric of the ideas in front of us. They are not so much concerned about the next bill. They are concerned about our vision for America and where we would take it, and they are frightened of a President who himself would take on actions which they knew were contrary to the good of the future of the country and that were certainly outside the boundaries of the laws which restrain even the President, because this country believes that not even the President is above the law.

So the questions before us are very critical. There are some who are saying: You all in the House have passed a DHS bill, and it is all your way or no way. I beg to differ. We sent our version of a Keystone pipeline bill to the Senate. The Senate made significant changes. They sent that back, and, just today, we sent the bill with the changes, the changes that were brought by Democrats in the Senate. The Senate Democrats allowed the bill to come up for debate. They amended the bill. There are more amendments in this one bill than have been heard in the previous year, total, so the system is working properly. We just sent that bill to the President. We are going to ask him to sign it or to turn it down. The people will have an opinion now about the outcome of whether the President signs it or doesn't sign it.

In contrast, look at what is happening with the DHS bill. The Senate Democrats, under HARRY REID, are saying: No, we are going to block it again. There is no debate, and there is no discussion, and there are no more ideas that are going to come in front of this Senate. I think that the American people are going to have the same opinion that they had about REID's blocking all of the bills that came from the House before. I think that to be the case.

At any rate, we in the House have passed our bill. The Senate should either obstruct or move forward. There are many fashions to do both, but the American people are looking and judging because they desperately want an institution that functions. They are not really significantly interested if it functions for Democrat rule or Republican rule. I think what they want is a system that is passing commonsense legislation, guaranteeing that the future of this country will be solid and sound. Then we can build a healthy economy, where everyone has got opportunity and where everyone has a chance to succeed based on the merits of his work.

That is not what this President is putting in line, and that is the question before the House now as the Senate twice has rejected or has, maybe, even three times rejected the opportunity to debate the issue. I just calm-

ly tell the American people that we are here, prepared to do the work you sent us to do. We will continue to do it. All you have to do is express your opinions to this body.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, we have heard from Representatives of the people of this Nation from all across the country. So far, I have yielded to Representatives from Florida, Alabama, West Virginia, New Jersey, North Carolina, Arizona, and New Mexico.

Now I yield to a good friend and patriot from the State that has seen and has participated in creating so much of the history of this Nation. He is the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. I thank Mr. LOUDERMILK for putting this together this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I was thinking about the situation we are in, and it came to my mind that there is a reason that the legislature is supposed to make the laws. There is a reason that we have a debate and that we discuss all of the different facets, because what also came to mind is the fact that the folks who have been legalized by the President's unconstitutional action will now get a Social Security number. With that, it will allow them to qualify for the earned income tax credit. As well, many will qualify for the child tax credit. Now, the IRS Code, Mr. Speaker, allows taxes to be amended back 3 years, and these folks who have just now received their Social Security numbers will be able to receive this payment retroactively.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker: Where is the fairness in that? I mean, what is fair about an illegal amnesty bonus? a bonus for breaking the law? What is fair about an immigrant's standing in line, coming here legally, wading through the process, only to watch somebody come right around him into this Nation, getting a Social Security number and, not only that, getting paid for doing that?

What is fair about hardworking, tax-paying Americans knowing that they can't get a break on their taxes because that money has got to go to somebody who came here expressly to break the law? What is fair about all of the children of all of these hardworking, tax-paying Americans being saddled with debt for the rest of their futures and their children's futures and those of their children's children for the sake of an illegal amnesty bonus? It is a bonus for breaking the law. What is fair about that, Mr. Speaker?

Now it is in the Senate, and the Senate is saying: Well, maybe the House should send another bill. The House sent a bill. It is the will of the House. It is the Senate's turn. With all due respect, if you don't want to vote for the bill, we get that. Vote "no." You can explain that to your constituents—you can explain that to your voters—but it is more important to you to pay somebody a bonus for coming here illegally. You can explain that.

The point is that they don't even want to have the vote. They are making sure there will be no vote. We are saying give this bill its chance; give it its day. If you have got a better idea, if you have got a different idea, that is great. That is wonderful. Let's see it. Pass your bill and send it over, and we will work together to pass something along.

I would say this to the leader of the Senate: It is time you make the rules, Mr. Leader. If now is not the time to change those rules in favor of the Constitution, when is the time? Instead of being concerned about 40-some years of tradition and of the way we run the Senate—instead of being concerned about that—how about being concerned about hundreds of years in favor of the Constitution? When President Obama didn't like the rule, apparently, even though he said 20 times or so that he had to abide by the Constitution, he just changed it. He just disregarded it.

□ 1815

And when HARRY REID didn't like the rule—a couple hundreds years of votes in cloture and the nuclear rule in the Senate—he just changed it. Right?

We are not asking to change it all the time, but when it comes down to a constitutional crisis, when it comes down to a division of powers, do you want to stand up for a bonus for acting illegally, for breaking the law, or do you want to stand up for the Constitution?

If that is not the time to change the rules for the President's unconstitutional executive action, if that is not the time to change the rules, Mr. MCCONNELL, when is the time? The time is now.

Pass a bill. Whatever your bill is, have a vote, "yes" or "no," send it to the House, and we will work it out. This legislation, this issue demands your attention. It demands a vote. It deserves a vote. The American people need to know. They deserve to know where their elected representatives in the Senate stand, not to just not vote on anything. They didn't send them there to just not vote. They sent them there to make a decision, "yes" or "no."

We get it. If you want to vote "no," good for you. You explain that. If you want to vote "yes," great. But have the vote. There is no reason to not change the rule if it gets us to a vote and upholds the Constitution. As a matter of fact, if it takes changing the rules to uphold the Constitution, this is one Representative of the Fourth District of Pennsylvania who thinks it is worth it.

With that, Mr. Speaker, again, I ask you: What is fair? What is fair about giving these bonuses to people who just received a Social Security card and who have been operating outside of the law for years? They receive their Social Security Card and they get a bonus.

You try that. Having worked here as a person who was born in this country,

you try to work under the table and then just apply and see if you will get a bonus from the IRS. Let me tell you what you get, Mr. Speaker. You will get a visit from the IRS, but it won't be for a bonus.

Think about fairness, Mr. Leader in the Senate. Change the rules. Let's move this bill forward.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, as you can see, this is a very passionate issue for many of us—not just because of politics but because this is about the heart of our Nation. This is the basis, the foundation of our Nation.

I now yield to a good friend and another freshman colleague from the great State of Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. I thank my colleague for yielding. I am pleased to have this time on the floor to talk about this important issue that faces our Congress.

On more than 22 occasions, President Obama has told audiences that, on the advice of his counsel, his attorneys, he could in fact not do what he has just proposed to do last November of 2014.

He stated that he did not have the statutory authority to defer deportation of over 5 million people who are in our country illegally, thereby granting them rights to drivers' licenses, work permits, Social Security, and health benefits.

For example, in 2013, the President stated that implementing immigration "reform" through executive action was "difficult to defend legally" and "not an option." He has repeatedly told the American people that he is a President, not a king, not an emperor.

Mr. Speaker, I will place in the RECORD the 22 times that the President has uttered these words that say that he does not have the authority to take executive action on immigration.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S TWENTY-TWO STATEMENTS ON HIS LACK OF AUTHORITY TO HANDLE IMMIGRATION POLICY BY EXECUTIVE ACTION

With the White House poised to grant executive amnesty any day now despite the American people's staunch opposition, on Sunday President Obama was asked about the many, many statements he made in the past about his inability to unilaterally change or ignore immigration law. His response was astonishingly brazen: "Actually, my position hasn't changed. When I was talking to the advocates, their interest was in me, through executive action, duplicating the legislation that was stalled in Congress."

This is a flagrant untruth: "In fact, most of the questions that were posed to the president over the past several years were about the very thing that he is expected to announce within a matter of days," reported The New York Times. "[T]he questions actually specifically addressed the sorts of actions that he is contemplating now," The Washington Post's Fact Checker agreed, awarding President Obama the rare "Upside-Down Pinocchio," which signifies "a major-league flip-flop." Even FactCheck.org piled on.

President Obama is once again trying to mislead Americans, but he can't run from what he's said over and over (and over) again. Not only are Americans not stupid—they can read:

1. "I take the Constitution very seriously. The biggest problems that we're facing right

now have to do with [the president] trying to bring more and more power into the executive branch and not go through Congress at all. And that's what I intend to reverse when I'm President of the United States of America." (3/31/08)

2. "We've got a government designed by the Founders so that there'd be checks and balances. You don't want a president who's too powerful or a Congress that's too powerful or a court that's too powerful. Everybody's got their own role. Congress's job is to pass legislation. The president can veto it or he can sign it. . . . I believe in the Constitution and I will obey the Constitution of the United States. We're not going to use signing statements as a way of doing an end-run around Congress." (5/19/08)

3. "Comprehensive reform, that's how we're going to solve this problem. . . . Everybody who tells you it's going to be easy or that I can wave a magic wand and make it happen hasn't been paying attention to how this town works." (5/5/10)

4. "[T]here are those in the immigrants' rights community who have argued passionately that we should simply provide those who are [here] illegally with legal status, or at least ignore the laws on the books and put an end to deportation until we have better laws. . . . I believe such an indiscriminate approach would be both unwise and unfair. It would suggest to those thinking about coming here illegally that there will be no repercussions for such a decision. And this could lead to a surge in more illegal immigration. And it would also ignore the millions of people around the world who are waiting in line to come here legally. Ultimately, our nation, like all nations, has the right and obligation to control its borders and set laws for residency and citizenship. And no matter how decent they are, no matter their reasons, the 11 million who broke these laws should be held accountable." (7/1/10)

5. "I do have an obligation to make sure that I am following some of the rules. I can't simply ignore laws that are out there. I've got to work to make sure that they are changed." (10/14/10)

6. "I am president. I am not king. I can't do these things just by myself. We have a system of government that requires the Congress to work with the Executive Branch to make it happen. I'm committed to making it happen, but I've got to have some partners to do it. . . . The main thing we have to do to stop deportations is to change the laws. . . . [T]he most important thing that we can do is to change the law because the way the system works—again, I just want to repeat, I'm president, I'm not king. If Congress has laws on the books that says that people who are here who are not documented have to be deported, then I can exercise some flexibility in terms of where we deploy our resources, to focus on people who are really causing problems as opposed to families who are just trying to work and support themselves. But there's a limit to the discretion that I can show because I am obliged to execute the law. That's what the Executive Branch means. I can't just make the laws up by myself. So the most important thing that we can do is focus on changing the underlying laws." (10/25/10)

7. "America is a nation of laws, which means I, as the President, am obligated to enforce the law. I don't have a choice about that. That's part of my job. But I can advocate for changes in the law so that we have a country that is both respectful of the law but also continues to be a great nation of immigrants. . . . With respect to the notion that I can just suspend deportations through executive order, that's just not the case, because there are laws on the books that Congress has passed. . . . [W]e've got three

branches of government. Congress passes the law. The executive branch's job is to enforce and implement those laws. And then the judiciary has to interpret the laws. There are enough laws on the books by Congress that are very clear in terms of how we have to enforce our immigration system that for me to simply through executive order ignore those congressional mandates would not conform with my appropriate role as President." (3/28/11)

8. "I can't solve this problem by myself. . . . [W]e're going to have to have bipartisan support in order to make it happen. . . . I can't do it by myself. We're going to have to change the laws in Congress, but I'm confident we can make it happen." (4/20/11)

9. "I know some here wish that I could just bypass Congress and change the law myself. But that's not how democracy works. See, democracy is hard. But it's right. Changing our laws means doing the hard work of changing minds and changing votes, one by one." (4/29/11)

10. "Sometimes when I talk to immigration advocates, they wish I could just bypass Congress and change the law myself. But that's not how a democracy works. What we really need to do is to keep up the fight to pass genuine, comprehensive reform. That is the ultimate solution to this problem. That's what I'm committed to doing." (5/10/11)

11. "I swore an oath to uphold the laws on the books. . . . Now, I know some people want me to bypass Congress and change the laws on my own. Believe me, the idea of doing things on my own is very tempting. I promise you. Not just on immigration reform. But that's not how our system works. That's not how our democracy functions. That's not how our Constitution is written." (7/25/11)

12. "So what we've tried to do is within the constraints of the laws on the books, we've tried to be as fair, humane, just as we can, recognizing, though, that the laws themselves need to be changed. . . . The most important thing for your viewers and listeners and readers to understand is that in order to change our laws, we've got to get it through the House of Representatives, which is currently controlled by Republicans, and we've got to get 60 votes in the Senate. . . . Administratively, we can't ignore the law. . . . I just have to continue to say this notion that somehow I can just change the laws unilaterally is just not true. We are doing everything we can administratively. But the fact of the matter is there are laws on the books that I have to enforce. And I think there's been a great disservice done to the cause of getting the DREAM Act passed and getting comprehensive immigration passed by perpetrating the notion that somehow, by myself, I can go and do these things. It's just not true. . . . We live in a democracy. You have to pass bills through the legislature, and then I can sign it. And if all the attention is focused away from the legislative process, then that is going to lead to a constant dead-end. We have to recognize how the system works, and then apply pressure to those places where votes can be gotten and, ultimately, we can get this thing solved." (9/28/11)

In June 2012, President Obama unilaterally granted deferred action for childhood arrivals (DACA), allowing "eligible individuals who do not present a risk to national security or public safety . . . to request temporary relief from deportation proceedings and apply for work authorization." He then argued that he had already done everything he could legally do on his own:

13. "Now, what I've always said is, as the head of the executive branch, there's a limit to what I can do. Part of the reason that deportations went up was Congress put a whole lot of money into it, and when you have a lot

of resources and a lot more agents involved, then there are going to be higher numbers. What we've said is, let's make sure that you're not misdirecting those resources. But we're still going to, ultimately, have to change the laws in order to avoid some of the heartbreaking stories that you see coming up occasionally. And that's why this continues to be a top priority of mine. . . . And we will continue to make sure that how we enforce is done as fairly and justly as possible. But until we have a law in place that provides a pathway for legalization and/or citizenship for the folks in question, we're going to continue to be bound by the law. . . . And so part of the challenge as President is constantly saying, 'what authorities do I have?'" (9/20/12)

14. "We are a nation of immigrants. . . . But we're also a nation of laws. So what I've said is, we need to fix a broken immigration system. And I've done everything that I can on my own[.]" (10/16/12)

15. "I'm not a king. I am the head of the executive branch of government. I'm required to follow the law. And that's what we've done. But what I've also said is, let's make sure that we're applying the law in a way that takes into account people's humanity. That's the reason that we moved forward on deferred action. Within the confines of the law we said, we have some discretion in terms of how we apply this law." (1/30/13)

16. "I'm not a king. You know, my job as the head of the executive branch ultimately is to carry out the law. And, you know, when it comes to enforcement of our immigration laws, we've got some discretion. We can prioritize what we do. But we can't simply ignore the law. When it comes to the dreamers, we were able to identify that group and say, 'These folks are generally not a risk. They're not involved in crime. . . . And so let's prioritize our enforcement resources.' But to sort through all the possible cases of everybody who might have a sympathetic story to tell is very difficult to do. This is why we need comprehensive immigration reform. To make sure that once and for all, in a way that is, you know, ratified by Congress, we can say that there is a pathway to citizenship for people who are staying out of trouble, who are trying to do the right thing, who've put down roots here. . . . My job is to carry out the law. And so Congress gives us a whole bunch of resources. They give us an order that we've got to go out there and enforce the laws that are on the books. . . . If this was an issue that I could do unilaterally I would have done it a long time ago. . . . The way our system works is Congress has to pass legislation. I then get an opportunity to sign it and implement it." (1/30/13)

17. "This is something I've struggled with throughout my presidency. The problem is that I'm the president of the United States, I'm not the emperor of the United States. My job is to execute laws that are passed. And Congress right now has not changed what I consider to be a broken immigration system. And what that means is that we have certain obligations to enforce the laws that are in place even if we think that in many cases the results may be tragic. . . . [W]e've kind of stretched our administrative flexibility as much as we can[.]" (2/14/13)

18. "I think that it is very important for us to recognize that the way to solve this problem has to be legislative. I can do some things and have done some things that make a difference in the lives of people by determining how our enforcement should focus. . . . And we've been able to provide help through deferred action for young people. . . . But this is a problem that needs to be fixed legislatively." (7/16/13)

19. "My job in the executive branch is supposed to be to carry out the laws that are

passed. Congress has said 'here is the law' when it comes to those who are undocumented, and they've allocated a whole bunch of money for enforcement. And, what I have been able to do is to make a legal argument that I think is absolutely right, which is that given the resources that we have, we can't do everything that Congress has asked us to do. What we can do is then carve out the DREAM Act folks, saying young people who have basically grown up here are Americans that we should welcome. . . . But if we start broadening that, then essentially I would be ignoring the law in a way that I think would be very difficult to defend legally. So that's not an option. . . . What I've said is there is a there's a path to get this done, and that's through Congress." (9/17/13)

20. "[I]f, in fact, I could solve all these problems without passing laws in Congress, then I would do so. But we're also a nation of laws. That's part of our tradition. And so the easy way out is to try to yell and pretend like I can do something by violating our laws. And what I'm proposing is the harder path, which is to use our democratic processes to achieve the same goal that you want to achieve. . . . It is not simply a matter of us just saying we're going to violate the law. That's not our tradition. The great thing about this country is we have this wonderful process of democracy, and sometimes it is messy, and sometimes it is hard, but ultimately, justice and truth win out." (11/25/13)

21. "I am the Champion-in-Chief of comprehensive immigration reform. But what I've said in the past remains true, which is until Congress passes a new law, then I am constrained in terms of what I am able to do. What I've done is to use my prosecutorial discretion, because you can't enforce the laws across the board for 11 or 12 million people, there aren't the resources there. What we've said is focus on folks who are engaged in criminal activity, focus on people who are engaged in gang activity. Do not focus on young people, who we're calling DREAMers. . . . That already stretched my administrative capacity very far. But I was confident that that was the right thing to do. But at a certain point the reason that these deportations are taking place is, Congress said, 'you have to enforce these laws.' They fund the hiring of officials at the department that's charged with enforcing. And I cannot ignore those laws any more than I could ignore, you know, any of the other laws that are on the books. That's why it's so important for us to get comprehensive immigration reform done this year." (3/6/14)

22. "I think that I never have a green light [to push the limits of executive power]. I'm bound by the Constitution; I'm bound by separation of powers. There are some things we can't do. Congress has the power of the purse, for example. . . . Congress has to pass a budget and authorize spending. So I don't have a green light. . . . My preference in all these instances is to work with Congress, because not only can Congress do more, but it's going to be longer-lasting." (8/6/14)

Further, notwithstanding the President's own legal argument to the contrary, Mr. Obama's supporters argue that he simply is doing what Presidents Reagan and Bush 41 did. This statement is simply not true. Instead, President Reagan and Bush responded in a statutorily acceptable matter to an ambiguity in a specific law and did not seek to circumvent or prevent enforcement of the law as it was written.

I supported recent House legislative action to defund the President's executive actions based on the facts above, as well as my view that Congress must

in fact fix our broken immigration system by legislation.

The separation of powers argument here is clear. In article I of the U.S. Constitution, Congress is granted the enumerated power of setting uniform law for naturalizing our citizens.

Mr. Obama's approach violates this provision by both exceeding his constitutional authority as well as his sworn obligation to faithfully execute the laws as passed by Congress.

While we are all familiar with the Executive's obligation to faithfully execute, we must focus on the cynical distrust that doing the opposite causes among our citizens.

James Madison in Federalist 51 discussed the need for each branch of government to guard against overreach by another. "When such an overreach occurs," Madison stated, "ambition must be counteracted by ambition." And clearly, our government works best when each branch stays within its prescribed boundaries.

Supreme Court Justice Kennedy argued this in a recent separation of powers case before the court when he said:

Liberty is always at stake when one or more of the branches seek to transgress the separation of powers.

As a matter of principle, as a matter of our role in Congress, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to stand up for the proper separation of powers and assert that Congress alone can debate and enact such sweeping changes to our immigration system.

Mr. Speaker, Members seeking to reform our broken immigration system should support our efforts to rein in this tyranny of the Executive. Only then can Congress work together to craft the proper solutions to fix our broken system. Only then will Congress come together and insist on a border that is secure and fully functioning as a cornerstone of our homeland security.

With a land, sea, and air border that knows who and why people are entering our beloved Nation, we can then turn our attention to those many connecting facets of our system: visa overstays; lack of a balanced, well-staffed, and functioning guest worker program; adequate welcome and legal openings for those facing persecution; speedy adjudication for those aliens who are detained; opportunities for needed workers, professors, and students in our universities; and finally, a process for handling those among us who remain outside our legal tax and societal systems.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to stand up for the first branch and our constitutional prerogative. Take action on our Homeland Security bill and send it back to the House.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Again, Mr. Speaker, you can see that Representatives from all across the Nation have stood here today and represented the people of this Nation on how important this issue is.

Mr. Speaker, we live in one of the most dangerous times in American history. Innocent American citizens are targeted by extreme Islamic terrorists at home and around the world.

On September 11, 2001, even the sanctity of our homeland was proven to be vulnerable. And now, an organization considered too evil and too extreme by other terrorist organizations is calling for homegrown terrorists to carry out unspeakable acts of violence against innocent Americans—acts which we have witnessed in the past year.

Since 2001, there have been more than 60 coordinated terrorist plots against Americans on American soil. These perpetrators of evil planned to execute their violence in the places where innocent civilians live, work, and play. They have targeted civilians on aircraft, at military installations, mass gatherings of citizens, sporting activities, restaurants, and shopping malls—the very places where Americans should expect to feel safe and secure.

However, the current administration continues to deny the ideology that motivates these acts of evil. When a known sympathizer to terrorist organizations chooses to carry out his evil acts against coworkers, it is passed off as workplace violence. When our Embassy in Benghazi was invaded and officials of the United States Government were slain at the hands of known terrorists, it was spun as a violent response to a YouTube video.

When a military pilot of an allied country was murdered in the most horrific and painful way, the President referred to the perpetrators as a cult of death, not extremist Islamic terrorists.

With the rise and the expansion of ISIS, our citizens, military, and first responders are in more danger than ever before, and we must be vigilant to protect our citizens and our national interests.

Following the terrorist attacks of 9/11, our government recognized that the threat of organized and well-planned acts by international terrorist organizations required new and dedicated resources to protect American citizens. In response, the Department of Homeland Security was created, and resources were allocated by Congress to protect our homeland from future devastating acts of terrorism.

Since the turn of the century, terrorists have plotted over 60 attacks against our Nation. Thankfully, more than 50 of these were thwarted by U.S. law enforcement and our intelligence community, while others were stopped with the cooperation of law enforcement from other nations.

In the past several months, the threat against America has grown exponentially. ISIS is one of the most well-funded, the most organized, the best armed, and the most ruthless terrorist organization in the history of the world.

Even al Qaeda, which planned and executed the most devastating attack on

American soil since the Japanese raid on Pearl Harbor, pales in comparison to the organization and resources of ISIS.

Recently, ISIS has expanded well beyond traditional communication tactics used by other terrorist organizations and has engaged in an effective Internet and social media campaign to recruit foreign fighters to join their ranks. They are purposefully, Mr. Speaker, targeting our youth by using popular video games to appeal to thrill seekers. They are promising that these young people can live out the fantasy world that they experience in their games.

Today, we are experiencing what may be the largest convergence of terrorist activity in history. As a result of the growth and the recruitment of ISIS, foreign fighters are swarming to Syria to join the ranks of the international jihad.

While it is virtually impossible to stop every act of terrorism against Americans, I believe the Department of Homeland Security, our military, and law enforcement agencies have done an exceptional job. However, we are only days away from the current funding of the Department of Homeland Security expiring, which, even according to this administration, could put us at grave risk.

During the first week of this 114th Congress, the House of Representatives took quick and decisive action to ensure that the Department of Homeland Security will continue to function at full capacity. We passed a funding measure that would ensure that all public safety functions within the Department are fully funded so that the agency can fulfill its mission.

Unfortunately, a few Senate Democrats are filibustering this bill and are keeping it from even coming to the floor for consideration. The Democratic Party is putting our national security at risk through their insistence that the President be able to grant 5 million illegal aliens legal status so they can receive work permits, tax refunds, and public assistance.

The President's recent executive order on amnesty places the safety of every citizen in jeopardy and eliminates job opportunities for hard-working Americans. At a time when millions of Americans are struggling simply to make ends meet, the President should be focused on providing American jobs, not introducing millions of new laborers into the workforce. Since the President assumed office, he has already issued almost 5.5 million work permits to foreign laborers.

The Senate now has the perfect opportunity to protect the safety of all Americans by approving House Resolution 240, a bill that would defund the President's executive order on amnesty, yet they refuse to take up this commonsense measure and do what is right for the American people. By not taking action, the Senate is relin-

quishing control to the President to continue carrying out these actions without the consent of Congress.

Today, my office and the office of every Member of Congress received a formal request from the White House to authorize the President to use military force to fight against ISIS. It is ironic that, on one hand, the President is asking to send our young men and women overseas to fight against terrorism but, on the other hand, he and Senate Democrats are willing to put our security at risk at home so he can, without constitutional authority, saturate the American workforce with foreign labor who have entered this Nation illegally.

□ 1830

Instead of working to strengthen our economy and secure our jobs for American citizens, the President seems to be more concerned with providing jobs for illegal immigrants.

He has even threatened to veto the Keystone pipeline, a bill that we just passed here just a couple of hours ago. He has already threatened that he is going to veto this bill with one stroke of his pen, a bill that would create more than 40,000 jobs; but with another, he is willing to add 5 million illegal immigrants to an already struggling job market.

Mr. President, the American people are hurting. Many families are spending countless hours around the kitchen table discussing how to pay their bills and live within their means. These families should not have to compete for jobs with those who are not legal U.S. citizens.

The American people should be calling on the Democrats in the Senate to stop their filibuster of H.R. 240. It is time for the President, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the Senate to put the American people first and help hard-working Americans find jobs.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TROTT). The Chair will remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair and to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

THE ISSUE OF TRADE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the opportunity to utilize the time allotted to the Democrats in the House to speak to the issue of trade. There are many who see this issue as an important issue.

Others are now beginning to understand some of the dynamics as they relate to free trade versus fair trade and just what the dynamics of some of the last decades were, as recent past history has indicated, as they relate to

American jobs and the American economy.

This will be a good opportunity for us to address in fuller terms the issues of trade that we believe need to be addressed significantly well before we go forward with these negotiated contracts that could cause undesirable results, rather than those for which we all, I would believe, want to work—the opportunity to provide for individuals to tether the American Dream, to be able to go forth with dignity, to assume jobs that allow them to express their skills and God-given talents, and to be able to have that soulfulness of earning a paycheck.

We want to focus on those issues here this evening. There are many who would suggest that a fast track is of great concern. Fast track is that circumventing of the responsibilities of Congress—the ability of Congress—to get more in depth with the proposed agreement, to understand fully what those impacts of the agreements might be on their local economy, on their State economy, and certainly on the national scene.

It is important for us, I believe, to invest ourselves as a House. I would encourage those viewing this evening to ask their individual Members of Congress where they are on the fast track.

Do you stand for the concept that goes back to the days of President Nixon, that gave a more expedited process and perhaps more authority over to the executive branch to get these contracts done? Or do you stand for the scrutiny that should rest with the Congress to make certain that no undue pressure is put on our local jobs and economy, falsely so?

I believe that we do have that responsibility. As we have seen in recent years, we have grown the trade deficit of this Nation into the trillions of dollars. The challenge exists here, in the House, in this Congress, both Houses being faced with the added pressures of understanding what the dynamics of our trade deals are all about.

The first step of which we express concern is that fast track concept where we, again, do not allow for the fullest efforts of Congress to be utilized—where we can amend, where we can adjust, where we can advise—and simply a thumbs-up/thumbs-down doesn't quite cut it for the people we represent, the working families the great many of us dub the "middle class of America."

As I enter into this discussion, I am reminded of the district that I represent in upstate New York that basically witnesses—hosts—the confluence of the Hudson River and Mohawk River.

Those two valleys merge in the district that I represent, and they were the gateway, designed as an Erie Canal, barge canal system, that produced not only a stronger economy for New York, developed a port out of a little town called New York City, and then gave birth to a necklace of communities

dubbed "mill towns" that became the epicenters of invention and innovation.

It was there that many an immigrant tethered his or her dream, the American Dream, at those factory sites, where they were able to climb that ladder of opportunity, where they were able to lift their family's potential simply through the investment of hard work, pouring forth somehow their ability to land those jobs, and then to provide the creative genius that oftentimes developed new product lines or better product lines.

That was a heyday of the American economy that, again, started through these mill towns. They became those locations of hope and prosperity. Then it led to a westward movement, an industrial revolution where we were the kingpin of the world's economy.

We know the world dynamics are different today. We know that we need to adjust and respond, but we do that thoughtfully. We do it mindfully. We do it in a way that is academically measured, so that we don't introduce free trade but, instead, value fair trade, making certain that fair trade doesn't dispense unnecessarily of American jobs, that does not deflate our economy and finds us working on something, competing on something—the likes of an unlevel playing field. We need to have that level playing field be the result.

Tonight, we are talking about some of those trade negotiations that will come forth. The most recent now is being viewed as a huge impact on the world's economy. A great percentage of the world's economy will be impacted by the TPP, the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

We have to make certain that it is done correctly, that it is done sensitively, that it keeps in mind that the American contribution to all of this should provide us an ample opportunity, an equal opportunity, to compete for jobs.

What has happened is that we have had these trade negotiations develop well beyond the original dynamics of trade barriers and tariffs. They are incorporating far more information and dynamics than just those barriers. We may reach to items like collective bargaining opportunities or environmental standards or guidelines for public health or requirements for public safety.

If we relinquish some of those hard-fought battles in this country to make safer a workplace or to have a product be as safe as possible or where we have been sound stewards of the environment or we have offered dignity to workers to collectively bargain, to unite as an effort to score for better benefits and just remuneration for the work that they do, we want to make certain that those standards are not dumbed down, that they are not reduced, that the world comply with those given opportunities for which decades' worth of sweat equity was poured forth.

Advocacy was echoed in the halls of government to make certain that these justified outcomes were fought for and realized and made statutorily etched into our government and our laws.

We do not take this lightly. We take this effort as a serious challenge, one that would address some of these hidden impacts that aren't often shared well enough with the general public that we serve that are represented here in this Chamber.

It is important for us to understand one of those growing concerns happens to be currency manipulation. It is one of those sneak attacks that really provides for a grossly unlevel playing field. We are discussing a critical aspect of the global economy and trade policy that has been ignored for far too long.

This currency manipulation is causing a lot of concern on both sides of the aisle and is now pushing legislators to speak more forcefully. When countries manipulate their currency, it makes foreign-produced goods all the cheaper. That should signal an alarm.

It doesn't end there. It also suggests or creates a situation where United States exports are less competitive. It doesn't end there because, as we lose in that battle, where we are less competitive, it then drains our economy by contributing to the downward pressure on wages in many sectors of our economy.

We have seen this tremendous impact in trade deficit that has been produced in this country because of failed negotiated contracts and because of the impact of currency manipulation.

Now, I understand that currency manipulation is not something most people talk about. It is not easy to conceptualize how devaluation of China's yuan or Japan's yen could impact us so severely. It puts American jobs in jeopardy. That is why we need to consider this issue much more seriously.

We need to make certain that a structured response to this manipulation is part of the negotiations and part of statute from the Federal perspective. Millions of jobs, I would suggest, are at stake.

If a country is going to cheat by devaluing its currency to make its products cheaper, it hurts America, and that hurt should not be tolerated. It is as simple as that.

For anyone that claims to support unfettered free trade, I urge them to engage in this issue. Persisting currency manipulation distorts markets. It is as simple as that. As long as it is allowed to continue, trade cannot be free, trade cannot be fair.

Now, there is a growing bipartisan consensus that strong and enforceable currency rules are needed, needed to ensure a level playing field for both the legislative perspective and as part of any new free trade agreement. We believe, many of us, that it should be part of statutory reform but, indeed, included in those agreements that are struck.

Few actions by foreign governments do more to disrupt free trade and harm the United States job market than currency manipulation.

A wide array of economic think tanks—including the Laffer Center at the Pacific Research Institute, the Peterson Institute for International Economics, the Economic Policy Institute, and the Center for Automotive Research—have all published what are extensive studies and commentaries supporting a crackdown on currency manipulation.

These groups hold varying and diverse views on the benefits of free trade, so they may not all be coming from the same perspective, but all are united in their sense that trade cannot be free or fair if countries are allowed to cheat by manipulating their currencies.

The Peterson Institute has support indicated for currency as a chapter in the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Certainly, the former economic adviser to the Vice President has also supported including a currency chapter in the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

The Peterson Institute has estimated that America's trade deficit has averaged some \$200 billion to \$500 billion per year higher as a result of the manipulation.

□ 1845

That is happening from many angles, primarily from forces in China and Japan. Let me repeat those stats. \$200 billion to \$500 billion per year is the estimate for our trade deficit coming from some sound think tanks as a result of currency manipulation.

The Peterson Institute also estimates that interventions in currency markets by foreign governments have cost United States workers as many as 5 million jobs over the last decade. So I believe it speaks to us profoundly and should cause us to respond to the challenges of protecting jobs, American jobs, through the issues of fairness. This is not asking for some unfair competitive advantage. It is simply reminding the world that we understand what is happening out there as dynamics work against us and that we are going to do what we can to inspire fairness in the process.

The EPI, the Economic Policy Institute, found that ending currency manipulation could reduce the United States trade deficit by as much as \$500 billion within 3 years and create as many as 5.8 million—5.8 million—American jobs. These are statistics that should not be taken lightly. They are reports that should feed our senses and build our passion to do what is correct here, to make certain that we inspire the sort of reforms to this process and to Federal law that would make for a much fairer outcome, a more fair outcome for the American public.

Certainly there is no greater issue that rests before Congress these days than creating the climate that allows for private sector job growth. Now,

government may not create jobs. That may not be our purpose, prime purpose, but we certainly can do all within our power to create the sort of climate, the environment that allows for job growth to be maximized.

As we move into this desire to have world trade work as powerfully as it can and as fairly as it can for those of us in this country, we need to make certain that some of these reforms are embraced, and embraced in as enthusiastic a manner and expeditious a process as possible.

There was a report released just last week by EPI highlighting the negative impact that the Trans-Pacific Partnership would have on the United States' jobs if currency manipulation is not addressed, and that report, dubbed Currency Manipulation and the 896,000 United States Jobs Lost Due to the United States-Japan Trade Deficit, contains estimates for job displacement for every congressional district. We are making certain that all of our colleagues know of this information. These are data that are relevant to the people that we represent. These are data that challenge us.

I know that the study found that over 46,000 jobs would be displaced in New York State, including 1800 in the 20th Congressional District of New York, my home district. That is due, again, to the massive trade deficit that this Nation endures with Japan, a deficit that has been fueled primarily by currency manipulation.

So how do we address currency manipulation? How does it work? To identify manipulation, we need first and foremost to look at three criteria, criteria that are based on the International Monetary Fund's definition.

First, does the country of concern have large reserves of foreign currency, does the country have sustained trade surpluses, and does the country continue to buy large amounts of foreign currency?

Worth repeating. Does the country have large reserves of foreign currency, does the country have sustained trade surpluses, and does the country continue to buy large amounts of foreign currency?

Undervalued exchange rates allow the manipulating country to boost exports of their products and then put imports from other countries that are not cheating at tremendous disadvantage. Floating currencies should be self-adjusting based on trade deficits and surpluses. Cheaper dollars will lead to more exports and a balancing of the deficit over time. It is an ebb and flow relationship, and there is a natural tendency for that ebb and flow; but when enters in a greed factor, it can change those results and change them severely. The natural trend is not allowed to occur when a country intervenes in that currency market.

Countries like China and Japan have prevented this self-correcting process by buying United States currency. This artificially strengthens the dollar and

keeps us importing relatively cheap goods produced abroad.

We already have a significant trade deficit with Japan, and that is very much measured in the automobile industry. Our trade deficit with Japan is second only to our trade deficit with China, and the majority of that deficit is in the automotive sector.

Now, if you are to talk to any of our colleagues from Michigan, they will tell you about the devastation that has been borne upon, laid upon that auto industry in their home State. They have shared with us some very painful statistics. Well, the majority of that deficit, as I said, is in the automotive sector as it relates to Japan and China.

Japan, for instance, imports one American car for every 100 Japanese cars imported into the United States each year. That is one car, one car imported from America into Japan for every 100 Japanese cars that are imported into the United States each year. That pattern can't continue. That is an easily predictable devastating outcome.

Ford Motor calculates that the weakened yen of Japan added some \$6,000 in profit, on average, per car imported from Japan in the years 2012 to 2013. So if you have that \$6,000 advantage built into the sales price, where do you think we are going? It is allowing for such a devastating impact on the American worker, the autoworker of this country. It is unrealistic to have us as a nation to stand silently and not echo some order of concern.

So what can the Congress do? Well, the House of Representatives should pass the Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act, and the administration should require strong and enforceable currency manipulation provisions in the TPP, in the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Bipartisan groups in the House and in the United States Senate here in Congress are introducing legislation which would use United States trade law to fight currency manipulation and provide consequences for countries that indeed do cheat.

In the 113th Congress, the Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act, of which I was cosponsor, would have enabled the Department of Commerce to impose countervailing duties to offset the impact of currency manipulation. If you want to cheat, you pay. We are not going to stand for unfair trade. That bill had 157 bipartisan cosponsors, and identical legislation was passed with bipartisan support back in 2010.

The legislation is identical to the House bill that passed with overwhelming bipartisan support in 2010. That bill is consistent with the World Trade Organization and its rules. I think that this bill is written intelligently to conform to our trade agreement rules by considering currency devaluations as an illegal trade subsidy.

We already have mechanisms for addressing other illegal subsidies, but a bill such as that one, which is a start to addressing the problem, will not end

the practice of currency manipulation. We also need to include provisions in our trade agreements. Those provisions included in those agreements would provide our trading partners with a strong deterrent for manipulating their currency in the first place. We also have to make sure that our trade obligations explicitly allow this approach to targeting currency manipulation.

So I believe there are efforts within our grasp that we can work to achieve, that the changes and the reforms that we can provide will enable us to breathe free and grow and enhance the opportunities of our manufacturing sector.

Now, we think back to the booming economy we had in the 1950s and 1960s. We think of all the post-World War II growth of this Nation. We think of the tethering of the American Dream. We think of the passion of immigrants who had come here to climb those ladders of economic opportunity. We think of the generations that were strengthened by those who made the journey. It was their dream to provide a better life for them and their children and their grandchildren, and they saw it happening within these mill towns, those epicenters of which I spoke, epicenters of invention and innovation, of creative genius that enabled us to be the best we could possibly be and where there was hope abounding in our communities.

We can bring back that spirit. We can call for justice, social and economic justice as it relates to workers, as it relates to a world scene where there is a thought for those in the middle-income community, the middle class of America, the working families of America, strengthened and empowered because we get it here in Washington, where we speak to forces like counterforces, like currency manipulation that doesn't give us a fair shot, that creates an unlevel playing field, that will cost us dearly in jobs and in the growth of our economy.

So there is much work to be done. We need to make certain that as stewards of these agreements we are insisting that our strength be heard at the table, that we make certain that we are informed about issues like child labor laws, about the rights for collective bargaining, about environmental standards, about the need for public health and public safety to be addressed in the workplace and in the product line that is developed.

These are standards that are uniquely American at times, that should lift the world along with the people of this great country. We don't abandon those championing efforts that enabled us to be a stronger people, a safer people, building a stronger tomorrow. We don't abandon those principles. We build upon them. We share them with the other nations of the world.

As I mentioned to a group of labor individuals in my district recently, there are consequences galore if we continue down this path.

□ 1900

We are selling short the American worker. We are offshoring jobs that we can ill afford to ship away.

But it is beyond that. Not only does the American worker lose her job, not only does the American worker lose his hope, we then find economies around the world accepting the fact that their citizens are working for 75 cents an hour. Where is the justice to any of the workers around the world? This is an impact that has a ripple effect that pours forth in painful measure with insensitivity and gross, gross negative outcomes.

We can do better than that. We can be a country that will stand tall and know from the growth and progress that we have achieved through our halls of government, through the efforts of labor and unionized forces that came through labor and said, We are better than this. We need to share in the wealth of our economy.

We need to make certain that we respect our labor forces. The unionized efforts gave us sound benefits and sound salaries and good working conditions, acceptable standards. We are not going to ship that away. We are not going to allow for currency manipulation and the undoing of the American ideals, to be forsaken for the sake of a factor that has taken this global economy and produced these outcomes that are grossly unfair.

When we see a trade deficit in the trillions of dollars, when we understand that addressing currency manipulation can undo by hundreds of millions of dollars a deficit in a short order of 3 years, we can make a difference. We can be a force of change. We can be the voice of reason. We need to be that leader at the table.

Congress needs to be involved, invested in this opportunity. We need to make certain that the academics guide us here, that we pay attention to the data that are speaking to our senses.

We are rejecting all for which we fought. We are rejecting all for which labor painfully organized and achieved successful outcomes. If there is not justice for all in this process, it will not work.

But the American standard, the American appeal, the American hope that has been a beacon to people around the world should be that guiding force, should be the noble effort that allows all of us to understand that by committing to these issues of social and economic justice, we will have strengthened not only the American worker but workers around the world. An unlevel playing field simply does not work here. And offshoring jobs is the painful, gross neglect of the American Dream. The American Dream was one that found people playing by the rules, rolling up their sleeves, and expecting to taste success.

We can still build that aura within the halls of government. We can create those standards that determine a fair and just outcome. And we can speak

soulfully to the people who are counting on us in the given communities they call home across this great expanse called the United States of America. We have always been that higher standard. We have always been the people in search of a better tomorrow. We have always been a society indebted to justice.

Throughout our annals of history, stories replete of us making a difference by working our process called government, by making certain it empowers the individuals and families of this Nation in a way that simply speaks to what is right. We know it is right here.

There have been a number of folks in this House championing the effort of fair trade, talking about the inclusion of Congress in a way that allows for amendments and improvements to agreements and certainly an outspoken force that speaks to holding fast to those standards that speak to the wisdom that guides us, of being fair and respectful to those who labor, who labor steadfastly, who ask only to be treated as an equal partner in this process.

It is an honor to represent those voices that speak so profoundly well in the workplace, asking for that dignity of work, asking for just remuneration for the sweat equity that they pour forth in wanting to have just that better step forward for their children and their grandchildren as they grow to their tomorrows, filled with hope. We can provide hope. We can build change. And we can issue justice if we put our mind, heart, and souls to that effort. I suggest we can do it. It is within our grasp.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity and yield back the balance of my time.

CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORITY VERSUS PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity tonight to address a very important matter regarding the role of the Congress. And I would associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from New York (Mr. TONKO) about the role that this body plays in trade but also the role that this body plays in foreign policy and matters of diplomacy.

Every American watches the news each day. We all see the same stories, be it ISIS, be it terror around the globe. We know that we, as a nation, are engaged against a threat that, left unchecked, could cause great harm to our homeland and to American interests abroad. We also have heard in recent news the conversation about the Prime Minister of Israel addressing our Nation.

We have seen the President's negotiations with Cuba, the President's negotiations with Iran, and it begs the question: What is the role of Congress in all of these matters, in these matters of foreign policy and foreign affairs?

So I appreciate the opportunity tonight to discuss a view of our side of the aisle and many in this Congress. I will be joined by my colleague from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) shortly to specifically talk about the role that Congress provides in setting the direction of our Nation's foreign policy.

This body is a coequal branch. We are established under article I of the Constitution, just as the administration is established under article II. We are coequal branches.

This body, most every American knows, has the authority to declare war. This body does, this Congress does. We fund our diplomatic activities. We fund our military activities. We authorize the use of military force, as was affirmed by the President today in sending such a request to this body to ask for the constitutional affirmation of this body, of this Congress. And we do so routinely.

So when we come across events where sometimes people question why Congress would inject itself into matters of national security, into matters of foreign affairs, let's revisit why and the important role that Congress has served.

This body, this Congress rejected the President's negotiation of the Treaty of Versailles in 1919 and 1920. This body rejected the President's negotiation of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty in 1999. This body did that, reflecting the will of our constituents, of this Nation. This body, very importantly, investigated the Iran-Contra affair. This body investigated the intelligence activities related to 9/11. This body investigated the events of 2011 in Libya.

We have the authority of the purse as well, as spending originates in this body. We have used that authority to limit the transfer of detainees at Guantanamo, over the objection of the President.

We have used the constitutional authority of this body in matters of foreign aid and, at times, withholding foreign aid. Following the capture of Osama bin Laden and questions about Pakistan's role, this body responded by putting restrictions on that foreign aid. And, yes, this body provides billions to Israel as a matter of not only protecting the security of Israel but furthering our national security in the Middle East.

So it is appropriate then to raise questions very respectfully and in a way that reflects our constitutional responsibility of the President's decisions at times. We are one Nation. We are united in providing for the security of our country, but sometimes we have different ideas. And it is okay to raise questions on the President's decisions.

Consider the President's recent actions and the concerns of this body

over the negotiations to return Bowe Bergdahl that involved the release of five prisoners from Guantanamo, in contravention of a law passed by this Congress and signed by the President. He provided no notice of that.

We know that this President sent a secret letter to the Supreme Leader of Iran during a time of critical negotiations that many of us have concerns about and during a time when many of us have asked for additional sanctions on Iran, not fewer sanctions.

We know this President has attempted to negotiate with the Castro regime to normalize relations in Cuba.

We know that the President sent a message to Putin just before his last election, saying, If you just give me time and wait until after the election, I will have more flexibility. He delivered that message to the Russian President.

So it is okay that those of us in this body have raised those questions.

The President has the authority to do most of what I just said, although I object to his no notice in the Bowe Bergdahl case. But we also have the authority to provide oversight and to exert our role in this.

So how do we do that? We do that in three or four areas that are very ripe right now for conversation, for debate, and in a way that attracts the attention and the interest of our constituents, of the American people that send us here to represent them.

We saw today the President's request for an Authorization for Use of Military Force. I appreciate the President sending that request to this Congress. I believe we should have done that last September. I was one of a few Members of Congress who signed my name onto an Authorization for Use of Military Force that we introduced last Congress prior to the President sending his resolution to this body. I believe we had a constitutional responsibility to do that, as this body, to ask: Are we a nation at war? And if so, are we willing to incur the sacrifice necessary to win that war?

I am encouraged that the President today, during his press conference, said that by working with the Congress and by negotiating on the language that we can make this resolution even stronger. And I think we will see that. I hope we will see that in the coming weeks and the coming months.

The language in the Authorization for Use of Military Force that prohibits no enduring offensive ground troops I think causes much consternation for many in this body. Are we really going to pass a resolution that restricts the tools of our own warfare when it comes to providing for the national security of the United States?

The President will have his opportunity to make his case. This body will have our opportunity to make that case as well.

Limiting or sunseting the authorization to 3 years I think is something that we should begin to talk about. It

is okay for us to have to revisit a responsible Authorization for Use of Military Force in 3 years so that we don't find ourselves with a President years from now relying on an authorization that can be 10, 11, or 12 years old. We need to have that debate in this body and represent our view of how we respond to ISIS because the President's view has created much concern.

We saw at the National Prayer Breakfast that he suggested that the foundation of our response to ISIS needed to start with our own humility, by looking at our own history.

I appreciate the academic conversation the President would like to have on that. But that sentiment, in itself, compromises our own national security, in my opinion, because it suggests that we first must look inward before responding to what is a pending national security threat, a threat to our homeland and a threat to our national interests.

We need to have a debate whether or not we believe that an air campaign is sufficient. For the President to suggest that no ground troops will be required, that somehow that is a way of providing for the safety of our men and women in uniform, ignores the very risk of those who will be engaging in a dangerous air campaign and will continue to do so every day. And what happens if we lose one of our pilots? What happens if one of our pilots is captured, like the Jordanian pilot that was captured and, as we all saw, the tragic end that he met? Are we, as a nation, prepared to respond and rescue? Are we going to put boots on the ground? Should we put boots on the ground? That is a debate we need to have.

None of us are advocating for an extended war. None of us are advocating for putting men and women in harm's way. But if we are going to engage, as a nation, with our partners to defeat a threat to the United States, we need to have an honest debate about how we do that and not start the debate by restricting how we intend to do that.

□ 1915

We also have a role in the future of Guantanamo. I have introduced legislation, H.R. 654, which would prevent the President of the United States from handing over our naval base at Guantanamo to the Cuban regime without congressional approval. This is very different from the debate over the future of the prison and very different from the debate over the transfer of detainees.

Mr. Speaker, this simply says that we, as the United States, have a naval station 90 miles off our shore, and when Raul Castro demands that we return that to the Cuban people and pay reparations to the Cuban Government as terms of negotiation, my legislation says, No, Mr. President, you may not do that without coming to this body to ask for authorization. Certainly, I would not lend my vote to that.

I was pleased to hear testimony in the other body, in the Senate, when the administration said that is not a matter they would consider, but as we have seen in the President's negotiations in the past, it gives us reason to pause.

My legislation would simply codify the restriction that says that the Guantanamo Naval Base may not be returned to the Cuban people without congressional approval.

Finally, we do have a role in inviting a foreign leader to address this body, Prime Minister Netanyahu. It is fully appropriate as a coequal branch of this government to invite and to ask for Netanyahu to address us about his vision of security in the region, his vision of peace in the region—his vision of security—and also his vision of the current negotiations with Iran.

No Member of this body should shy away from receiving an address from the Prime Minister of Israel. We should stand resolute—Republicans, Independents, and Democrats—and be here for that address and not insult the Prime Minister and the people of Israel by turning it into a political game of boycotting an address by the Prime Minister.

We should be here showing our support for the security of Israel, for the people of Israel, and, yes, for the Prime Minister's leadership. This is appropriate. We can disagree with the administration without being disagreeable.

As we engage in oversight, Mr. Speaker, it is important that we continue this dialogue, and we do, as the President very respectfully suggested, and I want to thank him again for the tone of his remarks today when he said he hopes the AUMF can be better by working with the Congress.

I would ask for the same of the administration when our Speaker steps out and invites Prime Minister Netanyahu because it represents the interests of this body when it comes to Israel and to the current negotiation with Iran.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be joined this evening to discuss this further by a fine colleague of mine in this body, Representative RODNEY DAVIS from Illinois.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Well, thank you to the gentleman from Florida for actually putting this Special Order together tonight and also for yielding me time.

You brought up a great number of issues that I think are very important to many of us, regardless of whether or not you represent 800,000 constituents in Florida or—like me—800,000 constituents in central and southwestern Illinois.

I will tell you, DAVID, that the other night, I was cleaning out one of my son's pockets in his jacket because I was throwing it into the laundry, and I pulled out a copy of the Constitution that he got at school.

I flipped through it, and I reread article I, article II, article III, and the Bill

of Rights. You learn something new each time. What you don't forget is that our forefathers who created this great institution understood that it took equal powers. It took equal branches of government to produce the freedoms that we here in America sometimes take for granted.

It is exactly what you said about let's work with each branch of government. We can disagree without being disagreeable. You address so many issues. I would like to actually talk back and forth on some of those.

Let's start with the invitation to Prime Minister Netanyahu. We have a tremendous disagreement on whether or not the United States should unilaterally enter into negotiations with the terrorist State of Iran.

I worry. I worry what it means for America and what it means for our closest ally in the Middle East, Israel, if Iran finally was given access to a functional nuclear weapon. What would they do with that? Whom would they provide that technology to? It is something in a geopolitical sense that we have to be concerned about in our position as Members of Congress.

These are issues that we have to put a check and balance on the administration to ensure that we are working towards what is the common goal for our allies.

I think that Prime Minister Netanyahu's being invited to this great institution to come here to address the United States Congress, to address 435 Members of this House and many others, to talk about how we are working together as allies, I don't think that is an insult.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I say: What took so long? Why did it take the Speaker of the House to put the invitation out? Why did the administration continue to block this? These are the types of issues that we as an equal branch of government have to address in this body. That is why we are happy to talk about many of the other issues.

You mentioned Guantanamo Bay. I am a proud cosponsor of your bill that is going to ensure that this administration cannot negotiate away the United States' ownership of Guantanamo Bay, regardless of whether or not the President is going to—which I think is a terrible policy—regardless of whether or not the President is going to clear out Guantanamo Bay of the terrorists who are there because they want to hurt Americans.

I think we need to ensure that there is a law of the land that does not allow this administration to negotiate away a very important base in Cuba that protects Americans.

Mr. Speaker, these are the types of issues, foreign policy issues—ISIS is one that I know we will be able to discuss tonight and others—but I am happy to begin a discussion on whatever it is you think is most important when it comes to America's foreign policy and our ability to be that oversight branch, that equal branch to the executive branch.

Mr. JOLLY. I thank my colleague. Let's, for a moment, stay on the topic of Prime Minister Netanyahu.

One of the reasons we take to the floor is to make sure that the voices are heard from all over the political spectrum. As the media and some in this body have gained the attention of the media by suggesting that the Prime Minister shouldn't attend, it is important for those of us who believe he should to take time to discuss why that is.

Most people know and understand—but some people don't—the significance of our partnership with Israel and what it means in one of the most volatile regions of the world.

This is a nation that has committed to democracy, to peace, to freedom, to representation, and to security; and they are doing so in an incredibly volatile region. All that they have asked of the United States over the years is that we stand with them in their own courage to promote peace, security, and freedom of their own people.

I would say, as I mentioned earlier, for those who have chosen not to attend, I certainly respect that decision, but I think it sends a message that is wrong to say not just to the people of Israel, but to the Prime Minister himself.

Not only is there a political message trying to be delivered by those that don't attend, but there is also this notion that, somehow, those of us in this body better understand the internal politics in Israel better than the elected leaders.

Why should we not trust that Prime Minister Netanyahu understands what is best for his nation? Why should we try to suggest that we know better than Prime Minister Netanyahu what is right for Israel and for the people of Israel? To suggest otherwise is demeaning both to the Prime Minister, as well as to the people of Israel.

I look forward to the Prime Minister's address, and I think this body, as we make decisions both about Iran sanctions but also about our aid to the people of Israel, I think this body has an opportunity to learn from the Prime Minister and to understand the issue better as we begin to make decisions.

I look forward to the Prime Minister's address to this body.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Well, like my colleague, Mr. JOLLY, I look forward to the Prime Minister's address, too. It is really beyond what I thought serving as a Member of Congress we would see here, and it is the sheer pettiness of the fact that the Speaker of the House invited the Prime Minister and many decided to say they are going to boycott this.

Do you know what—boycott it. If that is your idea of your freedom of speech, go ahead. We will fill the seats. We will make sure that Prime Minister Netanyahu understands that America stands with him and his nation as our greatest allies in the Middle East.

When that happens, he will come here, he will be received with a reception that is worthy of the Prime Minister of Israel, and I am just honored to be able to sit in this room and to hear why our bilateral relationship is of the utmost importance.

Mr. Speaker, I wish we didn't have this pettiness here in this Congress because I think the American people are sick and tired of the infighting. I think they are wanting us to govern together.

This is just one more example that goes out to the American people that tells them that people in Washington in this institution can't get along. I hate to say it, but they are wrong on many issues because we do get along, but on this one, it is so important that we show respect to our greatest ally.

Mr. Speaker, I notice we have been joined by our colleague from California (Mr. VALADAO), who I think wants to participate in this discussion on Prime Minister Netanyahu also.

Mr. JOLLY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, a couple of years ago, I had the opportunity to go visit Israel and actually spend some time with Prime Minister Netanyahu. That was, for me, probably one of the most enlightening trips I have been on, to have the opportunity to actually see what they are experiencing there and to see how important our relationship is to the folks there in Israel, but also to us here in the U.S.

We learn so much from the technology that they use to protect their borders, to protect themselves from terrorists, and we see the situation that we have got going on with ISIS now today, and we need that relationship more than ever, something that can actually truly make a difference because we truly are under attack at all times.

We have got people around this world—and now, we are hearing today in committee, it was mentioned that there are a lot of people within our own borders today, so it truly is a scary time.

To have someone with the experience that Netanyahu has and to see what he has seen over the years and to bring that and share that with us here in our Chamber where we pass the laws, where we are here, sworn to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, but also the people here, and that is our number one priority, and to have the opportunity to have him speak to us, I think, is an honor.

Mr. Speaker, I am looking forward to that opportunity. I think it is something that will help all of us here in Congress truly understand what we are up against and what needs to be done. I think it is something that most of us are smart enough to attend. There are a few that choose not to, but I think that is going to be a very small group of people.

Again, Mr. JOLLY, I appreciate the opportunity.

Mr. JOLLY. I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

It can't be lost in this conversation about the pending address from the Prime Minister. As we mentioned, the security of Israel in a very volatile region, it is a region that is the center of much of the presence of ISIS.

As we often see the political debate, the TV commentary, and the radio commentary about how we define ISIS, the fact is that if we are not willing to define our enemy, we will never defeat our enemy. We know that we face a threat, an organization that has declared war on us, and we don't get to choose the threats we face as a nation. We certainly wish we could. We only get to choose how we respond to those threats.

The President's submittal of an AUMF request today is the right one. This body, I think, can have a very respectful debate about the terms of how we confront ISIS, about the authority, the authorization that we want to provide this administration for how he engages.

I think the most critical thing we can do, though, is not tie the hands of our men and women in uniform and the leadership of our Department of Defense as they make decisions how to execute our campaign against this radical organization.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am, again, so proud to be joined by my colleague from Florida and my colleague from California.

When we talk about ISIS, this is a true threat to Americans abroad. I have never in my lifetime seen such a savage organization who finds it entertaining to show the death of innocent civilians.

□ 1930

Let us also recognize that most of the civilians who have been killed by ISIS have been fellow Muslims. So it is not something that we here in America with our freedoms that we enjoy can comprehend. I think we have to do everything we can to eradicate them, to destroy them and ensure that they never get a foothold in any type of nation-state whatsoever because their plans will be to do one thing, and that is to kill Americans.

Part of our job as Members of Congress is to come here and make some pretty tough decisions. These are decisions that none of us, when we stood up to get sworn in in this institution, thought we would have to make, but they are decisions that the American people demand that we make. We are being demanded to ensure that America remains safe here in the homeland and Americans should remain safe abroad.

The President talks about a trajectory of peace. I don't know what he is looking at. It seems like a flat line of destruction to me. We have an opportunity now to put forth an Authorization for Use of Military Force, something I never wished that we would

vote on in this House, but we are forced to by the failures of the foreign policy coming out of this administration in dealing with ISIS.

I stood on this floor and I said I am willing to stand with the President, who told me this strategy of using air superiority and working with our allies on the ground was going to work. It is clearly not working. The last thing I wanted to do was stand here and offer up an opportunity for American Special Forces and ground forces to partner with allies to go in and defeat ISIS, but it may be the only chance we have.

And this Authorization for Use of Military Force, I like the fact that it may expire in 3 years. Let it be reauthorized. But the fact of the matter is we need the President to stand up and be the Commander in Chief. We can put any piece of paper in front of him and his administration that we want, but if he is not willing to do the job and be the Commander in Chief, to destroy, defeat, and ensure that America remains safe here and abroad, then he is not doing the job that he was elected to do.

We will do our job. We will pass an Authorization for Use of Military Force, and we will give the President the opportunity to fight ISIS, but we have to make sure that our men and women in the military are the ones who are put at the forefront of what matters most, and the only thing that we should consider is that the American military, our soldiers, our men and women who fight for our freedoms, should be given the opportunity to do what they are trained to do.

Let's not play politics with destroying ISIS. Let's actually allow our men and women in uniform to do just that. They can do it. They have done it throughout history, and that is exactly what we need to continue to do in this institution. Let's work together. Let's make this happen.

Mr. JOLLY. I want to associate myself with my colleague's remarks and simply close with this. It is important to revisit the context of how we brought this up tonight. We are one nation. The President, the Congress, we are united as Americans, as elected officials of this country, to protect the national security of the United States.

The point of tonight's Special Order is that just as the President exercises his article II authority, this body also has a responsibility to exercise our article I authority, and that is okay. That is why we have the greatest republic that has ever been on the face of this Earth. Because we can have these debates in a constructive way between a President with one view of how to respond, a Congress with another, but know every day that we as a nation, the President and this body, are resolved to eradicate the threat of ISIS from the face of this Earth. We will do that.

As I mentioned, just as the President asks us to consider an authorization to use military force, we must also ask

the President to understand our interest in how this war to defeat ISIS is executed. And on issues of Iran, Cuba, and others, we will work together. We will have our differences and disagreements, but we remain one United States resolved to protect the security of our interests.

I look forward to a very healthy debate on these issues in the coming months.

I yield to Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I thank the gentleman again for organizing this opportunity.

I just want to remind all of our fellow colleagues, it is a privilege to serve in this great institution. These decisions that we will make will not be easy, but the decisions we make will be judged in history as to what happens here and what the future holds. Let's make sure that we make our forefathers and those who follow us proud to be Members of Congress. Let's do the right thing.

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

BORDER SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I come before this body today, again, to talk about the very important issue of border security.

My district is Arizona's Second Congressional District. I represent about 85 miles of the southern border. We have border residents and ranchers who every day are dealing with transnational criminal organizations that are trafficking drugs and people and weapons and money through their property, putting their lives at risk, often having them have to make difficult decisions, potentially life-and-death decisions.

As we stand today, this administration has done nothing to secure our border. This is a national security threat. It is a public safety threat. The people of southern Arizona need to be heard, and that is why I am organizing some time to address this issue.

I appreciate one of my colleagues, the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO), joining this conversation. This is a serious issue. We do have a bill, Secure Our Borders First Act. I am a cosponsor of the bill, and I believe it is an important bill that should unite this body to move forward and

address this issue. I don't want to play politics with it.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO).

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative MCSALLY. I had an opportunity to go to your home State a couple of weeks ago and spend some time with you on the border. I have spent quite a bit of time here in Washington over the last 2 years talking about immigration reform. I do believe that we have to fix the problem. We have to address the situation we have with immigration in general. But something that I learned a lot about on that trip which I knew before, until I really got to experience and see for myself, I didn't realize how bad the situation on the border was and what our border agents face on a day-to-day basis, with people coming in with tools that I happened to use in my shop when I am building stuff, saws and torches and different types of equipment, just to get through the fence. When you see the situation we have got with the types of drugs and the types of people crossing the border on a daily basis, it is truly a situation that has to be resolved and looked at in a totally different way.

Chairman MCCAUL came up with a piece of legislation to address this, going along the whole border in a piece-by-piece manner. It looks at each part of the border and how it needs to be addressed. From that tour and the time I spent on the border, I got to see how important it was; from the California portion in San Diego and how people are getting across the border and the type of tunnels they are digging to the type of aircraft that people are flying, the drones that you can buy for a couple thousand bucks online; and even down to your part of the border where we got to see people cutting through the fence and actually making ramps and driving over barriers that weren't able to be cut; down to Texas to the Rio Grande when we traveled the river and saw what the situation was there, where people can hide and how narrow that area is.

The bill that was introduced helps secure the border because it looks at each portion of the border separately and individually and addresses it as a problem in itself. It puts technology in those places where it can truly make a difference. That border with this legislation can actually be secured—as much as we possibly can. Then we can move on with the rest of what has to be done. Obviously, fixing our guest worker programs and fixing our visa programs and the type of legal immigration that we welcome in this country because this country was built on immigrants. But we want to make sure that we secure the border first.

I am thrilled to be here and spend some time with you this evening talking about such an important issue. I appreciate the invitation.

Ms. MCSALLY. Congressman VALADAO, I appreciate you coming to

visit my district. Twenty-one Members of this body came to southern Arizona to see what these border residents and ranchers are dealing with on a daily basis, to include our chairman, Chairman MCCAUL. I really appreciated your willingness to come see firsthand and listen to the ranchers and border residents.

We have men and women in uniform in our communities that are doing the best they can. But the strategy that they have been given in our sector is just not working, and they need some better tools and they need a better strategy so that we can use intelligence-driven operations, we can use technology where it works, we can have barriers where they work. Ideally, we need to be detecting the illegal activity of the cartels well south so that we are able to then monitor and either deter the breaches or intercept them as soon as possible when they come over the border.

Some of the additions that I added into the bill were to create a rapid reaction force so that they quickly intercept, and directing the Border Patrol to be patrolling at the border to the maximum extent possible. Right now there is a multilayered approach in these rural areas. It is called a Defense in Depth strategy. It relies on taking sometimes, what they say, hours to days to intercept illegal activity. The problem with that is, during those hours to days, these cartels are transiting over private property.

Whereas in the past, sometimes, these ranchers, look, they have always had a humanitarian heart. If they saw individuals who were coming over illegally to find work, if they needed water, they would help them and then they would call border security. But now they don't know who they are. As the numbers have gone down, the cartel activity, the drug mules, the potential violence, the violent history of the individuals who are apprehended have gone up. So they don't know who it is that is crossing their property right now.

Rancher Rob Krentz, in 2010, went out to help someone, and that is the last we have heard of him. He was murdered on his own property. They still don't know who did that as he was out there responding.

We have stories of individuals in my district. You have heard some of them. We hear more every single day where, generally speaking, they are on alert. They usually don't go out of their homes unless they are armed, and they often don't go out unless it is in daylight hours. So it is impacting their lives and their livelihood, and they are constantly dealing with cut fences and loose cattle or killed cattle and all of the implications that come with these cartels that are trafficking across their property and around their homes, like break-ins and other things that come with that.

So I really appreciate your willingness to come down and see that firsthand.

For those who are listening and watching, I want to make sure they know: Call your Congressman. This is a good bill. We have to get this thing passed. If we can't unite this body around securing our border, what can we unite around? This is something that we need to get done. It is what we have been asked to do. On our side of the aisle, as Republicans, we always hear our colleagues say to secure the border first. Well, this is an opportunity to do that. I stand today to support that bill again.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) to join the conversation.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank one of my newest colleagues, Congresswoman MARTHA MCSALLY, who has shown true leadership on this issue because it is personal. It is your district. Just like many issues that we face in the Midwest are issues that you and I will talk about but you don't have to experience, but these are issues that you see and we hear about. You see many cases where the border is not secure, where drug cartels are coming through private property. We in Illinois cannot imagine someone walking through our backyard hauling drugs and criminals. These are things that we don't experience, but we have to experience as Members of this institution because every vote we take impacts every single citizen in this great country.

I just am proud that you are willing to stand up and talk about the issues that matter most to this debate, and that is how we secure our borders, because once we do, we can fix our broken immigration system. We can fix the process that we already have, called the naturalization process, and ensure that we have a system that is going to work.

My fear, though, is that many in this debate, they don't want to see this problem fixed because they want to use it as a political hammer.

I will tell a personal story very quickly. I can remember doing one of my public meetings and having an organization come in and talk to me about their view of how we make our border more secure. As I was going to another public meeting, this organization decided to send members to my house and send the same message to my then 12-year-old son. Bullying tactics like that are not conducive to solving problems, not just in this institution but in this great country.

That is why I am so proud to be able to stand here with both of you today and talk about the issues that are important, and the fact that we are willing to talk about it and find solutions and begin our address towards making those solutions real is the reason why we came to this institution.

□ 1945

Thank you for your leadership, both of you, on many issues, especially this one. I hope, some day, I can follow in

the footsteps of my colleague from California and visit your district and see the same things he did.

Ms. MCSALLY. Well, you can come down any time. The door is open. We are ready to show anyone, really, from this body, so that they can see firsthand what we are dealing with.

I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois for his comments and his encouragement and his support to this bill in this initiative. We have got to find like-minded individuals to move this forward because that is what the American people are asking us to do.

When we were hosting the CODEL down at the Ladd ranch, Jack Ladd and John Ladd, just amazing and wonderful Americans and hardworking people who gave us their perspective, along with many other ranchers. If you remember, one of the ranchers said: Look, these mules are just trafficking through our neighborhoods, but they are going to yours.

Once they hit the highway and they are able to get around, they are moving on to Phoenix, they are moving over to California, they are moving up to Illinois. They are bringing their drugs to all over the United States. There is cartel presence in many of these States. This is a very sophisticated criminal organization. Even though it starts in my district, it is impacting everyone in the country, related to their presence in everybody's district.

This is the time. We have been talking about border security for a very long time, and there have been efforts. With putting up some of the additional barriers, we have seen the efforts and how that has delayed activity, for sure. We have seen how the San Diego sector has really done a fantastic job in order to go from what was literally just an open border to having much better control.

But this is a sophisticated organization, these cartels, and they adjust. What do they do? They adjusted into my sector. Even as we put up some barriers, it basically funneled them into these rural areas, so that these criminals were trafficking through the ranchers' neighborhoods and border residences.

Again, we were the highest sector since 1998 until last year, as far as the number of apprehensions, but as we said on the trip, we don't know what the denominator is.

If all we are doing is measuring the numerator of how many individuals we have caught or apprehended, but the Border Patrol does not have situational awareness to be able to see all activity and then intercept the activity, we don't even know what those numbers are.

We have got to have the political will now to address this very important issue, so that we can bring the promise home to the people who live in my community and then in the rest of the country.

This is not hard. This is a good bill. In our sector, it provides additional re-

sources, it provides additional technologies to increase the situational awareness. It holds Border Patrol and the senior appointees in Homeland Security accountable for securing the border, and it provides the resources and the capabilities that they need in order to gain situational awareness and operational control.

I have heard many of our colleagues—and if you all want to join on this discussion—say, Just build a fence, just build a fence. Look, we have built some fences in southern Arizona, and those fences and those vehicle barriers and the pedestrian fences, they are delaying activity, for sure.

What we have seen is these sophisticated cartels have got scouts on hilltops, they have got good communication devices, they have got incredible equipment, and they are across those fences. They either go over it, through it, or under it; and they do it in very fast time.

A barrier is certainly one element of a strategy in order to slow down the activity, but that is not the only answer. It is very costly, about \$5 million a mile for some of this fencing, so where it is appropriate, it definitely needs to be put up.

But if we don't actually have Border Patrol actively monitoring where the fence line is, using intelligence-driven operations, and then intercepting the activity, patrolling right at the border on the south of John Ladd's ranch, not on the north side, then we are still not going to be able to stop these breaches because they will happen.

For those who don't understand that, I welcome them to come to Arizona and see that.

I yield again to the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO), my colleague.

Mr. VALADAO. I appreciate the opportunity again.

But, no, that is something we hear about a lot in the district. Everybody just says: Build a fence, follow the existing law.

Most people don't know the technology out there. Like you said, they literally have scouts. They have got people every so often, every so many yards or 100 yards, whatever the distance, spotting where the Border Patrol agents are. They know everything about these Border Patrol agents.

I heard a story that one of the people crossing the border actually had a booklet with all the names, addresses, and the tendencies of each and every Border Patrol agent.

They knew if they chewed gum, if they chewed tobacco, if they read a book while they were sitting there. They knew how slow they drove from checkpoint to checkpoint. They knew everything about this person. They knew exactly how long they would have those openings to get across.

They knew how to dig a tunnel. There was a tunnel they found that was 90 feet underground, 700 yards long, and the only reason they found that wasn't

because of technology—because they don't have the technology to find that—it was because they found an informant that opened their mouth and told them where it was at, and they were able to stop that.

It is amazing how much is out there and what these people are doing, and anyone that believes just building a fence is going to work—they are going to go under it, they are going to buy those drones to go over it.

I heard stories of cannons that are literally firing bales of drugs over the top. There are so many opportunities out there. For anybody to believe that just enforcing the law the way it is written today, it will never work—it just won't—because the technology is out there.

If you ask any police officer on the street or any parent out there, you can't do everything the same you did 50 years ago because your children have way better technology to do stuff, our prisoners in our prison system have much more opportunity, and now, these folks have unbelievable amounts of technology out there to get across or to bring their drugs across.

Like you mentioned earlier, the problem has changed. What the folks in your district had mentioned to me was 20 years ago, 15 years ago, it was a large number of people—it was families, it was those that we see typically working on farms—who are out here just looking for an opportunity.

The folks coming across today are dangerous. They are cartels. They are trying to bring drugs. They are bringing problems into this country. A lot of times—like one of your constituents—someone's life was taken. It is a truly sad situation.

But it has to be addressed in a way that actually solves our problems. We don't just take votes here because of sending out a press release. We solve problems. Legislation that we introduce and that we pass and that we vote on has to solve problems for the American people. That is what we are responsible to do, and that is what I want to do.

So again, I thank you for the opportunity.

Ms. MCSALLY. Thank you. Again, I appreciate the gentleman from California. Thank you so much for your perspectives.

I agree. If anyone thinks, if anyone in this body thinks, let's just build a fence, I would invite you to please come to southern Arizona and see the doggy doors that are cut—even in California, the doggy doors, as they call them—that get cut out in less than 60 seconds and where individuals are still coming through.

So those barriers are helpful, but they are a speed bump. We are dealing with sophisticated organizations that are much more nimble than we are. When we come up with a different strategy, they are able to react much more quickly.

But we have got men and women in Border Patrol right now that if they

are able to detect any sort of activity, they just start tracking them sometimes by themselves, they are out there tracking them, without any situational awareness as to what they are tracking, who they are tracking, what do they have on them, are they armed, are they not armed, what is their intent.

Some of the other things in this bill actually help provide them with the situational awareness that they need. Some of it is bringing technologies back that we have used overseas so that we can just have motion sensing and know what is moving and what is not moving so we don't have to bother lining agents up on the border, but we can respond and react with intelligence.

Mr. DAVIS, would you like to join us again and provide some more comments? I yield to you.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Absolutely. And it relates to the fact that sometimes the policies that are put in place through administrative rules or by this body hinder our ability to achieve the goals that Americans want us to achieve.

We could build fencing, but you know there are many times people will find a way around that fence. And that doesn't mean let's not do it, but what it means is let's also enact policies that will not hinder our Border Patrol agents from actually doing their job.

One of my colleagues from Illinois flies National Guard duty over the southern border and talks about how different groups will overwhelm a single Border Patrol agent. And understand that a majority of those who are trying to cross into America will get in. Some won't, but a majority will. And it is worth the risk to many.

Frankly, if we weren't living in this great country, we would probably want to be here too. This is a wonderful country that is the beacon of hope for so many throughout this globe.

But we also have to take into consideration the impact that it has in this country. And we need to make sure that we put policies in place that allow our border to be secure by making sure our Border Patrol agents have the tools and the ability to address the problem that both of you have addressed so well this evening.

So thank you again for being here. Thank you again for being willing to stand up, because it is not an easy issue to talk about. It is not an easy issue because it has become so politicized. But I commend you for that because we have to stand up and take courage. We have to take courageous stances, and we have to take courageous votes that may not make all of our constituents happy. But these are opportunities to lead, and that is exactly why we all came to Congress.

Again, thank you to my colleague.

Ms. MCSALLY. Thank you, Mr. DAVIS, for your kind words and your support.

I come from a very diverse district and a very split district. I won by 167

votes to get here. So we are a very diverse and split district.

But I will tell you, this is a unifying issue, even in my district. When I look at the things that are going to unify us, it is making sure that we are safe and secure and have economic opportunity. Throughout my district, people agree we need to secure the border.

Now, they also want to look for thoughtful solutions to modernize and revamp our legal immigration system so that those who want to come here to work and are going to contribute to our economy have a legal way to do that. We need to work on those challenges as well. As we talk about it in southern Arizona, we need a high fence and a wide gate, sort of metaphorically.

What that means is, let's focus our border security on transnational criminal organizations and the public safety and national security threat, but we also need to make sure we have got good economic development and opportunities for individuals to come here legally, and also for commerce to be able to flow, which is a separate issue. They often get lumped in together and oftentimes these issues get hijacked by others who have other intentions that are trying to politicize it.

But I think every American—Democrat, Independent, Republican—can agree that they want their families to be safe and secure from transnational criminal organizations. I can't find anyone who doesn't agree to that.

So why is this not an issue that would unify this body? Why is this not an issue that we could work together on within our party and then across to the other side of the aisle to actually get the job done, to use commonsense solutions, to give the situational awareness, the tools they need, to hold Homeland Security accountable, to secure our border once and for all, direct a better strategy sector by sector, to provide that situational awareness and operational control?

I strongly support this bill. I appreciate the leadership of Chairman MCCAUL, my colleagues who have joined me here tonight, and others who have gotten behind this bill. And I want to urge those who are watching and listening to please call your Congressman, tell him to support the Secure Our Borders First Act, and let's get this thing through the House, through the Senate, and signed by the President.

This is not time to play politics with border security. The residents and the ranchers in my community cannot wait any longer in order to have that fear go away so that they can feel like they can sleep well at night and their livelihood is not at stake and their families are not at risk. We owe it to them to take action.

Let's figure out how to unify, work through any sort of solutions that we need to in order to get to a commonsense agreement, and let's pass this bill.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 12, 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:

403. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's interim rule — Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Relaxation of the Handling Regulation for Area No. 3 [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0092; FV15-948-1 IR] received February 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

404. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's interim rule — Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of the Saleable Quantity and Allotment Percentage for Class 3 (Native) Spearmint Oil for the 2014-2015 Marketing Year [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0087; FV14-985-1B IR] received February 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

405. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oranges and Grapefruit Grown in Lower Rio Grande Valley in Texas; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0054; FV14-906-3 FIR] received February 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

406. A letter from the Under Secretary, Rural Development, Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Rural Development Regulations — Update to FmHA References and to Census References (RIN: 0570-AA30) received February 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

407. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's annual report listing all repairs and maintenance performed on any covered Navy vessel in any shipyard outside the United States or Guam during Fiscal Year 2014, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7310; to the Committee on Armed Services.

408. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Community Planning and Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's Major interim rule — Housing Trust Fund [Docket No.: FR-5246-I-03] (RIN: 2506-AC30) received February 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

409. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the De-

partment's final rule — Annual Funding Notice for Defined Benefit Plans (RIN: 1210-AB18) received February 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

410. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Fluorescent Lamp Ballasts [Docket No.: EERE-2009-BT-TP-0016] (RIN: 1904-AB99) received February 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

411. A letter from the Deputy Director — ODRM, CDC/NIOSH, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Closed-Circuit Escape Respirators; Extension of Transition Period [Docket No.: CDC-2015-0004; NIOSH-280] (RIN: 0920-AA60) received January 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

412. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Washington; Redesignation to Attainment for the Tacoma-Pierce County Nonattainment Area and Approval of Associated Maintenance Plan for the 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Matter Standard [EPA-R10-OAR-2014-0808; FRL-9922-81-Region 10] received February 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

413. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Transportation Conformity and Conformity of General Federal Actions [EPA-R06-OAR-2011-0938; FRL-9922-73-Region 6] received February 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

414. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; North Carolina; Inspection and Maintenance Program Updates [EPA-R04-OAR-2013-0772; FRL-9922-42-Region 4] received February 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

415. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Difenconazole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0151; FRL-9920-98] received February 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

416. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Flutriafol; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0482; FRL-9922-06] received February 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

417. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: Extension of the Reformulated Gasoline Program to Maine's Southern Counties [EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0283; FRL-9921-82-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS19) received February 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

418. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's

final rule — Revision to the Arizona State Implementation Plan; Nogales Nonattainment Area; Fine Particulate Matter Emissions Inventories [EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0450; FRL-9922-74-Region 9] received February 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

419. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Placer County Air Pollution Control District and San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0731; FRL-9921-37-Region 9] received February 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

420. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the Clean Air Act Section 110 Submission Requirements for State Implementation Plans and Notice of Availability of an Option for Electronic Reporting [EPA-HQ-OAR-2015-0045; FRL-9922-54-OAR] received February 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

421. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Silverton, Texas) Station KXDJ(FM), Spearman, Texas [MB Docket No.: 14-156] (RM-11725) (File No.: BPH-20140519AHY) received February 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

422. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 14-55, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance to the Netherlands, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

423. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revisions to the Unverified List (UVL) [Docket No.: 141104925-4925-01] (RIN: 0694-AG35) received February 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

424. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — U.S.-India Bilateral Understanding: Additional Revisions to the U.S. Export and Reexport Controls Under the Export Administration Regulations [Docket No.: 130405339-3339-01] (RIN: 0694-AF72) received January 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

425. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Russian Sanctions: Licensing Policy for the Crimea Region of Ukraine [Docket No.: 141218999-4999-01] (RIN: 0694-AG43) received February 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

426. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-114, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

427. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's Annual Performance Report (APR) for Fiscal Years 2014-

2016 and the Annual Performance Plan, pursuant to Public Law 111-352; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

428. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's fiscal year 2014 Performance and Accountability Report, prepared in accordance with OMB Circular A-136 and part 6 of Circular A-11; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

429. A letter from the Executive Resources Program Manager, Small Business Administration, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

430. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; List of Authorized Fisheries and Gear [Docket No.: 130904784-4999-02] (RIN: 0648-BD67) received February 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

431. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Using Hook-and-Line Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 130925836-4174-02] (RIN: 0648-XD654) received February 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

432. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's Fiscal Year 2014 report to Congress on H-1B Petitions, pursuant to Public Law 105-277, div. C, title IV, section 416(c); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

433. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting a status report on the Bureau of Prisons' compliance with the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997, pursuant to Public Law 105-33; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

434. A letter from the Under Secretary for Policy, Department of Transportation, transmitting a letter regarding the Department's response to the National Transportation Safety Board's 2015 Most Wanted List, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 1135(e)(1); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

435. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Attorney General's first quarterly report of FY 2015 on the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994, pursuant to Public Law 110-389; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Veterans' Affairs.

436. A letter from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's Congressional Justification of Budget Estimates for Fiscal Year 2016, including the Performance Plan for the year, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 231f(f); Public Law 93-445, title I, section 416; jointly to the Committees on Appropriations, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Ways and Means.

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. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. POLIS, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 860. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to amend the process by which students with certain special circumstances apply for Federal financial aid; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 861. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. FARENTHOLD (for himself and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 862. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide that the first sale doctrine applies to any computer program that enables a machine or other product to operate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 863. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify the treatment of seasonal positions for purposes of the employer shared responsibility requirement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 864. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prohibit the exclusion of individuals from service on a Federal jury on account of sexual orientation or gender identity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 865. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to limit the liability of health care professionals who volunteer to provide health care services in response to a disaster; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. STEWART, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. TIPPTON, Mr. SALMON, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. HUELSKAMP):

H.R. 866. A bill to achieve domestic energy independence by empowering States to control the development and production of all forms of energy on all available Federal land; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BARR (for himself, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. FINCHER):

H.R. 867. A bill to exempt the natural aging process in the determination of the production period for distilled spirits under section 263A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEWART (for himself and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 868. A bill to provide for coordination between the TRICARE program and eligibility for making contributions to a health savings account, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 869. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to broaden the special rules for certain governmental plans under section 105(j) to include plans established by political subdivisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 870. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to treat Puerto Rico as a State for purposes of chapter 9 of such title relating to the adjustment of debts of municipalities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 871. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to direct the Bureau of Prisons to provide certain voting information to Federal prisoners upon their release from prison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITTMAN (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 872. A bill to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe-Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 873. A bill to promote energy efficiency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HULTGREN (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. SWALLOW of California, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 874. A bill to amend the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 to improve the high-end computing research and development program of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. CUELLAR:

H.R. 875. A bill to provide for alternative financing arrangements for the provision of certain services and the construction and maintenance of infrastructure at land border ports of entry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Judiciary, Homeland Security, 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. DOGGETT (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana):

H.R. 876. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require hospitals to provide certain notifications to individuals classified by such hospitals under observation status rather than admitted as inpatients of such hospitals; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (for herself, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. VELA):

H.R. 877. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (for herself, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. VELA):

H.R. 878. A bill to provide for the authorization of border, maritime, and transportation security responsibilities and functions in the Department of Homeland Security and the establishment of United States Customs and Border Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. GUINTA:

H.R. 879. A bill to repeal the "Cadillac Tax" on middle class Americans' health plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 880. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify and make permanent the research credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. JONES, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 881. A bill to prohibit certain nutrition rules with respect to foods sold at schools as a fundraiser; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. FARR, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KIND, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SIREN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 882. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to improve environmental literacy to better prepare students for postsecondary education and careers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 883. A bill to provide emergency funding for port of entry personnel and infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Appropriations, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. RIBBLE (for himself, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. EMMER, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. KIND, Mr. KLINE, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 884. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to reissue final rules relating to listing of the gray wolf in the Western Great Lakes and Wyoming under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. BASS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DENT, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 885. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTERMAN (for himself, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BLUM, Mr. HILL, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. CRAWFORD):

H.R. 886. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to permit States to impose workforce requirements for individuals made eligible for medical assistance under the amendments made by the Affordable Care Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 887. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to the treatment of patient encounters in ambulatory surgical centers in determining meaningful EHR use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. CAPUANO:

H.R. 888. A bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to require certain systemically important entities to account for the financial benefit they receive as a result of the expectations on the part of shareholders, creditors, and counterparties of such entities that the Government will shield them from losses in the event of failure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 889. A bill to amend chapter 97 of title 28, United States Code, to clarify the exception to foreign sovereign immunity set forth in section 1605(a)(3) of such title; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLAWSON of Florida:

H.R. 890. A bill to correct the boundaries of the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System Unit P16; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CUELLAR:

H.R. 891. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 141 Paloma Drive in Floresville, Texas, as the "Floresville Veterans Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 892. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to prohibit the paying of premium subsidies on policies based on the actual market price of an agricultural commodity at the time of harvest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. ASHFORD):

H.R. 893. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (for himself, Mr. LANCE, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. TONKO, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. DENT):

H.R. 894. A bill to extend the authorization of the Highlands Conservation Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on 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 Ms. GABBARD (for herself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. TAKAI):

H.R. 895. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 regarding Native Hawaiian education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GIBBS:

H.R. 896. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify when the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency has the authority to prohibit the specification of a defined area, or deny or restrict the use of a defined area for specification, as a disposal site under section 404 of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GIBBS:

H.R. 897. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on 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. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 898. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the equalization of the excise tax on liquefied natural gas and liquefied petroleum gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 899. A bill to require the country of origin of certain special immigrant religious workers to extend reciprocal immigration treatment to nationals of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LABRADOR (for himself, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. COOK, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 900. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide for congressional and State approval of national monuments and restrictions on the use of national monuments; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 901. A bill to prohibit accessing pornographic web sites from Federal computers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. NEAL (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms.

DELAURO, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. WELCH, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KIND, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. RUSH, Mr. KEATING, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Ms. ESTY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 902. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make improvements in the earned income tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 903. A bill to require notification of individuals of breaches of personally identifiable information through Exchanges under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 904. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of designating the study area as the Black Metropolitan National Heritage Area in the State of Illinois, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. THORNBERRY (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. LANCE):

H.R. 905. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the equalization of the excise tax on liquefied natural gas and per energy equivalent of diesel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 906. A bill to modify the efficiency standards for grid-enabled water heaters; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. McNERNEY:

H.J. Res. 31. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding the permissible sources of funding for elections for public office and State ballot measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H. Res. 104. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should provide Congress with a detailed deployment and troop commitment plan prior to approval for authorization to commit United States Armed Forces to fight the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE (for himself and Mr. WALBERG):

H. Res. 105. A resolution calling for the protection of religious minority rights and freedoms worldwide; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. LANCE):

H. Res. 106. A resolution supporting quality of life for prostate cancer patients; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and

Means, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. Res. 107. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the third week in October as National School Bus Safety Week and for the designation of Wednesday of that week as National School Bus Drivers Appreciation Day; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

2. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Ohio, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 54, urging the Congress to continue the full funding and production of the F-35; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Ohio, relative to Senate Resolution No. 410, urging the Department of Commerce to conduct a thorough investigation into unfair trade practices of foreign glass manufacturers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Ohio, relative to Substitute House Resolution No. 283, urging the Congress and the Department of Defense to protect and uphold the religious and free speech rights of military service members; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs.

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. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 860.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 861.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 862.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section 8, Clause 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. RENACCI:

H.R. 863.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

Within the Enumerated Powers of the U.S. Constitution, Congress is granted the power to law and collect taxes. This provision grants Congress the authority over this particular piece of legislation.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 864.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment XIV, Section 1

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 865.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 866.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Tenth Amendment stating that, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." and

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 providing that "Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States. . . ."

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 867.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution: Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. STEWART:

H.R. 868.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 869.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Clause I of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 870.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to establish uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the United States Constitution; to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution such power, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution; and to make rules and regulations respecting the U.S. territories, as enumerated in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 871.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the United States Constitution related to general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 872.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress with the power to regulate commerce and relations between the United States and Indian tribes, and to pass all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, as well as all other Power vested by the Constitution.

By Mr. McKINLEY:

H.R. 873.

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. HULTGREN:

H.R. 874.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, to provide for the common defense and general welfare;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper,

By Mr. CUELLAR:

H.R. 875.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS

CLAUSE 18

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 876.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H.R. 877.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1; and Article 1, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H.R. 878.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1; and Article 1, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GUINTA:

H.R. 879.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII Clause I: The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

Article I Section VII Clause III: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among several States, and with Indian Tribes;

Article I Section VII Clause XVIII: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 880.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which gives Congress the "power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises . . ."

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 881.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 882.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause.

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 883.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 884.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 885.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Fifteenth Amendment, Section 2 Section 1: The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the U.S. or by any state on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

By Mr. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 886.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 1

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 887.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 888.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Sec. 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. CHABOT:

H.R. 889.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this legislation is based is found in article I, section 8, clause 9; article III, section 1, clause 1; and article III, section 2, clause 2, of the Constitution, which grant Congress authority over federal courts.

By Mr. CLAWSON of Florida:

H.R. 890.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States

By Mr. CUELLAR:

H.R. 891.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS

CLAUSE 18

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 892.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The ability to regulate interstate commerce pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 893.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority for this bill is pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 894.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 895.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, also known as the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. GIBBS:

H.R. 896.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3 (related to regulation of Commerce among the several States)

By Mr. GIBBS:

H.R. 897.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the Constitutional authority for this legislation in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, that grants Congress the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested by Congress in the Constitution of the United States or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 898.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 899.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LABRADOR:

H.R. 900.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation has been written pursuant to Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2, which gives Congress the authority "To dispose or and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 901.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"The Congress shall have the Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or Department or Officer thereof."—Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 902.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I and the 16th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 903.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, which states that Congress shall have the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states . . ."

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 904.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 905.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 906.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.J. Res. 31.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the U.S. Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 9: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
 H.R. 25: Mr. HENSARLING.
 H.R. 27: Mr. HENSARLING.
 H.R. 38: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
 H.R. 124: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 169: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
 H.R. 173: Mr. HENSARLING.
 H.R. 174: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
 H.R. 178: Mr. BYRNE and Mr. POSEY.
 H.R. 188: Mr. WELCH, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. NEAL.
 H.R. 198: Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 204: Mr. ISSA.
 H.R. 210: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
 H.R. 232: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Mr. McDERMOTT.
 H.R. 270: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.
 H.R. 280: Mr. COFFMAN.
 H.R. 317: Mr. WALZ.
 H.R. 353: Mr. RIBBLE.
 H.R. 393: Ms. GABBARD.
 H.R. 402: Mr. HILL, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
 H.R. 431: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. SCALISE, and Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 443: Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 445: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 448: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 452: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 456: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 465: Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 471: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 472: Mr. NUGENT and Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 486: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 508: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 519: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 528: Mr. POSEY, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 529: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 537: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 540: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 543: Mr. HENSARLING and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 546: Mr. NUNES, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 555: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 556: Mr. SABLAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 560: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 571: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 572: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. YODER, and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 577: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. JONES, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 592: Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 594: Mr. TROTT, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 595: Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 598: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 601: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BOST, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 603: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 612: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. COLE, Mr. TROTT, and Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 622: Mr. BARTON and Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 633: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 638: Mr. JONES, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 650: Mr. NUGENT and Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 654: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BARR, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 667: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 676: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 681: Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 708: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 721: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 731: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 742: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 746: Mr. COHEN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. FARR, and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 751: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 756: Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 766: Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 767: Mr. DENT and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 782: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 789: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 793: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FLEISCHMANN and Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 794: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 800: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 801: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 803: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. BABIN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 814: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 818: Mr. ROSS and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 842: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 845: Mr. RIBBLE, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 850: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 855: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 858: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.J. Res. 9: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.J. Res. 25: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. WITTMAN.

H. Res. 14: Mr. SANFORD, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. DOGGETT.

H. Res. 15: Mr. COSTA.

H. Res. 28: Ms. MENG, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. DEUTCH.

H. Res. 54: Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H. Res. 62: Mr. PAULSEN.

H. Res. 67: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Res. 93: Mr. DEUTCH.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Clarksville, Tennessee, relative to Resolution 20-2014-15, supporting the maintenance of current troop levels at Fort Campbell; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5. Also, a petition of the City of Port Townsend, Washington, relative to Resolution No. 14-058, designating City shorelines as a Maritime Heritage Area; to the Committee on Natural Resources.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2015

No. 23

Senate

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

PRAYER

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

Eternal Spirit, the giver of every good and perfect gift, we are sinful people seeking salvation. We are lost people seeking direction. We are doubting people seeking faith. Teach us, O God, the way of salvation. Show us the path to meaningful life. Reveal to us the steps of faith.

Today use the Members of this body as instruments of Your glory. Quicken their hearts and purify their minds. Broaden their concerns and strengthen their commitments. Show them duties left undone. Remind them of promises unkept and reveal to them tasks unattended. Lord, lead them to a deeper experience with You.

And, Lord, please comfort the loved ones of Kayla Jean Mueller.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to H.R. 240.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows: Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 5, H.R. 240, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

CLAY HUNT SAV ACT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, last night I joined Members of both parties to recognize the latest bipartisan achievement for the American people.

The Clay Hunt SAV Act, which will provide important support to our Nation's veterans, passed the House and Senate with overwhelming bipartisan support. It is on its way to President Obama's desk, and I am confident he will sign it.

KEYSTONE BILL

Mr. President, today the House of Representatives is expected to pass yet another bipartisan bill for him to sign, the Keystone jobs bill. It is just common sense. That is why this bipartisan legislation already passed the Senate with support from both parties. That is why labor unions support it, and that is why the American people support it. Americans know construction of this infrastructure project would pump billions into the economy and support thousands of good jobs. They also know America could achieve this with, as the President's own State Department has indicated, minimal environmental impact.

Americans are urging President Obama not to interfere in the review process for political reasons any longer. Americans are urging the President to finally heed scientific conclusions his own State Department already reached. Let American workers build this infrastructure project. Sign this jobs and infrastructure bill.

Powerful special interests may be demanding that the President veto Keystone jobs, but we hope he will not. If the President does ultimately bow to these special interest demands, that is a discussion we can have then. But either way Americans should know this:

The new Congress will not stop pursuing good ideas.

This new majority is committed to refocusing Washington on the concerns of the middle class, and the passage of bipartisan bills such as Keystone, Clay Hunt, and Keystone jobs shows we are doing just that.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mr. President, on a different matter, Democrats are blocking Homeland Security funding in order to defend Executive overreach the President has said himself, on many different occasions, he didn't have. As I indicated yesterday, this is the reason the Senate can't move forward, so it needs to come to an end. This is the simplest and most obvious way it can.

Many Democrats previously indicated opposition to the kinds of overreach described by President Obama himself as unwise and unfair. So all they have to do is back up those words with some action. If Democrats claim to be against overreach and claim to be for funding the critical activities of the Department of Homeland Security, then there is no reason for them to continue their party's filibuster.

So vote with us to allow the Senate to actually debate Homeland Security funding instead. We have already offered a fair and open debate that would allow for amendments from both parties. If the bill needs to be amended, that is when it could be, when we actually get on the bill and offer amendments.

This is about Democrats being confronted with a choice: filibuster funding for Homeland Security to protect overreach of President Obama himself, referred to as "ignoring the law" or allow the Senate to debate, vote, and amend the very funding they claim to want.

AUMF FUNDING

Mr. President, one final and critically important matter. This morning we received the President's proposed authorization for the use of military

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S907

force against ISIL and its affiliates. It was clear from the outset that a successful military campaign to defeat ISIL would require a multiyear effort, so it is certainly in order for Congress to debate an authorization such as this.

Because Congress must meet its responsibility to decide whether our military should use force, the Senate will review the President's request thoughtfully. Individual Senators and committees of jurisdiction will review it carefully, and they will listen carefully to the advice of military commanders as they consider the best strategy for defeating ISIL. Because this decision demands such serious consideration, I want our Members to have an early opportunity to discuss the President's request. That is why later today our conference, the Republican conference, will meet for a discussion led by Senators CORKER and MCCAIN.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAUL). The Assistant Democratic leader is recognized.

NECESSARY ABSENCE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I am standing in today for the Democratic leader, Senator REID, who is absent for a medical procedure. He was with us yesterday and will be returning after the break. We wish him a speedy recovery. He has gone through quite a bit after the accident that he endured on January 1, and we wish him the very best and quick recovery.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mr. President, we are going to have a chance to do something this week that is important, to fund the Department of Homeland Security. This was a department created after 9/11 for obvious purposes. We never want America to be vulnerable again to that type of extremist terrorist attack and all the death and destruction it brought with it.

So on a bipartisan basis we created this Department. Twenty-two different agencies were merged into one so we would have a common effort to keep America safe and secure, and the Department of Homeland Security has done a great job. Secretary Jeh Johnson, who is currently the leader of that agency, is an extraordinarily gifted, talented man, and he is doing his best to keep America safe.

We should do everything we can to keep it safe, too, and that means the Senate and the House of Representatives need to do their job when it comes to the Department of Homeland Security.

As everyone knows, when we talked about funding the agencies of government this past December after the election, there was only one agency, one department, which the Republicans singled out and said we will not properly fund this one department.

What was it? The Department of Homeland Security. I don't understand this.

If the Department of Homeland Security has the singular responsibility of keeping America safe, why would we risk the security and safety of America by not properly funding the Department? But the House Republicans insisted on that position and Senate Republicans backed them up.

Why would they jeopardize America's security over the funding of DHS? So the Republicans could engage in a political debate over President Obama's immigration policy. It is an important debate. It is a worthy debate. There is no reason we shouldn't engage in this debate. But why would the Republicans insist that this debate be at the expense of funding the Department of Homeland Security? It doesn't make any sense. In fact, we are running a great risk by what we call continuing resolutions instead of regular budgetary appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security.

Secretary Johnson has talked to us about what is going to happen if we don't properly fund the Department of Homeland Security. There are grants that are given through DHS to fire departments and police departments across America to train their personnel, to upgrade their equipment, and to be ready, God forbid, for the next challenge that faces America.

Yet the Republicans insist on stopping that grantmaking to the local police departments in your community and mine—and to the fire departments—so they can engage in a debate with the President over immigration.

What is it about the President's immigration policy that infuriates the Republicans? Could it be that the President has said he wants to prioritize deportations in America so that we, in fact, are going to deport those who are the most dangerous in the United States? I hope that is not it because the President's position is something most Americans would endorse, heartily endorse.

Could it be they object to the President's proposal that those who are here undocumented—parents of American citizens and parents of legal residents—that those who are here undocumented step forward, pay their taxes, submit themselves to a criminal background check in order to have a 2-year temporary work permit? I doubt many Americans would disagree with that. It would mean these tax-paying workers would be checked, and if there is any problem, deported.

The Republicans want to stop that. They disagree with the President's Executive order. I think we ought to have that debate but not at the expense of funding the Department of Homeland Security, but that is their position.

So in 16 days the Department of Homeland Security runs out of money. The Department entrusted with keeping America safe from terrorism runs out of money.

What are we going to do about it? There is something very easy we can turn to. It is on the Senate Calendar of

Business. It is on every desk on the floor or available to every Senator: S. 272, a bill introduced by Senators SHAHEEN and MIKULSKI to make the appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security to give them the budget they need to protect America. It takes out all of the immigration riders insisted on by the House and takes us down to the basics.

So are we going to fund the Department of Homeland Security?

Well, the Republican majority leader has insisted he will stand in the way of funding DHS unless we can get into this political debate about immigration. I think that is shortsighted.

Senator REID came to the floor a few days ago and said: We are prepared to engage in this debate on immigration—but not at the expense of the Department of Homeland Security. We have had three votes on the floor of the Senate and this effort by the Republicans has fallen woefully short in every single vote to receive the 60 votes necessary.

So why does the majority leader insist on sticking with this approach? It is hard to explain. It could be that within his own caucus—and maybe he personally thinks that the efforts of the President to protect certain people from deportation are just plain wrong.

One of those efforts is one I heartily support myself. It is called DACA. DACA was an Executive order issued by the President in 2012. In that Executive order the President said those who are eligible under the DREAM Act would be given protection from deportation.

The DREAM Act was a piece of legislation I introduced 14 years ago which said: If someone was brought to America as an infant, a toddler, a small child, and they stayed in America, had no serious criminal issue, finished high school, and they were prepared to enlist in the military or go on to college, they would get a path to legalization. That is what the DREAM Act said. It has never become law.

But these young people, we estimate 2 million nationwide, are left in limbo. They came to America, were brought to America at an early age, grew up in America, went to American schools, pledged allegiance to our American flag, sang our national anthem, and believed they were Americans. Then they were told, sorry, but you don't have the necessary documentation. You are not here legally.

So they are left in limbo. They have nowhere to turn. Under the laws of the United States they are subject to deportation. President Obama said on a 2-year basis we will protect these young people from deportation. They will have a background check, they will pay their fees, and on a 2-year basis they can live in America without fear of deportation and work in America or go to school in America. Those are the DREAMers. That is the DACA provision which the Republicans are opposing in the House of Representatives. It

is the provision which the majority leader insists we vote on before we can fund the Department of Homeland Security.

I think it is instructive to introduce these DREAMers to Members of the Senate who may not know who they are, and I want to introduce two of them today: Nelson and John Magdaleno. Nelson is on the left in the suit, and John is on the right on his graduation today. They were brought to the United States from Venezuela when Nelson was 11 and John 9 years old. They were both honor students at Lakeside High School in Atlanta, GA. In high school John was the fourth highest officer and commander of the Air Honor Society in his Junior ROTC.

Nelson and John both went to the Georgia Institute of Technology, one of the most selective engineering schools in America. In 2012 Nelson graduated from Georgia Tech with honors and a major in computer engineering.

President Obama established the DACA Program shortly after Nelson graduated from Georgia Tech. Thanks to DACA, Nelson has been working since 2012 as a computer engineer for a Fortune 500 semiconductor corporation.

John also received DACA in 2012, while he was still a student at Georgia Tech. He then worked for 2 years as a researcher in a biomedical engineering lab at Georgia Tech, researching glaucoma, one of the leading causes of blindness.

In 2014 John graduated from Georgia Tech with a major in chemical and biomedical engineering and with the highest honors. He is now working as a process engineer with a Fortune 500 company.

Nelson Magdaleno wrote me a letter, and here is what he said:

To me DACA means an opportunity to be able to live my dreams and contribute to society in ways that I could not have imagined. DACA means one of my life goals, owning my own company, could be a possibility in the future. DACA means a chance. DACA means the American Dream.

His brother John wrote, and here is what he said:

I consider an American to be someone who loves, and wholeheartedly dedicates themselves to the development of this country. From age nine, I have made the United States my home, and it has made me the man I am today. I proudly call myself an American.

When you hear the stories of these two young men, who attended college and finished without any government assistance or loans, who worked hard to get their degrees in challenging fields such as computer engineering, who went to one of the best schools in America, who now have talents and skills that create opportunities not only for discovery but for innovation and entrepreneurship, I wonder: What are the Republicans thinking when they say these two individuals don't belong in America, that they need to be deported, that they need to be sent back to Venezuela, a country neither of

them really knows. Is that the answer to America's future? Is it to export the most talented minds, the hardest working individuals, and that the amazing achievements they have made in their lives are to be ignored? I don't think so.

I think Americans by and large believe in fairness. Fairness says we will not hold the children of the parents who were responsible for wrongdoing responsible themselves. If you are pulled over for speeding, you may get a ticket. But it would be fundamentally unfair to give one to the child sitting in a car seat in the car. They weren't driving. These kids weren't driving either. Their parents came to America without any permission from the children. But they set up a life here and they made a good life here. Should we now penalize these children because their parents came to America?

That doesn't make sense. Frankly, it doesn't represent what this country is all about. We are a nation of immigrants, and the immigrants who come here make a difference. They bring not only a determination for a better life, but they are risk takers. They leave it all behind from wherever they were. They come to America and risk it all in the hopes they will have a better life and, even more importantly, that their children will. That is who we are. That is what America is all about and has been from the beginning of time.

Why would we turn our backs on this heritage? Why would we ignore the opportunity these young people bring? That is the Republican position, at least the one stated by the House of Representatives. It has been summarily rejected now three different times on the floor of the Senate. Yet the majority leader comes to us today and says he may do it again.

This is not fair to the Department of Homeland Security, it is not fair to John and Nelson, and it is not fair to this country. Let us do the right thing. Let's fund the Department of Homeland Security before we leave for any recess. Let's get it done so that Department can protect America.

The majority leader talked about what we have achieved here—the Keystone Canadian pipeline act, which was the highest priority of the Senate Republicans. TransCanada, a Canadian corporation, would be able to transport oil from Canada to a refinery in Texas and then export it from the United States. There are benefits of construction, of course, and 35 permanent pipeline jobs, of course. But in the end the refined oil coming in from Canada will not benefit the American economy. We had an amendment on the floor that would address that very issue, and every single Republican said we will not vote to keep that refined oil product in America.

We also suggested that if we are going to build a pipeline in America, we use American steel. Let's put American workers to work at the steel mills to make the steel that is necessary to

build the pipeline, and that too was rejected by the Republicans. They said no, insisting on American steel won't be part of this so-called pipeline jobs projects.

Well, I think there are better ways to get the economy moving forward and to create more jobs. One of them is infrastructure, and I am sure we will debate it at a later time.

The other thing mentioned by the majority leader was the Clay Hunt bill, which was a bill that was needed and important, related to veteran suicide, and it passed overwhelmingly, to no one's surprise.

Why was this bill held up in the previous Congress? There was an objection to bringing the bill to the floor by a Republican Senator—by a Republican Senator. There was no obstruction in passing this bill on the Democratic side, and I am glad it passed. I know the President is about to sign it.

The other thing I want to mention is that it is unfortunate we are leaving this week for the 1-week Presidents Day recess. We are leaving at a time when the nomination of Loretta Lynch to be Attorney General of the United States is still pending. She has been pending, I understand, longer than any nominee for Attorney General in recent history.

I went through the hearing with her and there was no opposition—none. They asked the witnesses who were brought in if any one of them objected to her being Attorney General, and not one would raise their hand. There were no objections. There is no objection to this woman serving our Nation. She has been the U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of New York. She has done an amazing job. Why are they holding her up? What is the purpose in this? We should approve her nomination before we leave this week.

PULLMAN NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, a Chicago neighborhood that has played a significant part in our country's African-American and labor history is being recognized next week in an exciting way. Next Thursday President Obama is going to declare the Pullman Historic District on the South Side of Chicago a national monument. This is the first time a unit of the National Park Service would be established in Chicago.

This designation is the result of a collaborative effort by the businesses, residents, and organizations of the Pullman area in Chicago to restore and preserve this unique community. The people who are part of the Pullman legacy helped shape America as we know it.

The Pullman neighborhood includes almost 90 percent of the original buildings the railroad magnate George Pullman built a century ago for his factory town to build railroad cars. It was the birthplace of the Nation's first black labor union, the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.

Pullman workers fought for fair labor conditions in the late 19th century, and Pullman porters helped advance America's civil rights movement.

During the economic depression of the 1890s, the Pullman community was the catalyst for the first industry-wide strike in the United States, which helped to lead to the creation of Labor Day as a national holiday. The Pullman porters are credited with creating the African-American middle class.

I have supported this designation for some time and have introduced legislation with my colleague Senator KIRK and with Congressman ROBIN KELLY to make the site a national historical monument.

Alderman Anthony Beale of Chicago's 9th Ward has worked hard to garner support for the recognition of Pullman. Many others in Chicago helped advance the proposal: Eleanor Gorski, with the Chicago Department of Planning and Development; David Doig, president of Chicago Neighborhood Initiatives, Lynn McClure and LeAaron Foley with the National Parks Conservation Association, and many others who drew attention to the historical significance of this neighborhood.

The Pullman national monument will be an important addition to the current National Park System. It highlights stories from communities that are rarely represented in other national parks. The park's urban location on Chicago's South Side makes it easily accessible to millions of people by public transportation—again setting Pullman apart from other national parks.

The National Park Service is associated with national wonders such as geysers and forests. Urban national parks are few and far between. With this designation, the Pullman neighborhood is joining the ranks of the National Mall and the Statue of Liberty as national parks accessible in urban areas. The monument will also provide an opportunity for tourism and job creation—much needed in this community.

It is only right that Pullman be preserved and honored as a part of our National Park System. I commend the President for this decision to showcase the prominence and legacy of Pullman in our Nation's history.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and with the majority controlling the first half.

The Senator from Alaska.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes in morning business.

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

NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes today to talk about my growing concern over President Obama's policies regarding several major national security issues.

Of course, the President has just today sent over to Congress an authorization for use of military force against ISIL, the Islamic State, but over the past 6 years, as the quantity and frequency of international crises have grown, there have been some very clear trends that have emerged from this administration's foreign policy.

First, we have seen what might be dubbed the red-line syndrome in which the President uses stern language and strong rhetoric toward a hostile foreign regime or terrorist group and then backs it up with either total inaction or ineffectual action, thus inviting not respect, not fear, but ridicule.

The most infamous example, of course, is when the President remarked that the use of chemical weapons by Bashar al Assad of Syria would constitute a red line and then, after Assad had crossed that red line and used chemical weapons on his own people, the President did essentially nothing in response, thus damaging the United States' credibility on the world stage in the eyes of both our friends and our foes.

And I don't have to remind the Senate what has happened since that time. More than 200,000 Syrians have lost

their lives in this terrible civil war, and millions of Syrians have become displaced, either internally within the country or outside of the country in refugee camps, such as those I visited in Turkey and others in Lebanon and Jordan, just to name a few places.

So there are consequences associated with tough talk and no action.

The second pattern I have observed is what might be what my dad called, when I was growing up, paralysis by analysis. In other words, this is what some have called just plain dithering.

I think what the President seems to regard as a deliberative process and as a virtue others call dithering or paralysis by analysis. We can think of numerous examples, starting with the snail-like pace of the President's decision process early in his administration with regard to whether to surge U.S. forces in Afghanistan and, if so, what long-term role we should play there.

Again, in today's Washington Post, when I got up and was getting my first cup of coffee, I was reading that now apparently the administration is starting to reassess again their commitment to Afghanistan.

But the list of the President's paralysis by analysis is lengthy. The situation in Ukraine is another painful example. In Ukraine, the President has stood idly by and watched Russian President Vladimir Putin carry out a de facto invasion of Ukraine, starting with Crimea, and continuing today in eastern Ukraine.

From "mysterious little green men" to columns of full-up Russian tanks, the hand of Putin in the Ukraine has been unmistakable. It has been the most blatant land grab by a force that Europe has seen in quite some time. Yet the best President Obama has been able to do is more hollow rhetoric.

Now there have been modest economic assistance and nonlethal military resources to Ukraine's Government, and there have been some sanctions, but they apparently have not worked to dissuade Putin.

The Senate might recall what I recall when the President of Ukraine came to speak to a joint session of Congress just a few months ago when he asked for more aid, lethal aid to fight and defend his country. But he did say: Thank you for the blankets. Obviously you can't win a war with blankets.

By the way, the President's policies toward Russia have been an unabated disaster, dating all the way back to his 2009 reset of relations with Russia, and Vladimir Putin has taken full advantage of the opening that he sees and the lack of resoluteness on the part of the U.S. Government.

We have little to show for this so-called reset except realities such as this: the aforementioned Russian annexation of Ukraine, a Russian violation with impunity of President Reagan's landmark intermediate-range nuclear arms treaty, which now poses a direct threat to the security of our NATO allies in Europe.

We have also seen a steady flow of Russian weapons and other support to the blood-thirsty butcher of Syria, Bashar al Assad, who, as I mentioned earlier, has slaughtered more than 200,000 of his own country men and women.

The President's paralysis by analysis has also infected his incoherent approach in dealing with the terrorist army of ISIL, the so-called Islamic State. In 2011, after he pulled negotiations with the Iraqis on a status-of-forces agreement, the Obama administration proceeded with a misguided plan to pull the plug on the American presence in that country, thus squandering the blood and treasure that Americans invested in trying to liberate the Iraqis and provide them with a better future.

While it is true the Iraqis had not agreed to the U.S. conditions to an enduring American presence, including legal immunity for our troops, the administration simply gave up and failed to expend the political capital necessary to secure a status-of-forces agreement and to preserve the security gains in Iraq that, as I have said, had been paid for by American blood and treasure.

The resulting security vacuum, coupled with an incompetent and corrupt Prime Minister, set the conditions for ISIL to make alarming gains in territory and power in Iraq last year.

As chaos took hold in Syria, ISIL and other terrorist groups were flourishing. We know that in 2012 many of the President's most senior National Security Advisers—including then-CIA Director David Petraeus, then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, then-Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Martin Dempsey, and then-Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta—all of them recommended at that time that the President initiate a program to arm vetted moderate Syrian rebels.

President Obama refused, publicly remarking just 1 year ago that ISIL, the Islamic State in the Levant, was the JV team of terrorist groups. Today, of course, the irony is the President has now sent us an authorization for the use of military force to fight this JV team, as he called it 1 year ago.

Then last summer, when the challenge had grown many times more complex and more difficult, the President dusted off the idea and moved ahead with it.

This is not exactly a picture of decisive leadership, nor is it designed to instill respect—indeed, fear—in our enemies nor confidence in our allies.

Today, with ISIL growing in strength in our region, our Commander in Chief cannot even bring himself to call the evil they represent by their rightful name. He refuses to acknowledge ISIL is a radical Islamist group, even after these jihadists have beheaded numerous American citizens, other Western captives, and burned alive a pilot from one of our closest allies, Jordan.

And then, of course, there is the most recent tragic news about Kayla

Mueller, the young humanitarian aid worker who tragically lost her life in the hands of ISIL terrorists, after being held captive in Syria since 2013. Kayla, from Phoenix, AZ, had been assisting the group Doctors Without Borders.

In 2011, in a video she posted on YouTube, remarking about the slaughter by Bashar al Assad of his own citizens in Syria, and the rampage of ISIL, she said that “silence is participation in this crime.”

Well, the President chose to use his recent speech at the National Prayer Breakfast that I attended, along with my wife and friends from Dallas, to paint a picture of moral equivalence between the barbaric entity known as ISIL and Christian crusaders from centuries ago. I have to say I am not the only one, apparently, who was confused by this equivalency or this comparison the President used during his remarks that morning.

This week, as Congress has now received the President's draft authorization for use of military force against ISIL, most of us still lack a clear understanding of the strategy the President seeks to employ in order to degrade and destroy this threat.

Even though the military campaign began last August, I know the Presiding Officer has served with distinction in the U.S. Marine Corps—and one of the things I hope the President will answer is how he hopes to defeat ISIL with just airstrikes. Indeed, as I understand from the military experts, you can't hope to win a conflict like this by blowing up things with airstrikes. You actually have to hold the territory so the enemy doesn't reoccupy it once you have moved on somewhere else.

The strategy we have heard so much about clearing, holding, and building, which seems to be an essential strategy when it comes to winning a conflict such as this, is nowhere to be seen in the President's strategy to have airstrike after airstrike after airstrike.

So I hope the President will enlighten us on what strategy he seeks to employ in order to degrade and destroy ISIL. If not, I trust that Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle will offer their ideas about the kind of strategy that could have a reasonable chance of success.

I personally am reserving judgment on this authorization for use of military force until I learn more about the President's strategy and hear more about what sort of consensus we can have in the Senate about a strategy that has a reasonable chance of success.

I take very seriously—as I know every single Member of this Senate does—the granting of authority to use military force, putting our men and women in uniform in harm's way to protect not only us but our national security interests around the world. So this is one of the most serious and most important sorts of debates we can have as Members of the Senate. But I

worry about the flawed policies I have identified and that these are really just the tip of the iceberg.

In future remarks, I wish to come back and address a national security threat that I think is perhaps the most urgent, and that is of Iran's relentless quest for nuclear weapons, as well as the impact on our closest ally in the Middle East, the State of Israel.

Recently one of America's finest generals and former Commander of the United States Central Command, Gen. James Mattis, testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee that the United States needs “to come out now from its reactive crouch and to take a firm strategic stance in defense of our values.”

I couldn't agree more. The world is safer and more stable when America leads, leads from the front, not from the rear, and when we say what we mean and we mean what we say, and we back it up with action.

If the President can't do that, then over the last 2 years of his administration it will be incumbent upon Republicans and Democrats in Congress to lead the way in the absence of Presidential leadership and to do what we can do within our authority to prevent further erosion of American credibility on the world stage.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, last Tuesday President Obama met with 10 people at the White House. These are people who had written him letters about the health care law. The White House said it designed this little publicity stunt to remind people to sign up for insurance on healthcare.gov by the deadline date of Sunday, February 15.

At his meeting the other day the President said that the people there were “a pretty good representative sample of people whose lives have been impacted,” as he said, “in powerful ways.”

I will tell you, if President Obama really wanted a representative sample, he would have included some of the people his law has affected in alarming and expensive ways. What does the President have to say to those people? Why didn't he invite any of them to the White House for his photo-op?

Here is what the New York Times wrote on Sunday, February 8. This is the Sunday Review, New York Times. The headline is “Insured, but Not Covered: New policies have many Americans scrambling.” Why isn't the President willing to talk to those people

who are scrambling all across the country who may have insurance but are not covered?

The story starts off by telling the story of one woman in New York City. Her name is Karen Pineman. She lost her existing health insurance policy because it didn't meet all the mandates President Obama said a health insurance policy had to include. It might have worked very well for her, but it didn't work well enough for President Obama, so she lost her coverage.

The article says that "she gamely set about shopping for a new policy through the public marketplace." After all, she had supported President Obama and she had supported the health care law, as they say, as a matter of principle.

The article goes on:

Ms. Pineman, who is self-employed, accepted that she'd have to pay higher premiums for a plan with a narrower provider network and no out-of-network coverage.

So here she is—supported the law but then lost her insurance and had to buy other insurance with a narrower provider network and higher premiums. She accepted that she would have to pay out of pocket to see her primary care physician because her primary care physician didn't participate and wasn't part of that narrow network. She even accepted, the New York Times reports, having copays of nearly \$1,800 to have a cast put on her ankle in an emergency room after she broke her ankle playing tennis.

The article goes on:

But her frustration bubbled over when she tried to arrange a follow-up visit with an [orthopedic surgeon] in her network.

She had to buy the insurance under President Obama's law because she lost her own insurance even though the President had promised her "if you like your insurance, you can keep it."

The article goes on:

The nearest doctor available who treated ankle problems was in Stamford, Conn.

She is in New York City. She lives in New York. The closest doctor who was in her network was in Connecticut. She has had it. She said:

It was ridiculous—didn't they notice it was in another state?

What does President Obama have to say to this woman in New York? I see she wasn't included in the photo-op they had at the White House with the 10 people who wrote letters to the President. What does he think about the powerful negative ways his health care law is affecting her life? After all, the New York Times thought it was enough that they would devote the front page of the Sunday Review section this past week to "Insured, but Not Covered: New policies have many Americans scrambling."

The article sums it up this way:

The Affordable Care Act has ushered in an era of complex new health insurance products featuring legions of out-of-pocket coinsurance fees, high deductibles and narrow provider networks.

All of ObamaCare's mandates force insurance companies to use things like

these deductibles and narrow networks to keep premiums from going up even faster. Remember, the President said premiums would go down by \$2,500 per family. They have actually gone up, not down, and they have done all these things so they wouldn't go up even faster.

The New York Times article says that under ObamaCare these insurance plans come with "constant changes in policy guidelines, annual shifts in what's covered and what's not, monthly shifts in which doctors are in and out of network," and surprise bills for services people thought would be covered. Is the President proud of that? He stood up and said the Democrats should forcefully defend and be proud of the law. I don't see one Democrat on this floor of the Senate who is standing here to forcefully defend and be proud of this law.

The article goes on to say that for many people it is all so confusing and so expensive "that they just avoid seeing doctors." What does President Obama have to say to people who are so confused by their insurance now that the easiest path is to just not go for health care?

According to a recent poll, 46 percent of Americans said that paying for basic medical care is a hardship for their family. Forty-six percent say it is a hardship for their family. Where was it a year ago? Well, it is actually up by 10 percent.

The President said that things would get better, that people would like the health care law, and that Democrats should forcefully defend and be proud of it, but 10 percent more people this year than last year say that it is harder to pay for basic medical care, that it is a hardship for their family. What does he say to these people? What does the President of the United States say to these people who said his Affordable Care Act is making their life more of a hardship?

This is an extensive article, "Insured, but Not Covered," in the Sunday issue of this week's New York Times.

There is another example from this article—Alexis Gersten, who lives in a town called East Quogue. She bought ObamaCare health insurance coverage for her family. Then she found out that they did have insurance, but they weren't covered. When her son needed an ear, nose, and throat doctor, the nearest one in her network was in Albany, NY, which is 5 hours away from where she lives. Even though her own cardiologist was on the network list, he said he didn't take her plan. She ended up driving an hour to see a new cardiologist. Finally, there was a dispute over deductibles that left her with a pediatrician's bill for \$457.

Five hours to take her son to a specialist? Is that what the President means when he says the Democrats should forcefully defend and be proud of this law they voted for? Almost \$500 out of pocket to see a pediatrician? Is that the kind of powerful effect Presi-

dent Obama wanted his health care law to have on families? That is what he said last week, "a powerful effect on their lives." What does the President have to say to this woman, to Alexis?

The only reason health care costs are not even higher for a lot of people is because the Obama administration decided to give subsidies to some people to help hide the true costs. Over the next few months, the Supreme Court is going to decide if President Obama is breaking his own law by giving out some of those subsidies.

Millions of people in 37 States may suddenly find that they have to bear the expenses of ObamaCare entirely on their own, buying insurance that many of them don't want, don't need, and can't afford, covering lots of things they would never buy insurance for if given the personal choice, but the President says they must because he seems to know more about what they need for their families than they do.

Last December several of us asked the administration to start warning people, people who buy insurance through the healthcare.gov Web site—the disastrous Web site—to inform those people that they may lose their subsidies come this summer when the Supreme Court makes its ruling.

We asked the administration—the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Treasury—to let us know how the administration plans to protect people who might get caught in the mess that President Obama and his administration and all the people who voted for it created. All we have heard in response is that the administration has no plans—no plans—to warn anyone or to do anything to help Americans harmed by the President's health care law. This has the potential to be yet another ObamaCare train wreck.

Another study came out last month that looked at the change in health insurance coverage for the first 9 months of 2014. It found that there was a total change of about 8 million more people who actually have coverage. The problem is that most of those people were just added to Medicaid. Medicaid is a program that is already broken and doesn't work well. As a doctor who has taken care of patients in Wyoming for almost a quarter of a century, I can tell you that Medicaid across the country is a broken system. Yet the people who have gotten health insurance—not care; the President is quick to use the word "covered," but he doesn't use the word "care" because there is a huge difference. I can tell you that as a doctor. There were about 6 million people enrolled in the individual market, mostly through the exchanges, except 5 million people lost their insurance that they had gotten before through work.

So when you take a look at the net effect on coverage, 89 percent of those newly covered got it through Medicaid. That works out to a net gain of a little under 1 million people who actually got private insurance, in spite of the exchanges and in spite of the subsidies.

Seven and a half million got it through Medicaid. All of that expense and all of the hardship President Obama caused on American families—families who have suffered as a result of the President's health care law—and most of the net gain in coverage is people who went onto Medicaid?

The American people didn't ask for this. If President Obama actually talked with a real representative sample of Americans, he would know that. But he doesn't. He only hears what he wants to hear. He disregards the rest. He didn't do that last week. He still refuses to listen to people who have been hurt by his law.

It is time for the President to be honest with the American people about the ways his law has harmed them. This is it—New York Times, Sunday, February 8, "Insured, but Not Covered: New policies have many Americans scrambling."

It is time for the President to start working with Republicans to give people the kind of health care reform they wanted all along—access to the care they need from a doctor they choose at a lower cost. That is what the American people are demanding, and that is what they deserve, and that is what Republicans are going to give them when we get the opportunity to do so. It is time for President Obama to join us.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, we are running out of time until the Department of Homeland Security shuts down, and the majority doesn't seem to have any real plan to avoid it.

There are 17 days left—with a week of recess in between—until tens of thousands of DHS workers are furloughed, fire grants to local fire departments are no longer sent out, and training local first responders in handling terrorist attacks stops dead in its tracks. Yet each day comes with a new round of finger-pointing from Republicans eager to pass the buck to the other Chamber.

The distinguished majority leader, my friend, Senator MCCONNELL, and my friend from Tennessee, Senator ALEXANDER, and many other Republicans in this body have said it is time for the House majority to come up with a new plan. The House of course says it is the Senate majority that needs to act again. This morning Speaker BOEHNER, astoundingly, said the House

would not pass another DHS bill. He is tied in such a knot he can't move, even though he knows his failure to move risks a government shutdown.

The House of course says it is the Senate majority that needs to act again, and yesterday the majority leader said the onus was now on the House to fund DHS. This morning the majority leader said the onus is now on the Senate. We have all kinds of Abbott and Costello behavior going on. The funny thing is the finger-pointing is not at the Democrats. They are pointing at each other as to who is to blame.

The American people are getting whiplash from listening to the Republican leadership on this issue. The Republicans need to sort out the divisions within their own caucus before they deflect any blame on Democrats, because while Democrats remain united in both Houses in support of a clean bill, the Republican majority is busy playing a game of hot potato with national security funding.

The disunity and delay has led a few Republicans to start talking about a continuing resolution that would guarantee another cliff and more brinkmanship and underfund DHS in the meantime. Delaying this same standoff by a few weeks or months isn't a very good plan B. It is hardly a plan at all.

Secretary Jeh Johnson described the CR for DHS this way: "It's like going on a 300-mile trip with a five-gallon tank of gas."

Let me give a few examples of why a Republican continuing resolution is a very poor plan B.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, will my friend from New York yield for a question?

Mr. SCHUMER. I will yield for a question when I finish my remarks, just as he was nice enough to yield to me a few days ago.

First, without a bipartisan full-year bill, the Secret Service cannot move forward with the critical reforms recommended by an independent panel of experts made after the White House fence-jumping incident.

Second, we can't upgrade the biometric identification system that prevents terrorists from coming into the country. Republicans and Democrats negotiated an additional \$25 million for DHS to upgrade the system that allows them to stop terrorists from coming through an airport or on a cargo ship and into the United States. A CR does not provide that funding.

Third, Secretary Johnson has said the Department will be constrained by a CR from improving security along our southwest border and maintaining the resources we added to deal with last summer's border crisis. Some say, Why does a CR constrain all of this? Because it is just ratifying last year's funding, and when new situations have emerged—new terrorist threats, new trouble on the border—we can't change the budget. It makes no sense. No company would simply pass last year's budget when they are experiencing new

challenges; neither should our government.

In short, a CR just doesn't work. It is not how we should be funding the Department of Homeland Security.

So we implore our Republican colleagues: Don't shut down the Department of Homeland Security, don't set up another shutdown, and don't underfund the men and women who work 24/7 to keep us safe. Pass a clean appropriations bill and give the people on the frontlines of defending this country the tools they need to get the job done.

I will be happy to yield for a question to my good friend, the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask my friend from New York—I don't hear any Republicans talking about a shutdown and I don't hear any Republicans talking about a continuing resolution. I just hear Republicans talking about taking up the bill the House has passed, which is a \$40 billion appropriations bill and having a vote on it. But isn't it true that Democrats are united in blocking our ability to even consider that \$40 billion appropriations bill?

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank my friend for the question. It is nice to see him standing on the Democratic side. I hope he tries it again. If he likes it, he might do it more often.

I would say this: We all know what Speaker BOEHNER did. The hard right in the House said we want to force the President to undo his Executive order. They know if they put it on the floor alone, the President might veto it, so they attached it to Homeland Security and they basically say to the President, the only way we will fund the Department of Homeland Security is if we include these unpalatable riders, which the President has said he would veto.

So there is a simple solution.

That would force a shutdown. What the House did is say if we don't do it our way, we are shutting down the government. That didn't work 2 years ago—and that effort was led by the junior Senator from Texas, not my friend, the senior Senator from Texas—and it is not going to work today. Everyone knows what our colleagues in the House did. They are playing hostage. They are holding a gun to the head of America and saying unless we do it their way, they are going to shut down the government. That is why they attacked it.

Let me repeat to my dear friend from Texas: No one objects to debating what the President did on Executive orders. We welcome that debate. It is the act of tying it to funding the government—the same thing they did with ObamaCare a few years ago—that says we are going to shut down the government unless we get our way.

So the logical solution—and I will yield in a moment—is very simple: Pass the Department of Homeland Security bill. If they don't want to shut

down the government, pass a clean Homeland Security bill and then the majority can put immigration on the floor and we can debate it.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, again, I don't hear any Republicans talking about shutting down the government. Indeed, the deadline, as I understand, is February 27 for this appropriations bill. What we are having is a discussion about the President's abuse of his authority under the Constitution by issuing the Executive order. I understand we disagree about that—and we ought to have that debate—and the public I think would insist that we honor our oath by making sure we protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, including against Presidential overreach.

I ask my friend, is it going to be the consistent position of our Democratic friends in the Senate that they are going to block us from even getting on the bill so that then they can offer amendments to strip out the parts they don't like? That is the way the Senate is supposed to work, but it doesn't work that way when Democrats are filibustering this \$40 billion appropriations bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank my colleague from Texas for his good question. I agree with parts of what he said. First, I agree that we disagree on the President's Executive order.

Second, I agree we ought not debate it in a hostage-taking situation. Our colleagues in the House may not have used the word "shutdown." It doesn't matter. Their actions speak louder than words. When they attach these proposals to the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill and say we are not going to fund Homeland Security unless we get some of these proposals, that is saying we will shut down the government unless we get our way. Sure, they will not shut down the government if we vote for all of their extraneous immigration provisions, and then next time they will attach something else and then something else. But they are using the threat of a government shutdown to try and get their way. That has not worked in the past and it will not work today.

So we Democrats are not blocking any debate. We are happy to debate funding the Department of Homeland Security. We are happy to debate immigration. Challenge us. Pass Homeland Security, put immigration on the floor, and see if any Democrat tries to block that debate. We welcome that debate. We think we will win that debate. I know my good friend from Texas disagrees with that.

But that is not the issue. The issue is again that unless Democrats do it our way, we are shutting down the government. That is what the House did and so far that is what the Republican majority in the Senate is going along with. That is government shutdown. That is hostage-taking. That hasn't worked in the past and it will not work now.

It is unprecedented. The junior Senator from Texas came up with this kind of thinking, and unfortunately too many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle go along with him, either out of conviction or for some other reason.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one last question? He has been very gracious, and I appreciate it.

Mr. SCHUMER. Of course. I enjoy these debates.

Mr. CORNYN. While I don't agree with his answers, I appreciate the spirit in which we are actually having a discussion. But I wonder if he can explain to me how it is that the majority is blocking Department of Homeland Security funding when the House has passed a \$40 billion bill. Republicans have been united in voting to proceed to get on the bill and then allowing an amendment process where the minority can then move to strike the provisions they don't like. That is the way the Senate is supposed to operate.

How is it that Republicans are blocking Department of Homeland Security funding under those circumstances? I don't understand that.

Mr. SCHUMER. I would just ask the rhetorical question—and I thank my colleague—why did they attach these provisions, inimicable to the President, inimicable to us, to the Department of Homeland Security bill, which has nothing to do with it? It was not because they wanted a debate, not because they wanted to fund Homeland Security. There are easy ways to do that. They wanted to say that unless we do it their way, they are not going to fund Homeland Security and they are going to shut down a major portion of the government.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE. The Senator from Mississippi.
Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are indeed, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes.

TRIBUTE TO MALCOLM BUTLER

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I rise briefly today to recognize the extraordinary story of my fellow Mississippian Malcolm Butler, who hails from Vicksburg, MS, and attended Hinds Community College. Mr. Butler, a cornerback for the New England Patriots, made the game-winning interception in Super Bowl XLIX on February 1, 2015.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Rick Cleveland.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Daily Journal, Feb. 3, 2015]

VICKSBURG'S BUTLER RISES UP AS
MISSISSIPPI'S LATEST NFL HERO
(By Rick Cleveland)

You wait in line, easing around one car-length at a time. Finally, you roll down your

window and the voice over the microphone says, "Welcome to Popeyes. Can I take your order?"

Malcolm Butler was that voice, the one who asks you if you want your chicken spicy or mild, your tea sweetened or unsweetened.

Before he became a Super Bowl hero, Malcolm Butler worked the to-go window at Popeyes. That was after nobody much had recruited him out of Vicksburg High School. That was after he was kicked off the Hinds Community College football team after a campus altercation.

"Welcome to Popeyes, can I take your order?"

Well, sure, I'll have a pass interception on the goal line to win the Super Bowl.

Malcolm Butler's story is for everybody who makes a huge mistake. Who flunks the big exam. Who gets kicked out of school. Who gets fired. Who gets told they aren't quite good enough or tall enough or fast enough.

Malcolm Butler, Super Bowl hero.

Twenty-six seconds remained. The Seattle Seahawks had second-and-goal at the New England one-yard-line trailing 28-24. The Hawks needed three feet, 36 inches for victory.

There were 22 players on the field. Would Russell Wilson, the great star from Wisconsin, give it to Marshawn Lynch, the irrepressible one from Washington, or throw to Doug Baldwin of Stanford? Would they run behind James Carpenter of Alabama or Justin Britt of Missouri? Who would make the big defensive play: Vince Woolfork, the monster out of Miami, or Dont'a Hightower of Bama?

So many questions, just one answer.

Only heaven or Pete Carroll knows why the Seahawks didn't give the ball to Lynch, but they did not.

No, they ran out of the shotgun. They didn't even fake it to Lynch. The Seahawks ran a straight pass. Ricardo Lockette split out wide to the right behind Jermaine Kearse. The call was for Kearse to clear a path for Lockette to run a simple slant pattern.

Malcolm Butler never let it happen. Later, he would say he saw what would happen before it happened. He saw it in his mind's eye. Butler didn't let Kearse get in his way. He broke in front of Lockette before Russell even released the ball. And then, somehow, he caught the ball during the collision.

Malcolm Butler, Super Bowl hero.

SUMMON THE HEROES

Mississippi has produced so many over the years. Jerry Rice starred in three Super Bowls. Eli Manning was the MVP in two of them. Brett Favre led the Packers to a Super Bowl title. L.C. Greenwood sacked Roger Staubach four times in one Super Bowl. The great Willie Brown of Yazoo City once returned a Fran Tarkenton Super Bowl pass 75 yards for a Super Bowl touchdown. Walter Payton helped the Bears shuffle to a Super Bowl ring.

But Jerry Rice was the greatest receiver in the history of the game. Eli Manning's pedigree is known to all. Favre was in the process of winning three straight NFL MVPs. Greenwood was part of Pittsburgh's Iron Curtain. Willie Brown might be the greatest corner in the history of the sport. Payton was Payton.

Malcolm Butler? After they let him back on the team at Hinds, he had no Division I scholarship offers. He played his college football at West Alabama, formerly Livingston. When he finished Livingston, 32 NFL teams had a chance to draft him. None did.

But Malcolm Butler kept working, kept believing.

Against all odds, he made the team, worked his way into the rotation and made

the biggest play in the most important game. Thus he joins Mississippi's remarkable Super Bowl pantheon.

Willie Brown, L.C. Greenwood, Walter Payton, Jerry Rice, Brett Favre and Malcolm Butler.

Malcolm Butler.
Super Bowl hero.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, Rick Cleveland is the executive director of the Mississippi Sports Hall of Fame and Museum. This story appeared on February 3, 2015, in a number of newspapers, including my hometown of Tupelo's Northeast Mississippi Daily Journal. The article points out how Malcolm Butler overcame adversity, how he went from working at a Pop-eyes fried chicken restaurant to being the hero of this year's Super Bowl.

My home State of Mississippi has a long and storied football tradition. Gridiron legends such as Archie Manning, Eli Manning, Michael Oher, Jerry Rice, Walter Payton, Brett Favre, and a host of others from the Magnolia State are included in this list. As Rick Cleveland points out in the article, Malcolm Butler now joins Mississippi's remarkable Super Bowl pantheon.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

(The remarks of Mrs. MURRAY pertaining to the introduction of S. 469 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, it is my understanding that we have someone coming down in about 10 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized shortly after 2:25 p.m. I wish to lock that in—Senator HOEVEN and then me.

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

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

KEYSTONE PIPELINE

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I would like to speak on the subject of the Keystone XL Pipeline. The Keystone XL approval bill which we passed in the Senate will be voted on this afternoon in the House. I believe the House will pass the bill with a strong bipartisan majority, just as we did in the Senate.

This bill is about energy, it is about jobs, it is about economic growth, and it is about national security through energy security. I have been on the floor in the Senate talking about all these issues as we worked on this bill. The Keystone XL Pipeline approval bill was the first bill we took up in the Senate in this Congress, S. 1. I think there were on the order of 250 amendments filed on the bill and we voted on more than 40 amendments with rollcall votes. We debated, Senators brought forward their amendments, and we voted on the bill and the bill passed, as I say, with a strong bipartisan majority.

Now the House will vote, as I say, this afternoon on the bill as well. I think it is remarkable that today is the day we will pass the bill completely through the Congress. I think it is remarkable because it is on the very same day the President has sent to the Congress an AUMF, authorization for use of military force, to deal with ISIS. It is on the very same day the President has sent us an AUMF, authorization for use of military force, to actually send our soldiers, our men and women, our combat resources to the conflict in the Middle East, the very same day we are passing legislation that will help our Nation with the production of more energy, not only in the United States but also working with our closest friend and ally, Canada.

This pipeline is about the infrastructure we need to help us move to energy security, meaning that we produce more energy than we consume. Today in the United States we consume about 18 million barrels of oil a day. Of that total, we produce about 11 million barrels a day, and we import from Canada about 3 million barrels a day. So if we do the math, that means there are about 4 million barrels a day we need to import from other countries. We get about half of that from OPEC, roughly 2 million barrels a day. The Keystone XL Pipeline will move 830,000 barrels a day. Some of that will be produced in Canada, some of it will be produced in the United States, but it will move 830,000 barrels a day to our refineries. That is almost 1 million barrels a day we don't have to import from somewhere else.

So go back to the math. I just said we were importing from countries other than Canada 4 million barrels a day, half of that from OPEC—about 2 million barrels a day. This project is almost half of what we are importing from OPEC right now. That is why I say it is remarkable on the very same day that we are working to build en-

ergy security for this country, where we are working to develop the infrastructure we need to move oil from where it is produced to where it is refined and consumed in this country, we are also dealing with the conflict in the Middle East. OPEC—we are getting oil from the Middle East and we are dealing with conflict in the Middle East. Let's break that cycle, right?

At the point that we produce more energy than we consume, we are more energy secure. It is not only about growing the economy and creating jobs, but that means we don't have to get oil from OPEC anymore. That is one more reason we may not have to be involved in a conflict in the Middle East in the future. So here we are in a bipartisan way in the Congress doing the work the people sent us to do in the Senate and in the House on a project that has overwhelming bipartisan support, on a project where all six States on the route of this pipeline—Montana, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas—all of the States have approved it.

They didn't have to particularly hustle because they had 6 years to do it. The administration has held up this project for 6 years. Here we are with something that Congress overwhelmingly supports on a bipartisan basis. All six States that have this pipeline have approved it, and the American people overwhelmingly support it.

In poll after poll, 65 to 70 percent of the American public said, yes, build this infrastructure, create an energy future where we produce the oil and gas we need in America and we work with Canada. We the American people don't want to rely on OPEC or the Middle East anymore for our energy. We don't want to have to import oil from the Middle East. That is what this legislation is all about.

On the very day we are approving this bill through Congress, we are getting the President's request for the use of military force. He is sending that agreement to us and, I believe the President is saying to us, Congress, join with the Obama administration to work to deal with the terrible problem of ISIS, and we need to do that.

We are going to give that AUMF, authorization for use of military force, careful consideration. I think the Congress will work its will. Then we will, together, as representatives of the American people—the Executive and the legislative branch—work to defeat ISIS.

Just as the President is sending that document today, we are sending him a document. We will be sending him a law dutifully passed by both the Senate and the House in a bipartisan way and saying, Mr. President, we need you to work with us too. Just as you want Congress to work with you on an authorization for use of military force, we want you to work with us on behalf of the American people who have spoken loudly and consistently that they want energy security.

Mr. President, we need you to work with us to build that vital infrastructure so we can produce our energy here at home and work with our closest friend and ally, Canada, and not be dependent on energy from the Middle East anymore.

Don't be fooled—don't be fooled. We are in a battle right now for global market share to determine who is going to produce energy in the future. Is it going to be OPEC? Is it going to be Russia? Is it going to be the United States? Who is going to produce energy in the future? The reason the price at the pump has come down over \$1 over the course of the past year is because we are producing so much oil and gas in the United States and because we are getting more from Canada. More supply pushes prices down. If that were a tax cut, it would equate to more than a \$100 billion tax cut for the American consumer. So what is going on?

On a global basis OPEC is pushing back, because they know if they push back, instead of our industry and our energy industry in this country continuing to grow, it starts to shrink again. Who is back in the driver's seat? OPEC is back in the driver's seat. What do you suppose is going to happen then? Prices will go right back up, and that benefit consumers get at the pump we will not have anymore. Also, that security issue I am talking about we will not have because we will have to continue to bring in oil from the Middle East. This is about a long-term strategy for national security.

It is more than just sending our combat resources into a conflict. A long-term strategy for national security also includes energy security, and just as the President is sending us an AUMF today, we are sending him legislation today that will make our Nation more energy secure. I hope the President will join with us in that endeavor on behalf of the American people.

Thank you, and with that I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for such time as I shall consume.

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

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I was listening very carefully to the Senator talking about our situation with the pipeline, and there is something else I was going to talk about, but I want to make sure we say it as often as we can. I have sent for a poster which I want to share with the Senate.

My State of Oklahoma is more than just passively interested in the pipeline. In the center of Oklahoma is a town called Cushing. Cushing, OK, happens to be the central location for the pipelines going throughout the United States—east, west, north, and south. The picture, if it does arrive, that I wanted to share with everyone is of this President who is trying to, I guess, insult our intelligence by having it

both ways. I think the Senator from North Dakota made it very clear that the President is dragging his feet and that he has been able to successfully stop the pipeline from coming through.

The picture I will show is a picture of President Obama coming into my State of Oklahoma and standing with all the barrels behind him in Cushing, OK, announcing that he is not going to stop the pipeline from going south from Oklahoma down to the Texas border. That is very good because he cannot do it. The only place he can stop it is when it crosses the international border. Of course that is where he is continuing to stop it.

I have to say he has lost the war of words on this because people know we have an opportunity—that everything the Senator said is correct. We can be totally independent in no time at all. We are not talking about years, we are talking about weeks and months. We can have our total independence just by lifting all the restrictions we have right now, not just the pipeline but what is happening on Federal land.

It is interesting. We have gone through this shale revolution in this country, and it has been so overwhelming. In the last 5 years it has been in spite of the President because he continues in his budget to have all kinds of punitive provisions for the oil and gas industry. Yet because of what has happened with the shale revolution, the use of hydraulic fracturing, the horizontal drilling, we have increased our production over the last 5 years by 61 percent. All of the 61 percent is in private land or it is in State land. We have on Federal land a reduction. While the rest of the country has increased 61 percent, it has been reduced by 6 percent. That is the dilemma we have right now.

It goes far beyond just the pipeline. We have an opportunity to be completely free—and I am talking about our Northern Hemisphere—being free from dependence on anyone in any part of the world for our ability to produce the energy necessary to run this machine called America.

(The remarks of Mr. INHOFE pertaining to the introduction of S. 452 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT
AGREEMENT—S. 295

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S.

295; that there be up to 1 hour equally divided in the usual form; that following the use or yielding back of that time, the Hatch technical amendment at the desk be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be read a third time, and the Senate proceed to vote on the bill with no intervening action or debate.

Following disposition of the bill, the Senate will resume the motion to proceed to H.R. 240, the DHS appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. No objection.

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

AMY AND VICKY CHILD PORNOGRAPHY VICTIM RESTITUTION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report S. 295.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 295) to amend section 2259 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 1 hour of debate, equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I thank the majority leader for moving ahead on S. 295, which we call the Amy and Vicky Act.

The need for this bill arises because of the Supreme Court's 5-to-4 decision last year in *Paroline v. United States*.

The Court at that time limited the recovery that a victim of a child pornography offense could receive, even as additional wrongdoers saw her image as it was repeatedly posted on the Internet.

Rather than making the offender provide restitution for all the harms caused by the repeated viewings, the Supreme Court limited the recovery against any one defendant to the relative harm that defendant caused.

This bill will expand the categories of loss for which the victim could recover. It would reverse, then, the Supreme Court by permitting the victim to recover up to the full loss from any one defendant, subject to a minimum amount, depending upon the defendant's conduct. No longer, then, would the victim receive restitution from each defendant limited to that defendant's own actions. Each defendant would be jointly and severally liable for the victim's entire loss.

The bill sets up a contribution procedure for those defendants, which then would make the victim whole. Of course, that is the main point.

The choice is between the convicted child pornography offender being held responsible for the full loss and the innocent victim not receiving full compensation.

The Supreme Court ruled that the victim could not receive all her restitution from any one single defendant,

even as her damage suffered was compounded. This bill appropriately rejects that. I hope it is not the last time this Congress overturns a Supreme Court decision.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation, as I was in the last Congress. I was pleased that the first legislation the Judiciary Committee took up when I became chairman was this bipartisan child pornography bill, and I am glad to have shepherded that bill through the committee so that the Senate at this time can take it up as one of its first legislative items.

We should all commend, as I do, Senator HATCH for his work on this very important piece of legislation.

I yield the floor.

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I am very pleased to see the Senate will pass the bipartisan Justice for Amy and Vicky Act.

As an original co-sponsor of this bill, it's great to see that the Senate is helping ensure that victims of child pornography are able to receive full restitution for the terrible harms that they have suffered.

Last year, the Supreme Court issued a decision that sharply limited the remedies available to victims of child pornography.

The case involved Pennsylvania resident "Amy."

"Amy" was just eight and nine years old when her uncle raped her. Amy received help from a therapist and her family, and began to heal. Then, at age 17, Amy learned that her uncle recorded the events and traded them over the Internet. Amy is believed to be the most widely traded image of child pornography: Her attorney estimates that over 70,000 people have viewed these images.

I cannot begin to imagine the devastation Amy feels, so I turn to her own words. Amy writes:

Every day of my life I live in constant fear that someone will see my pictures and recognize me and that I will be humiliated all over again. It hurts me to know someone is looking at them—at me—when I was just a little girl being abused for the camera. I did not choose to be there, but now I am there forever in pictures that people are using to do sick things. I want it all erased. I want it all stopped. But I am powerless to stop it just like I was powerless to stop my uncle. . . . My life and my feelings are worse now because the crime has never really stopped and will never really stop. . . . It's like I am being abused over and over and over again.

Amy has struggled to hold down a steady job, facing repeated breakdowns. Amy estimates she has suffered \$3.4 M in lost income and counseling costs over the years.

Amy sought restitution from those who viewed and traded her image. The Federal restitution statute allows a victim of child pornography to collect restitution from those convicted of producing, trafficking, or viewing images of the victim's abuse.

But Amy faced a problem common in child pornography cases: Tens of thou-

sands of people have trafficked in her image. When she attempted to collect restitution, could she collect the full amount from any one person? Or would she have to wait for tens of thousands of people to be criminally convicted, collecting a small amount from each person, in order to be made whole?

Last April, in the case of *Paroline v. United States*, the Supreme Court decided that Federal statute required the latter. The Supreme Court recognized that this was unworkable, and it called on Congress to provide a legislative remedy.

Last year, I responded to the Supreme Court's call by introducing the Justice for Amy Act, which would ensure that victims of child pornography are able to receive full restitution, without having to appear in thousands of court cases.

It sought to amend the Federal restitution statute to provide that all defendants who produce, traffic, or possess child pornography of a victim are jointly and severally liable for all of that victim's damages, and may sue one another for contribution. This goal is to take the burden off of the child victim, and places it on the child pornographers. Once one defendant is found guilty, he is held liable for the full damages and the burden is on him to sue all other wrongdoers to help pay the restitution award.

I am pleased to see that this commonsense approach has been adopted by and incorporated into the Justice for Amy and Vicky Act. I am proud to be an original co-sponsor of this important legislation that the Senate will pass today.

This bill provides one important first step in ensuring that victims of child sexual abuse receive the help they need. I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues to provide additional protections for America's children.

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, as a father of four, I am deeply concerned by the very need for legislation like S. 295, the Amy and Vicky Child Pornography Victim Restitution Improvement Act. It is appalling that even a single one of our children is subject to such base and vile exploitation. As parents, and as a Nation, it is paramount we guard our children when there are those who would exploit them in pornography, who would enslave them in human and sex trafficking, and who would perpetrate this sickening crime upon them.

The Amy and Vicky Child Pornography Victim Restitution Act is one more step in laying the full consequences of these heinous crimes upon the perpetrators. While current law brings criminals to justice before the courts, it can leave the victims to reconstruct their lives with only limited resources on hand. This bill would make sure victims of child pornography have what they need to rebuild and restore their lives by making the perpetrators financially responsible.

Yet while it is a good and necessary step, nothing can ever truly be done by the law or the courts to repair the damage that has been wrought on these lives. We must stop it before it begins. So let us help those who are in need of healing and stop those who would continue this violence.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent that any time during the quorum calls be equally divided.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, later this month, on February 27, funding for the Department of Homeland Security will run out. I think we all agree this is a critical time for our country's national security, and it is important that we fully fund Department of Homeland Security to protect Americans against terrorist attacks.

But in recent days several of my friends across the aisle have spoken on this floor asserting that Republicans are trying to force a Department of Homeland Security shutdown. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Essentially, their argument is that unless Republicans choose to completely agree with President Obama's egregious constitutional violation of executive power to implement major changes in our immigration laws—an issue which is clearly the responsibility of the people's elected representatives—then Republicans will be responsible for any lapse in DHS funding.

So to put all this in perspective regarding this situation and the assertion that a few of my colleagues have made, let me give you some thoughts. First, let's remember how we got into this situation to start with. In 2008, a Presidential candidate by the name of Barack Obama said the following:

I take the Constitution very seriously. The biggest problems that we are facing right now have to do with trying to bring more and more power into the executive branch and not go through Congress at all. And that's what I intend to reverse when I am President of the United States of America.

He went on to say when he was President:

America is a nation of laws, which means that as President, I am obligated to enforce that law. I don't have a choice about that. That's part of my job. But I can advocate for changes in the law so that we can have a country that is respectful of the law but also continues to be a great country of immigrants.

Here is the key statement:

With respect to the notion that I can just suspend deportations through executive order, that is just not the case, because there are laws on the books that Congress has passed.

I could go on and on about what the President has said about his limitation of powers both as a candidate and as the President of the United States. Of course, he has violated and trampled on every word he has said, broken many promise he has made, and taken just the reverse position on everything he said about this issue on the Senate floor as a Senator and now as President.

So Republicans have responded by simply saying: "That is a violation of your Executive power. We think these issues ought to be debated and worked through the people's representatives, as they have been in the past."

Because there is an association between the Department of Homeland Security funding and funding for certain aspects of immigration, Republicans thought it would be worthwhile to bring a debate to the floor so the public could hear what we have to say on this issue and so that we could make adjustments through this process.

Having suffered through 6 years of this Presidency—4 years for me—led by a then majority leader of the Democratic Party, with Republicans not being allowed to debate on the floor any significant issues that perhaps did not fit the Democratic agenda, new management has taken over here and opened up the process so that we can again be the people's representatives and speak and debate on the floor, offer amendments—winning some, losing some—and come to a conclusion.

Looking for the right vehicle, the only real vehicle, that would allow us to at least debate and offer our amendments in opposition to what the President is trying to do has been totally stifled through Democrat filibustering, not even allowing us to move forward with the bill. So we are stuck here in a difficult situation, wanting to address this egregious abuse of the power constitutionally designated to the President and at the same time needing to fund our necessary security needs through the Department of Homeland Security.

By not allowing us to even bring this issue to the floor of the Senate and debate it back and forth, offering amendments to address each Senator's various concerns, we neglect to move forward on legislation that addresses these two important needs: Number 1, the funding of our national security through DHS, and Number 2, the issue of the President's constitutional overreach.

So we stand here frustrated with our inability to be able to go forward in the way the American people expect us to go forward, in the way this Senate has traditionally operated. Here we stand in a stalemate because one party says: "No, we don't even want to let you talk about it." One party says: "No, we don't even want to take it up, offer our amendments." Maybe they are afraid they will not pass. That is how it works here.

The irony is that at least eight Democrats, as I count, were very critical when the President issued his Executive order regarding immigration. They basically said: "Yes, that does exceed his powers, and he should not have done that."

Here is an opportunity for them to weigh in with their votes instead of just their rhetoric. Yet they will not even allow that to happen.

So we are caught here in this dilemma. But let me make a couple of things absolutely clear, at least from my perspective. I do not believe a departmental shutdown is the appropriate response to this issue. Funding and paying for essential functions of the Department of Homeland Security at a time when threats have never been higher is absolutely critical. So we have to achieve that by whatever means.

By the same token, addressing this egregious constitutional violation and the President's broken promises relative Executive power on immigration is a key issue the American people want debated now. It needs to be debated. Both sides have agreed that we need immigration reform. But it ought to be done through the people's representatives and not through the wishes of the President of the United States when he does not have the power to make these changes.

So I trust that we will be able to work through this in the next several days leading up to our recess or the end of this month when we have to come to a conclusion. We are working hard to do that. We just would like the opposing party, the Democrat Party, to allow its Members to say where they stand, to offer changes, to offer alternatives, and to offer amendments. It is important enough for us to do what we were sent here to do, and that is to represent the people in this country on the critically important issues that lie before us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the bill before us proves the axiom that big things come in small packages. This bill, the Amy and Vicky Child Pornography Victim Restitution Improvement Act, may only be several pages long, but it is a very big bill.

In 1994, by enacting the Violence Against Women Act, Congress required that defendants who commit certain crimes pay restitution to their victims. I had a lot to do with that bill. These

are crimes—such as the sexual exploitation of children—that have a particularly devastating impact on victims, and they need help to put their lives back together.

Last year, in a case titled "Paroline v. United States," the Supreme Court concluded that the restitution statute cannot provide the restitution that Congress promised for child pornography victims. The only way to fix this problem is to amend the restitution statute in a way that accounts for the insidious and evil nature of child pornography itself.

The Supreme Court held in Paroline that under the statute as currently written, a victim can seek restitution only for losses that are directly related to an individual defendant's distribution or possession of specific images of her abuse. That is not only virtually impossible to prove, but it pretends that defendants and images are isolated and self-contained. The truth is that in the Internet age, defendants are part of a growing, shifting, and constantly active group of individuals who keep the victimization going. As the Supreme Court put it in Paroline last year, each viewing of child pornography is a repetition of the child's abuse. Everyone who drives the trafficking in those images repeats that abuse and contributes to a victim's losses. Some of them will be caught and prosecuted, while others will hide in the shadows and seek safety in numbers.

The harsh reality for a victim is that the Internet has multiplied the number of individuals who harm her and, at the same time, made it harder to identify them so she can seek restitution—or should I say, she really can't seek restitution.

The bill before us today addresses this cruel catch-22. This bill is named for Amy and Vicky, the victims in two of the most widely viewed child pornography series in the world.

When I reintroduced this bill on January 28, I also shared the story of Andy, a young man in Utah who is the victim in another widely distributed child pornography series.

He is the named victim in more than 700 cases but has been granted restitution under Paroline in only one-quarter of the cases in which he has sought it and actually received restitution in just two of those cases.

This bill provides judges with options for calculating a victim's total losses and imposing restitution in different kinds of cases. That is not always easy for the very reason that I just described. A judge must impose restitution in an individual case for losses that flow from ongoing harm. But that is the diabolical nature of child pornography, and we must equip the criminal justice system to address it.

This bill helps victims in another important way. Today a victim must chase every single defendant to seek restitution, only to be told that she

must seek the impossible and, therefore, receive next to nothing. In addition to providing a way for judges to require meaningful restitution in individual cases, this bill allows defendants who harm the same victim to seek contribution from each other to spread that restitution cost.

Let me put it as simply as I can. The current statute maximizes a victim's burden and minimizes her restitution. This bill minimizes a victim's burden and maximizes her restitution.

Both Amy and Vicky personally endorse this bill. National victim advocacy groups also support it, including the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, the National Organization for Victim Assistance, the National Crime Victim Law Institute, the National Center for Victims of Crime, the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women, and the Rape, Abuse and Incest National Network.

Last October I received a letter endorsing this bill signed by the attorneys general of 43 States—22 Republicans and 21 Democrats. This has, in fact, been a truly bipartisan effort.

The senior Senator from New York, Mr. SCHUMER, has been my partner from the start in developing this legislation and has been a champion for crime victims for many years. It is important to have him on this bill. He is one of the great leaders in the Senate today, and we intend to do more together in the future.

The cosponsors include 22 Republicans and 17 Democrats. Big things really do come in small packages.

I have been contacted by advocates working with dozens of countries around the world to tackle the problem of child pornography and exploitation. They emphasize the need for meaningful restitution and say that this legislation can be an example for other countries to follow.

Congress in 1994 required full restitution for child victims of sexual exploitation. The Supreme Court last year confirmed that the restitution statute cannot keep that promise to victims of child pornography.

Enacting this legislation shows Congress at its best, stepping up and taking the action necessary to address this problem. Amy, Vicky, and Andy are counting on us.

This is an extremely important bill. It means that victims of child pornography—usually videos that are shipped all around the world and seen by, maybe, millions—have the chance of being able to get true restitution under this bill. Before that, they would have to go and sue everyone who was involved, and there is no way they could find that out, no way they could really do that, no way they could really get restitution and justify the attorneys' fees, and no way they could really vindicate themselves and show these people, these horrible people who do these things to children, that they are not going to get away with it anymore.

This bill eliminates all of that. This bill makes it possible for the victims of pornography and childhood exploitation to be able to recover and to get restitution for the very poor treatment they have undergone.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Amy and Vicky Child Pornography Victim Restitution Improvement Act, which my good friend Senator ORRIN HATCH has requested a vote on this afternoon.

First, I thank Senator HATCH for his work on this important legislation. I was proud to work alongside him as the Democratic cosponsor of his bill, and he has been an absolute force in pushing this bill in the Judiciary Committee and to the floor today. We have had a great partnership and have worked on many things together, and I think I join every one of my 99 colleagues in telling the Senator from Utah how much respect we have for him.

Our bill does one important thing. It fixes a flaw in our restitution system for pornography victims. You see, in this day and age, victims of child pornography face ongoing harm every time a video or picture of them is shared and viewed on the Internet. As the Supreme Court explained about a victim:

These sexual abuse crimes are compounded by the distribution of images of her abuser's horrific acts, which meant the wrongs inflicted upon her were in effect repeated; for she knew her humiliation and hurt were and would be renewed into the future as an ever-increasing number of wrongdoers witnessed the crimes committed against her.

The horror of sexual abuse can be long lasting. It can constitute the loss of income, medical care, psychiatric counseling, and therapy. The victims of sexual abuse, therefore, are absolutely in the right to seek restitution from those evil criminals who perpetuate the original crime by sharing and viewing images of the crime.

A 2014 Supreme Court case, *Paroline v. United States*, placed a heavy burden on the child pornography victims trying to recover restitution. The tragic effect of the Supreme Court's decision in the *Paroline* case was this: The more widely viewed the pornographic image of a victim and the more offenders there are, the more difficult it is for the victim to recover for her anguish and her damages.

For the perpetrators of child pornography, there should not be safety in numbers.

Now, the bill that Senator HATCH has led on and I was proud to cosponsor rights this wrong. Our bill provides a method for these victims to seek restitution for the total harm they en-

ured from this horrific victimization. Specifically, the Amy and Vicky Act does three things that reflect the nature of these crimes. First, it considers the total harm to the victim, including from individuals who may not yet have been identified. Second, it requires real and timely restitution. And, third, it allows defendants who have contributed to the same victims' harm to spread the restitution cost among themselves.

These specific changes are supported by the attorneys general of 43 States and countless national victim advocacy groups, such as the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, and they have wide bipartisan support in the Senate.

Once again, I commend my colleague Senator HATCH for the great work he has done on this and other things.

As I said while he was not in the Chamber, I look forward to our working on many other causes together. He is a great leader and very well respected by me and all of his colleagues.

I urge my colleagues to pass this important measure to give more power to the victims of sexual abuse to seek redress, closure, and justice for the crimes—the dastardly crimes—committed against them.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

Under the previous order, amendment No. 250 is agreed to.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the bill)

On page 4, beginning on line 22, strike "sexual conduct (as those terms are defined in section 2246)" and insert "sexual contact (as those terms are defined in section 2246) or sexually explicit conduct (as that term is defined in section 2256)".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, shall it pass?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 55 Leg.]

YEAS—98

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

NOT VOTING—2

Moran Reid

The bill (S. 295), as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. 295

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 “Amy and Vicky Child Pornography Victim Restitution Improvement Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The demand for child pornography harms children because it drives production, which involves severe and often irreparable child sexual abuse and exploitation.

(2) The harms caused by child pornography are more extensive than the harms caused by child sex abuse alone because child pornography is a permanent record of the abuse of the depicted child, and the harm to the child is exacerbated by its circulation. Every viewing of child pornography is a repetition of the victim’s original childhood sexual abuse.

(3) Victims suffer continuing and grievous harm as a result of knowing that a large, indeterminate number of individuals have viewed and will in the future view images of their childhood sexual abuse. Harms of this sort are a major reason that child pornography is outlawed.

(4) The unlawful collective conduct of every individual who reproduces, distributes, or possesses the images of a victim’s childhood sexual abuse plays a part in sustaining and aggravating the harms to that individual victim. Multiple actors independently commit intentional crimes that combine to produce an indivisible injury to a victim.

(5) It is the intent of Congress that victims of child pornography be fully compensated for all the harms resulting from each and every perpetrator who contributes to their anguish.

(6) Congress intends to adopt and hereby adopts an aggregate causation standard to

address the unique crime of child pornography and the unique harms caused by child pornography.

(7) Victims should not be limited to receiving restitution from defendants only for losses caused by each defendant’s own offense of conviction. Courts must apply a less restrictive aggregate causation standard in child pornography cases, while also recognizing appropriate constitutional limits and protections for defendants.

SEC. 3. MANDATORY RESTITUTION.

Section 2259 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) DEFINITION.—(A) For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘full amount of the victim’s losses’ includes any costs incurred by the victim for—

“(i) lifetime medical services relating to physical, psychiatric, or psychological care;

“(ii) lifetime physical and occupational therapy or rehabilitation;

“(iii) necessary transportation, temporary housing, and child care expenses;

“(iv) lifetime lost income; and

“(v) attorneys’ fees, as well as other costs incurred.

“(B) For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘full amount of the victim’s losses’ also includes any other losses suffered by the victim, in addition to the costs listed in subparagraph (A), if those losses are a proximate result of the offense.

“(C) For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘full amount of the victim’s losses’ also includes any losses suffered by the victim from any sexual act or sexual contact (as those terms are defined in section 2246) or sexually explicit conduct (as that term is defined in section 2256) in preparation for or during the production of child pornography depicting the victim involved in the offense.”;

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d);

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) DETERMINING RESTITUTION.—

“(1) HARMED BY ONE DEFENDANT.—If the victim was harmed as a result of the commission of an offense under section 2251, 2251A, 2252, 2252A, or 2260 by 1 defendant, the court shall determine the full amount of the victim’s losses caused by the defendant and enter an order of restitution for an amount that is not less than the full amount of the victim’s losses.

“(2) HARMED BY MORE THAN ONE DEFENDANT.—If the victim was harmed as a result of offenses under section 2251, 2251A, 2252, 2252A, or 2260 by more than 1 person, regardless of whether the persons have been charged, prosecuted, or convicted in any Federal or State court of competent jurisdiction within the United States, the court shall determine the full amount of the victim’s losses caused by all such persons, or reasonably expected to be caused by such persons, and enter an order of restitution against the defendant in favor of the victim for—

“(A) the full amount of the victim’s losses; or

“(B) an amount that is not more than the amount described in subparagraph (A) and not less than—

“(i) \$250,000 for any offense or offenses under section 2251(a), 2251(b), 2251(c), 2251A, 2252A(g), or 2260(a);

“(ii) \$150,000 for any offense or offenses under section 2251(d), 2252(a)(1), 2252(a)(2), 2252(a)(3), 2252A(a)(1), 2252A(a)(2), 2252A(a)(3), 2252A(a)(4), 2252A(a)(6), 2252A(a)(7), or 2260(b); or

“(iii) \$25,000 for any offense or offenses under section 2252(a)(4) or 2252A(a)(5).

“(3) MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF RESTITUTION.—No order of restitution issued under this section may exceed the full amount of the victim’s losses.

“(4) JOINT AND SEVERAL LIABILITY.—Each defendant against whom an order of restitution is issued under paragraph (2)(A) shall be jointly and severally liable to the victim with all other defendants against whom an order of restitution is issued under paragraph (2)(A) in favor of such victim.

“(5) CONTRIBUTION.—Each defendant who is ordered to pay restitution under paragraph (2)(A), and has made full payment to the victim equal to or exceeding the statutory minimum amount described in paragraph (2)(B), may recover contribution from any defendant who is also ordered to pay restitution under paragraph (2)(A). Such claims shall be brought in accordance with this section and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. In resolving contribution claims, the court may allocate payments among liable parties using such equitable factors as the court determines are appropriate so long as no payments to victims are reduced or delayed. No action for contribution may be commenced more than 5 years after the date on which the defendant seeking contribution was ordered to pay restitution under this section.”;

(4) in subsection (d), as redesignated, by striking “a commission of a crime under this chapter,” and inserting “or by the commission of (i) an offense under this chapter or (ii) a series of offenses under this chapter committed by the defendant and other persons causing aggregated losses.”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(e) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Amy and Vicky Child Pornography Victim Restitution Improvement Act of 2015, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report on the progress, if any, of the Department of Justice in obtaining restitution for victims of any offense under section 2251, 2251A, 2252, 2252A, or 2260.”.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business.

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

BARRY GOLDWATER STATUE DEDICATION

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, along with my colleagues I just had the opportunity to be at the unveiling of the statue of Senator Barry Goldwater in Statuary Hall.

I had the privilege of serving with Barry Goldwater. We traveled together many times. He came to Vermont at different times with me, and we became very close friends. It was interesting to watch Senator Goldwater form alliances across the aisle with different people. But I remember expressly one very personal thing.

I was very close to my father, and my father passed away late one evening in Vermont. The next morning, the first

two telephone calls my mother received were condolences. One was from Barry Goldwater, and one was from Ted Kennedy. The two had both talked before they called. I mention that because that was the type of people they both were. It had nothing to do with ideology; it was who they were.

In 1980 I had the second closest election in America. Somebody suggested to me that it must be because of my philosophy. I thought probably, but I can't figure it out. So I called up the man who had the closest election in 1980, the year of the Reagan sweep.

I said, "Senator Goldwater, what is the message we are being sent?"

Barry laughed and said, "We have to change our luck."

He suggested that he move into the office of the retiring Senator Abe Ribicoff of Connecticut, a Democratic Senator from New England. He said, "I am going to move into his office and change my luck. You better be strong enough to move into mine."

I suggested that I didn't have quite the seniority to do that. He said, "I will arrange your move next week." He did.

When I was sworn in for my second term in January of 1981, I was in that office. I have stayed in Senator Barry Goldwater's office ever since. I have stayed there now for—well, I am in my 35th year in Senator Goldwater's office, and I consider it a matter of pride, and I consider it a matter of pride to have served with him.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

AUMF

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President. I would like to touch on two topics. The first is that today the President has submitted a request for authorization for use of military force with regard to ISIL, or ISIS, as some call it.

First, I think it is good news that the President has made that submission, and I think he is right when he says the country is stronger when both Congress and the President act together.

I would say there is a pretty simple authorization he could ask for, and it would be one sentence, and that is, "We authorize the President to defeat and destroy ISIL." And that is what I think we need to do.

I look forward to reading through his submission. I understand it contains a time limitation. It does not contain geographic limitations. It contains some language that supposedly will make people feel more comfortable about the use of ground troops.

An authorization to use force that has limitations built into it is really quite unprecedented. We did some research, and the Congressional Research Service said that there really were

only two previous authorizations that have limited the President in terms of the use of force to be used or the duration of the conflict. One was in 1983 in Lebanon, and one was in 1993 in Somalia. Both of those were peacekeeping missions, so it made sense to limit the peacekeeping mission to use of force. But it appears that never before in certainly modern history has the Congress of the United States authorized the President to take on and defeat an enemy but has done so with limitations on the time or geography or anything of that nature. That is an important point for us to understand because under no circumstances can ISIL stay. What we need to be authorizing the President to do is to destroy them and to defeat them and allow the Commander in Chief—both the one we have now and the one who will follow—to put in place the military tactics necessary to destroy and defeat ISIS.

It is important to point out that circumstances on the ground might rapidly change. They already have. For example, when this began—if you look back a year and a half ago, if I had stood on the floor and given a speech about defeating ISIL or ISIS, no one would have known what I was talking about because at the time most Americans and most Members of Congress had no idea what that was. That is how quickly this has developed into a threat.

I would remind everyone that when they actually crossed over from Syria into Iraq, the President called them the JV team. Even today the facts on the ground continue to evolve very rapidly. For example, we now know through open source reports that ISIL has now established a presence in Derna, Libya, which gives them access to a port facility, and it is a completely uncontested space. There is no government shooting at them. There are no airstrikes. There is no one coming after them there. They can do whatever they want in Libya, and they are doing it. They are using it as a place to train, a place to recruit, a place to resupply, a place to raise money, and they have access to a port that allows them to bring all these things in.

There have also been open source reports of groups in Afghanistan beginning to pledge allegiance to ISIS. In fact, in at least four different countries in north Africa, there are now groups who have pledged allegiance to ISIL. So while we continue to focus on the conflict with relation to Iraq and Syria, we cannot overlook the fact that they are sprouting affiliates throughout the entire region.

I think that after the brutal murder of numerous Americans—we saw last week what happened to the Jordanian pilot—I don't have to spend much time convincing people how dangerous this group is. What we don't hear enough about is the atrocities being committed on a daily basis on the ground, what they are doing to the Sunni popu-

lation, for example, of areas they have now conquered, the brutality, the way they enforce sharia law with brutal tactics, not to mention the brutal stories we have heard of women being sold off or given away as brides to ISIL fighters, children trafficked into slavery, entire populations slaughtered, and fighters who were captured and killed in mass killings. This is what this group envisions for the world.

The goals of this group are not simply to govern what we knew once as Iraq or Syria or Libya or any other country; their ultimate goal is for the entire world—including where we stand today—to one day live under their mandate, under the rules they have established, under their radical version of Sunni Islam. You may say that is far-fetched, and it may be today, but that is their clear ambition—to spread their form of radical Islam everywhere and anywhere they can. They openly talk about this.

This group needs to be defeated. I wish we had taken this group on earlier. I wish, in fact, that we had gotten involved in the conflict in Syria earlier and equipped moderate rebel elements, non-jihadist rebel elements on the ground so that they would have been the most powerful force there. The President failed to do that in a timely fashion, and as a result a vacuum was created, and that vacuum was filled by this group who has attracted foreign fighters from all over the world to join their ranks.

Now we are dealing with this problem, but I would argue better late than never. Had we dealt with this a year and a half ago or 2 years ago, it wouldn't have been easy, but it would have been easier. But it is important to deal with it decisively now. We can debate the tactics, but it is the job of the Commander in Chief, in consultation with his military officials who surround him and advise him, to come up with the appropriate tactics to defeat the enemy.

For our purposes—very straightforward—ISIL is the enemy. They need to be defeated, and we should authorize this President and future Presidents to do what they can and what they must to defeat ISIS and erase them from the equation.

VENEZUELA

Mr. President, I also wish to take a moment to talk a little bit about what is happening in Venezuela. Tomorrow, February 12, will mark the 1-year anniversary since students and others across Venezuela took to the streets in peaceful demonstrations and demanded a better government and a better future than the current one, which is corrupt and incompetent and provides no leadership to the country.

Tomorrow also marks the 1-year anniversary since the Venezuelan Government, under Nicolas Maduro, responded with a violent crackdown that left dozens of people dead, thousands injured, and hundreds in jail as political prisoners. There have been at least 50 documented cases of torture by government

forces on peaceful demonstrators, and more than 1,700 individuals await trial today in Venezuela before a judiciary that is completely controlled by Maduro's government. This includes Leopoldo Lopez, who has been languishing in the Ramo Verde prison for almost a year.

In the year since the people took to the streets demanding more opportunity, accountability, and more freedom, the basic necessities have vanished from the shelves. It is one of the richest nations in the hemisphere, and its economy is in shambles.

Venezuela is also plagued with one of the world's highest murder rates, rampant corruption related to state assets, a 57-percent inflation rate, a junk rating on the global bond market, and unprecedented scarcity of goods as basic as toilet paper. Lately, things have gotten so bad in Venezuela under Maduro that they are no longer just kidnapping people. As the *Diario las Americas*, which is a newspaper in Miami, reported earlier this week, people are now kidnapping dogs and other pets in Venezuela and holding them for ransom. That is how bad things have gotten.

Why is this happening? Why has the cradle of Latin American independence—a country blessed with oil and energy wealth, with talented and hard-working people—become a failed state?

For starters, because it is modeling its economy after Cuba, which itself is a failed state.

Second, for years Venezuela has been in the grips of incompetent buffoons, one after another. First it was Hugo Chavez and now Nicolas Maduro. They have squandered the nation's riches.

Third, the country is being run by corrupt individuals. Just last week reports came out alleging that the speaker of the national assembly, Diosdado Cabello, is himself a drug kingpin.

Fourth, even with all the oil wealth Venezuela has squandered, it still possesses some of the largest oil reserves on the planet, but oil prices are dropping. In a country such as Venezuela where innovation and entrepreneurship are stifled, where wealth and power are concentrated in the government and its cronies, the entire economy is the oil industry. Ninety-six percent of Venezuela's export revenues come from oil.

So I am proud that in December the Senate and the House passed and the President signed a bill that sanctions human rights violators in Venezuela. It mandates that their assets be frozen and visa restrictions be placed upon them if they are involved in human rights violations. That is going to be critical going forward. As things get worse, more people in Venezuela will take to the streets, and the national guard in the country—which is nothing but armed thugs working on behalf of the Maduro government—will be tempted to crack down on people violently. So our legislation would impose visa sanctions and asset sanctions on individuals responsible for these human rights violations.

The good news is that the President has moved forward with some of these visa restrictions, and that is a very positive step. America should not be and cannot be a playground for Venezuela's human rights violators. But the financial sanctions part of the bill are long overdue. They are urgently needed because things are only going to get worse in Venezuela. People are only going to get more desperate. They are only going to speak out more. They are only going to demand freedom more. And I suspect, although I hope I am wrong, that the response from the Venezuelan Government will be more violence and more crackdowns on the people of their own nation.

If, God forbid, they use lethal force against their own people—which is a right they have reserved for themselves, a right the government has approved and has given authority to the national guard to use—we cannot simply stand by and watch as innocent people are killed or injured because the regime believes there will be no consequences.

So today I wanted to come here for a few moments and urge the President to do what I asked him to do in a letter last week, and that is to not sit idly by on the Venezuelan sanction law he signed last year but to use it—to use it immediately and decisively to make clear that the United States of America will not stand for repression taking place in Venezuela and that we will use the tools of our economy and the power we have given the President to punish those responsible for committing human rights violations in Venezuela against the people of that great nation.

Thank you, Mr. President.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise to talk about the Department of Homeland Security and the necessity to fund it.

Earlier today the President submitted a document for the authorization of use of military force to the Congress. I take the President's request very seriously. I look forward to the analysis that will be done by the Foreign Relations Committee, the Armed Services Committee, and debate on the floor.

Why did the President send it and why did so many in the Congress call for it? It is because everybody says that we have to do something about ISIL. You know what. I think we do have to do something about ISIL. What a ghoulish, barbaric terrorist group. There is no doubt there has to be an international effort to strike them from the planet and that the United States has to be a part of it.

But what comes out when we talk about ISIL is the need to have a strong, robust counterterrorism effort. If we are going to fight counterterrorism, we must fund the agency that has the principal responsibility for protecting the homeland.

The Department of Defense protects us against foreign invaders, but we have to also protect the homeland—whether it is against cyber security threats or other terrorist activity or other dangers that come to our country.

So why after 2 weeks do we have the Department of Homeland Security appropriations for fiscal year 2015? We are ready to vote on it. We have a clean bill. I am speaking now as the ranking or vice chair of the Senate Appropriations Committee. During fiscal year 2014, I chaired the committee. At the end of the year, when we worked on our omnibus, it was the will of the Congress that we would fund all government agencies except Homeland Security and instead put it on a continuing resolution until February 27 because there were those in both Houses who were cranky about the fact that President Obama exercised Executive authority in certain matters related to immigration.

So now we are holding up the entire funding for the Department of Homeland Security because some people are cranky with President Obama over him using an Executive order on immigration. These very people who are so cranky are criticizing him for being a weak leader. Oh, where is President Obama? Why doesn't he take strong and decisive action? When the President takes strong and decisive action, they not only don't like it, they are willing to hold up the entire funding for the Department of Homeland Security over this. What is this? Do we have a new math where 1 and 1 makes 14 or 5?

We created the Department of Homeland Security after the horrific attack of 9/11, and they need to be funded.

I am here to urge that we pass a clean funding bill to protect the Nation from terrorism, cyber security threats which are mounting every day, and so we can also help our communities respond to other threats.

I believe immigration does deserve a debate. I am not arguing about that, nor would I ever want to stifle a Senator's ability to speak on topics where they have strong beliefs and deeply held views, but let's move immigration to a different forum to talk about it.

In the last Congress the Senate passed a comprehensive immigration bill. It went to the House, and it sat there. Gee, it sat there. After a while it kind of sat there some more, and then it died as that session came to an end.

The President, frustrated that the House of Representatives refused to take up a bill and debate it through its committees and on the floor, acted through Executive order.

So my view is let's bring up immigration, let's move our comprehensive bill again with a full and ample debate, full and ample amendments. Maybe the House will finally get around to talking about immigration instead of talking about President Obama, and then we can pass the Homeland Security bill.

Three times last week the Senate rejected a procedural vote to take up Homeland Security. People can ask: Senator BARB, why did you do that? I voted not to delay but to move on. We Senate Democrats tried to move a clean Homeland Security funding bill. What does that mean? We focused only on the money. We said we did not want to have the five poison pill immigration riders that are in the House bill. We wanted to be able to take that out.

The President has been very clear. If we send him a bill that includes funding plus five poison pill riders on immigration, he will veto it. What is the consequence? We become a public spectacle in the world's eyes. We play parliamentary ping-pong with the President of the United States. We pass a bill because we want to have a temper tantrum. He vetoes it. It comes back. We have another debate where we huff and puff and hope problems will go away. We then try to override a veto and all the while we are eating up time.

The world is watching us. Our treasured allies are not the only ones asking about what is going on with the United States and how the greatest deliberative body has become the greatest delaying body. Our enemies say we can't get our act together internally to pass the very money to take them on, so they are going to try to bring it to us.

In the end, when all is said and done, more is getting said than done. Before we go out for the Presidents Day recess, I urge the Senate to pass this bill.

Tomorrow we are going to vote to confirm the Secretary of Defense, Dr. Ashton Carter. He has gone through the process and was reported out of committee. I look forward to voting for him.

Why are we going to move so fast to confirm Dr. Carter? Because we need a Secretary of Defense. We have to fight for America. We have to stand up for America. We have to be muscular and ready to deal with those bad guys. I agree with that.

I salute our military every day and in every way. They are out there on the frontlines, and their families are there to lovingly support them.

We are going to have a Secretary of Defense. Let's not forget we also have a Secretary of Homeland Security, Mr. Jeh Johnson. Instead of America having deep pockets to fight terrorism, the Secretary of Homeland Security will have empty pockets.

What is this? We are going to rush to confirm Dr. Carter, and I think we ought to. There is no dispute from me on that. Shouldn't we also rush to complete our work and fund Homeland Security? I think we should. We could do it tomorrow. We could do it tomorrow and pass this clean bill.

The Department of Homeland Security's mission is to protect America from terrorism and help communities respond to all threats, from terrorism to natural disasters. We are talking about the TSA, which protects our air-

ports. We are talking about the Border Patrol and ICE, so if we are talking about immigration, don't we want to fund the agents out there protecting our borders? Don't we want to continue to have cyber warriors securing our networks? We need to support the people who are dealing with bio and nuclear threats. We need to also continue supporting State and local first responders, firefighters, and EMS personnel in the different States so they can be ready—whether they are responding to a local disaster or something that has been caused by a despicable attack. We need to be able to pass this bill.

The Department of Homeland Security funding runs out on February 27, and my view is that instead of running the clock we should move this bill. I believe it could pass tomorrow and that we could get our job done. But, no, we are all going to go back to our home States and tell everybody how they have a government on their side and how they can count on us to fight for America. But the way to fight for America is to stop fighting with each other.

Let's try to find a sensible Senator and move this bill forward. I believe people on both sides of the aisle are patriots. I believe people on both sides of the aisle want to defend America. Let's come together on both sides of the aisle, right down the middle, and let's find a way to move this bill forward and have a debate on immigration. I don't want to stifle or stiff-arm it, but let's move this forward, and let's stand shoulder to shoulder doing our job to fund the agency that has the principal responsibility for protecting the homeland.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I am here to also talk about the DHS funding bill. I will say from the outset that I don't think the President did the right thing by taking this unilateral action. I think he has made it more difficult to pass immigration reform in this body.

Having said that, to attempt to use the spending bill in order to try to poke a finger in the President's eye, in my view, is not a good move. I believe that rather than poke the President in the eye, we ought to put legislation on his desk, and we ought to use this time—we have already used up 2 weeks trying to attach measures to a funding bill when we could have used this time to move actual immigration legislation.

Coming from the State of Arizona, we desperately need immigration reform. We desperately need to have more resources and better security on our border. We have needed that for a long time. We have had situations where part of the border gets better and then falls back. As soon as the economy ramps up again, we can expect a lot more flow across the border. We don't have sufficient border secu-

rity in the State, and Arizonans pay the price in terms of the cost of health care, education, criminal justice. We bear the brunt of the Federal Government's failure to have a secure border and to provide for a secure border.

We need to pass that kind of legislation. There has been a bill that has been introduced in the House and the Senate. I happen to be a cosponsor of the bill in the Senate which would help us to get a more secure border. That is one piece of legislation we could be moving right now so it could be put on the President's desk.

Second, we all know we need better interior enforcement. We need to make sure employers who employ illegal aliens are not able to do so. We need to make sure employers have the tools to find out if those they are hiring are here legally. That has been needed for a long time. It has been provided in other pieces of legislation. We could do a bill just on interior enforcement. We could be doing that now rather than simply making a statement on a spending bill.

We also need legislation to expand the guest worker plans and programs we have now. There has been legislation introduced in this body already to deal with high-tech workers. We need to make sure those who are educated in our universities and receive graduate degrees in the STEM fields are encouraged to stay. They ought to be encouraged to stay to help create jobs in this country rather than returning to their home country and competing against us. That has been needed, and that is recognized on a bipartisan basis. We could move legislation right now with regard to high-tech visas.

We also need to expand other visa categories. We need an ag worker bill to make sure areas where we simply don't have enough labor to deal with the needs we have on our farms—we need to pass legislation to do that. Legislation has been introduced and could be moved through now. We could be doing that.

We also obviously need to move legislation to deal with those who are here illegally now—the so-called DREAMers. They are here through no fault of their own. They were brought to this country when they were 2, 10 or 12 years, and they are now as American as you or I. They ought to be given a path where they can stay and have some kind of certainty moving ahead, but that needs to be done by Congress. It cannot simply be done by the President in Executive action. That kind of legislation could move here now as well.

We obviously need to deal with legislation for the broader class of those here illegally. We dealt with it in S. 744, which was introduced and passed in the Senate in the last Congress. It provided a way for those who are here illegally to get right with the law and to deport those who are in a criminal class but also allow those who are here and want to adjust their status to find a way to do so and to be able to stay.

Legislation such as that could move as well but instead we are spending weeks trying to make a statement on a spending bill.

So I hope we will actually do what this Senate is prepared to do and is ready to do again, which is actually to legislate—to move legislation through the committee process to the floor and on to the President's desk. That is how we ought to respond to the action the President has taken. I hope we will do so.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, over the last two weeks Republicans in Congress have insisted on playing political games with funding for the Department of Homeland Security. The same agency that supports States such as Massachusetts when disasters hit, the same agency that provides grants for equipment to keep firefighters safe when they rush into burning buildings, the same agency that helps train and fund local police, the same agency that tracks down weapons that terrorists can use to threaten our safety here at home, the same agency that keeps our borders and airports safe—this is the agency the Republicans are willing to shut down. Why? Why put America at such risk? Because Republicans want to protest the steps President Obama has taken to try to address our country's immigration challenges.

This is not a responsible way to govern. This is a dangerous way to govern. There are real threats out there, from ISIS in the Middle East to cyber threats, to acts of terror such as the one in Paris earlier this year.

DHS gives funding to State and local governments to help them prevent terror attacks. Massachusetts received over \$30 million in these grants just last year alone. If DHS shuts down, that funding dries up, leaving our firefighters, our police, and our EMTs hanging, putting the safety of every American at risk.

Think about the Customs and Border Protection agents, who screen people traveling into the United States through our airports, and the men and women of the Coast Guard who patrol our waters. They will still have to work those tough, sometimes dangerous jobs, but if the Republicans shut down the Department of Homeland Security, these people just won't get paid. Tens of thousands of workers nationwide could be working to help keep us safe and not get a paycheck to cover their groceries and rent. That is no way to treat the people who protect this country.

The solution is simple. Last year Democrats and Republicans agreed on a bipartisan bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security. That bill was ready to go until the Republicans decided they wanted to play politics. They decided to hold the Department of Homeland Security hostage to try to force the President to reverse an Executive order on immigration. That Department of Homeland Security funding bill is still ready to go. We could vote on it today and be done with all of this. Everyone who works to protect our safety would keep on working and keep on getting paid.

A few days ago the Boston Globe wrote an editorial about this, and they said:

The game of political chicken has to end with the Republicans blinking. It's one thing to disagree with a President's executive actions, but it's another thing altogether to hold crucial funding for a wide range of security programs hostage.

I couldn't agree more.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Globe, Feb. 7, 2015]

GOP SHOULD FOCUS ON FIXING IMMIGRATION,
NOT COMPROMISING SECURITY
(Editorial)

In the latest political show vote on Capitol Hill, Republicans are protesting President Obama's executive orders on immigration, enacted in November, by trying to attach language undoing them to a bill that funds the Department of Homeland Security. The attempt is going nowhere: Earlier this week, Democrats in the Senate blocked the bill from reaching Obama's desk. At the same time, the president has vowed to veto any legislation that reverses his immigration measures.

This game of political chicken has to end with the Republicans blinking. It's one thing to disagree with the president's executive actions, but it's another thing altogether to hold crucial funding for a wide range of security programs hostage.

Republicans who believe Obama's executive orders are an abuse of power should instead look for remedy in the courts. If Obama overstepped, the surest way to reverse his orders would be through a judicial ruling. Meanwhile, Congress should pass a "clean" Homeland Security funding bill that funds the agency without the immigration language.

Obama enacted the executive orders only after the House refused to vote on a Senate-passed bill that would have overhauled our current immigration system. In retaliation, the GOP decided to attack the president's orders at the funding source: DHS. The Republican bill included so-called "poison pill" amendments that prevent the use of DHS funds or fees to enforce Obama's executive actions, which will benefit about 4 million undocumented immigrants by shielding them from deportation while also allowing them to apply for work permits. The amendments also prevent the use of any funds to continue implementing a 2012 order that protected some undocumented immigrants who came to the United States as children.

Along with some Republicans who voted against the bill in the House and the Senate, three former secretaries of Homeland Security

have also urged the GOP to stop using the agency's budget as a political weapon. Republicans Tom Ridge and Michael Chertoff, and Democrat Janet Napolitano, wrote to Republican leadership: "DHS's responsibilities are much broader than its responsibility to oversee the federal immigration agencies and to protect our borders . . . Funding for the entire agency should not be put in jeopardy by the debate about immigration." They called for a clean funding bill for the rest of the year, like the one Maryland Senator Barbara Mikulski and New Hampshire Senator Jeanne Shaheen filed last week.

Obama has said he would be happy to see Congress pass a law that would make his executive orders unnecessary. Republicans, instead of engaging in quixotic budget tactics, should get to work on a new immigration bill and stop compromising national security.

Ms. WARREN. Let's be clear. If Republicans in the Senate don't change course, they will shut down the Department of Homeland Security and compromise the safety of the American people, and they will have done it because a handful of extremists in the Republican Party are angry at the President because he is trying to fix what we all know is a broken immigration system. Well, if they are angry about the President's immigration policy, let's debate the President's immigration policy. Last Congress the Senate passed a bipartisan bill to address immigration. Let's debate that bill again. Or if they want to propose a new bill, let's vote on that. But don't play games with the safety of the American people.

The way forward is clear. We need to pass a bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

IRRIGATE ACT

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President. I wish to discuss legislation I introduced yesterday that would help Native American irrigators, ranchers, farmers, and families fully utilize the irrigation systems in Indian Country. The bill, S. 438, is entitled the Irrigation Rehabilitation and Renovation for Indian Tribal Governments and Their Economies Act, or the IRRIGATE Act.

I thank my colleagues who have joined me as co-sponsors of this legislation, including Senators TESTER, HATCH, ENZI, DAINES and BENNET.

Careful management of water in Indian communities is essential if we are to ensure a reliable supply in the future. Many ranchers and farmers, both Indian and non-Indian, still depend on the Bureau of Indian Affairs, BIA, to deliver water for their needs.

The Department of the Interior initiated several Indian irrigation projects in the late 1800s and early 1900s intended as a central component of tribal economies. In most cases, the Federal Government did not even complete these projects. In 2006, the Government Accountability Office released a report on Indian irrigation projects, which highlighted the inefficiencies of the operation, maintenance, and management by the BIA.

While the BIA has indicated that the current backlog is estimated to be in excess of \$560 million, some Indian tribes estimate that this backlog estimate may be even higher. The most recent information from the BIA clearly reflects an upward trend in the costs of these systems, growing from \$549 million to in excess of \$560 million in only one-quarter year alone.

Deferred maintenance means inefficient water delivery and damaged infrastructure. For the Wind River Indian Reservation in Wyoming, these issues are perpetual problems. Tribal economies depend on these water systems—and the BIA has an obligation to repair those irrigation systems.

The bill intends to bring the BIA irrigation systems into the 21st century. The bill would authorize \$35 million each year from FY 2015 to 2036, to address the deferred maintenance needs of certain BIA irrigation projects. This includes any structures, facilities, equipment, or vehicles used in connection with the projects. The bill would also require a longer-term study on the operations of these projects.

This bipartisan bill is supported by many Indian tribes. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

REMEMBERING DEAN SMITH

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I wish to commemorate and celebrate the life of Coach Dean Smith. Dean Smith's accomplishments as coach, mentor, and teacher made him a legend in our State, and far beyond Tobacco Road. Brooke and I were deeply saddened to hear of his passing, but he left his indelible mark on our State. Under his stewardship, UNC-Chapel Hill became the formidable college basketball powerhouse that it is today. While he was a winning coach, he also encouraged his players to excel in the classroom and taught well beyond the locker room.

Coach Smith was born in Emporia, KS, in 1931. The son of public school teachers, his lifelong dedication to teaching on and off the court was instilled in him from a young age. Dean was a high school athlete playing basketball, football, and baseball. He earned an academic scholarship to the University of Kansas. While at Kansas he played basketball and was a member of the 1952 national championship team. He began his coaching career there in 1953 as an assistant coach.

Dean Smith then served his country in the U.S. Air Force. In 1958 he was

asked to serve as assistant coach for the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Three years later he would become the head coach for UNC. His first season as head coach was his only losing season in his 36 year coaching career.

His early days as coach were not always so smooth. In 1965, the UNC fans hung him in effigy after a loss to my alma mater, Wake Forest University. But, soon enough, he enjoyed tremendous success as a coach. He is considered one of the greatest to ever coach the game. His accomplishments are too many to list. Some of his most memorable feats include 2 national championship titles, 11 final four appearances, 17 regular season ACC titles, 13 ACC tournament titles, 27 NCAA tournament appearances with 23 of those being consecutive. He was the National Coach of the Year four times. Dean had 879 wins in his 36-year coaching career making him one of the winningest coaches of all time. Five of his players went on to be Rookies of the Year in the NBA or ABA. He coached Team USA to gold in the 1976 Olympics. Legendary UCLA coach John Wooden once said "Dean is the best teacher of basketball that I have observed." His philosophy known as the "Carolina Way" still rings true today. Play Hard, Play Together, Play Smart.

Coach Smith's influence extended far beyond the basketball court. He was a champion for social justice. He was the first UNC coach to offer a scholarship to an African-American player. He encouraged many local businesses to desegregate during the 1960s. He served as a mentor to his players and always taught them that education came first. During his career over 95 percent of his players received their degrees. His former players remember the fact that Coach Smith not only taught them about basketball, he taught them about life.

Throughout his career, he was a fierce competitor but was always respected by his opponents. There was never a hint of scandal about how he recruited players or how he ran his program. He was a pioneer in the art of assembling a long-term winning basketball tradition. Basketball, UNC and all of North Carolina have lost a giant with his passing.

I extend my sympathy to his wife Linnea and to all of Coach Smith's family.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL TO AUTHORIZE THE LIMITED USE OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES AGAINST THE ISLAMIC STATE OF IRAQ AND THE LEVANT (ISIL)—PM 5

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

The so-called Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) poses a threat to the people and stability of Iraq, Syria, and the broader Middle East, and to U.S. national security. It threatens American personnel and facilities located in the region and is responsible for the deaths of U.S. citizens James Foley, Steven Sotloff, Abdul-Rahman Peter Kassig, and Kayla Mueller. If left unchecked, ISIL will pose a threat beyond the Middle East, including to the United States homeland.

I have directed a comprehensive and sustained strategy to degrade and defeat ISIL. As part of this strategy, U.S. military forces are conducting a systematic campaign of airstrikes against ISIL in Iraq and Syria. Although existing statutes provide me with the authority I need to take these actions, I have repeatedly expressed my commitment to working with the Congress to pass a bipartisan authorization for the use of military force (AUMF) against ISIL. Consistent with this commitment, I am submitting a draft AUMF that would authorize the continued use of military force to degrade and defeat ISIL.

My Administration's draft AUMF would not authorize long-term, large-scale ground combat operations like those our Nation conducted in Iraq and Afghanistan. Local forces, rather than U.S. military forces, should be deployed to conduct such operations. The authorization I propose would provide the flexibility to conduct ground combat operations in other, more limited circumstances, such as rescue operations involving U.S. or coalition personnel or the use of special operations forces to take military action against ISIL leadership. It would also authorize the use of U.S. forces in situations where ground combat operations are not expected or intended, such as intelligence collection and sharing, missions to enable kinetic strikes, or the provision of operational planning and other forms of advice and assistance to partner forces.

Although my proposed AUMF does not address the 2001 AUMF, I remain committed to working with the Congress and the American people to refine, and ultimately repeal, the 2001 AUMF. Enacting an AUMF that is specific to the threat posed by ISIL could serve as a model for how we can work together to tailor the authorities granted by the 2001 AUMF.

I can think of no better way for the Congress to join me in supporting our Nation's security than by enacting this legislation, which would show the world we are united in our resolve to counter the threat posed by ISIL.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 11, 2015.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:30 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the

following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 710. An act to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to prepare a comprehensive security assessment of the transportation security card program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 719. An act to require the Transportation Security Administration to conform to existing Federal law and regulations regarding criminal investigator positions, and for other purposes.

H.R. 720. An act to improve intergovernmental planning for and communication during security incidents at domestic airports, and for other purposes.

H.R. 810. An act to authorize the programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and for other purposes.

The message further announced the House has agreed the following resolution:

H. Res. 99. Resolution relative to the death of the Honorable Alan Nunnelee, a Representative from the State of Mississippi.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 710. An act to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to prepare a comprehensive security assessment of the transportation security card program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 810. An act to authorize the programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 446. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the credit for employers establishing workplace child care facilities, to increase the child care credit to encourage greater use of quality child care services, to provide incentives for students to earn child care-related degrees and to work in child care facilities, and to increase the exclusion for employer-provided dependent care assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 447. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prohibit the exclusion of individuals from service on a Federal jury on account of sexual orientation or gender identity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 448. A bill to provide for coordination between the TRICARE program and eligibility for making contributions to a health savings account, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PORTMAN:

S. 449. A bill to reduce recidivism and increase public safety; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. REED, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 450. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax rate parity among all tobacco products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. KING):

S. 451. A bill to award grants to encourage State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and schools to utilize technology to improve student achievement and college and career readiness, the skills of teachers and school leaders, and the efficiency and productivity of education systems at all levels; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. WICKER, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. VITTER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 452. A bill to provide lethal weapons to the Government of Ukraine in order to defend itself against Russian-backed rebel separatists in eastern Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 453. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to States to streamline State requirements and procedures for veterans with military emergency medical training to become civilian emergency medical technicians; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 454. A bill to amend the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 to improve the high-end computing research and development program of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 455. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for special treatment of the research credit for certain start-up companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARPER:

S. 456. A bill to codify mechanisms for enabling cybersecurity threat indicator sharing between private and government entities, as well as among private entities, to better protect information systems; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. REID):

S. 457. A bill to secure the Federal voting rights of non-violent persons when released from incarceration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 458. A bill to provide emergency funding for port of entry personnel and infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BOOZMAN:

S. 459. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to approve waivers under the Medicaid Program under title XIX of the Social Security Act that are related to State provider taxes that exempt certain retirement communities; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 460. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to provide for the assessment and management of the risk of algal toxins in drinking water, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 461. A bill to provide for alternative financing arrangements for the provision of certain services and the construction and maintenance of infrastructure at land border ports of entry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 462. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to publish a health advisory and submit reports with respect to microcystins in drinking water; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 463. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to prohibit the paying of premium subsidies on policies based on the actual market price of an agricultural commodity at the time of harvest; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. SCHATZ, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 464. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 regarding Native Hawaiian education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KAINÉ (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 465. A bill to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe-Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. REED, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 466. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to improve the quality, health outcomes, and value of maternity care under the Medicaid and CHIP programs by developing maternity care quality measures and supporting maternity care quality collaboratives; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. LEE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. HATCH, Mr. COONS, and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 467. A bill to reduce recidivism and increase public safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 468. A bill to provide a categorical exclusion under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to allow the Director of the Bureau of Land Management and the Chief of the Forest Service to remove Pinyon-Juniper trees to conserve and restore the habitat of the greater sage-grouse and the mule deer; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. TESTER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 469. A bill to improve the reproductive assistance provided by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs to severely wounded, ill, or injured members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their spouses or partners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 33

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr.

WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 33, a bill to provide certainty with respect to the timing of Department of Energy decisions to approve or deny applications to export natural gas, and for other purposes.

S. 36

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 36, a bill to address the continued threat posed by dangerous synthetic drugs by amending the Controlled Substances Act relating to controlled substance analogues.

S. 48

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 48, a bill to prohibit discrimination against the unborn on the basis of sex or gender, and for other purposes.

S. 50

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 50, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit certain abortion-related discrimination in governmental activities.

S. 51

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 51, a bill to amend title X of the Public Health Service Act to prohibit family planning grants from being awarded to any entity that performs abortions, and for other purposes.

S. 83

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 83, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to improve nonretaliation provisions relating to equal pay requirements.

S. 125

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) were added as cosponsors of S. 125, a bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes.

S. 295

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 295, a bill to amend section 2259 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 295, *supra*.

S. 299

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of

S. 299, a bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba.

S. 301

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 301, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

S. 308

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 308, a bill to reauthorize 21st century community learning centers, and for other purposes.

S. 337

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 337, a bill to improve the Freedom of Information Act.

S. 373

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 373, a bill to provide for the establishment of nationally uniform and environmentally sound standards governing discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel.

S. 409

At the request of Mr. BURR, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 409, a bill to amend the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act to require the Secretary of Defense to inform the Attorney General of persons required to register as sex offenders.

S. 423

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 423, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 438

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 438, a bill to provide for the repair, replacement, and maintenance of certain Indian irrigation projects.

S. 439

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 439, a bill to end discrimination based on actual or per-

ceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, and for other purposes.

S. 441

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 441, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the Food and Drug Administration's jurisdiction over certain tobacco products, and to protect jobs and small businesses involved in the sale, manufacturing and distribution of traditional and premium cigars.

S.J. RES. 8

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 8, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures.

S. RES. 26

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 26, a resolution commending Pope Francis for his leadership in helping to secure the release of Alan Gross and for working with the Governments of the United States and Cuba to achieve a more positive relationship.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. REED, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 450. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax rate parity among all tobacco products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 450

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 "Tobacco Tax Equity Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHING EXCISE TAX EQUITY AMONG ALL TOBACCO PRODUCT TAX RATES.

(a) TAX PARITY FOR PIPE TOBACCO AND ROLL-YOUR-OWN TOBACCO.—Section 5701(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking "\$2.8311 cents" and inserting "\$24.78".

(b) TAX PARITY FOR SMOKELESS TOBACCO.—(1) Section 5701(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking "\$1.51" and inserting "\$13.42";

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking "\$50.33 cents" and inserting "\$5.37"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) SMOKELESS TOBACCO SOLD IN DISCRETE SINGLE-USE UNITS.—On discrete single-use units, \$50.33 per thousand.”.

(2) Section 5702(m) of such Code is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “or chewing tobacco” and inserting “, chewing tobacco, or discrete single-use unit”;

(B) in paragraphs (2) and (3), by inserting “that is not a discrete single-use unit” before the period in each such paragraph;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) DISCRETE SINGLE-USE UNIT.—The term ‘discrete single-use unit’ means any product containing tobacco that—

“(A) is not intended to be smoked; and

“(B) is in the form of a lozenge, tablet, pill, pouch, dissolvable strip, or other discrete single-use or single-dose unit.”.

(c) TAX PARITY FOR LARGE CIGARS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 5701(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “52.75 percent” and all that follows through the period and inserting the following: “\$24.78 per pound and a proportionate tax at the like rate on all fractional parts of a pound but not less than 5.033 cents per cigar.”.

(2) GUIDANCE.—The Secretary may issue guidance regarding the appropriate method for determining the weight of large cigars for purposes of calculating the applicable tax under section 5701(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(d) TAX PARITY FOR ROLL-YOUR-OWN TOBACCO AND CERTAIN PROCESSED TOBACCO.—Subsection (o) of section 5702 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting “, and includes processed tobacco that is removed for delivery or delivered to a person other than a person with a permit provided under section 5713, but does not include removals of processed tobacco for exportation” after “wrappers thereof”.

(e) CLARIFYING TAX RATE FOR OTHER TOBACCO PRODUCTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(i) OTHER TOBACCO PRODUCTS.—Any product not otherwise described under this section that has been determined to be a tobacco product by the Food and Drug Administration through its authorities under the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act shall be taxed at a level of tax equivalent to the tax rate for cigarettes on an estimated per use basis as determined by the Secretary.”.

(2) ESTABLISHING PER USE BASIS.—For purposes of section 5701(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, not later than 12 months after the date that a product has been determined to be a tobacco product by the Food and Drug Administration, the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary of the Treasury’s delegate) shall issue final regulations establishing the level of tax for such product that is equivalent to the tax rate for cigarettes on an estimated per use basis.

(f) CLARIFYING DEFINITION OF TOBACCO PRODUCTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 5702 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(c) TOBACCO PRODUCTS.—The term ‘tobacco products’ means—

“(1) cigars, cigarettes, smokeless tobacco, pipe tobacco, and roll-your-own tobacco, and

“(2) any other product subject to tax pursuant to section 5701(i).”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Subsection (d) of section 5702 of such Code is amended by striking “cigars, cigarettes, smokeless tobacco, pipe tobacco, or roll-your-own tobacco” each place it appears and inserting “tobacco products”.

(g) TAX RATES ADJUSTED FOR INFLATION.—Section 5701 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(i) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any calendar year beginning after 2015, the dollar amounts provided under this chapter shall each be increased by an amount equal to—

“(A) such dollar amount, multiplied by

“(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year, determined by substituting ‘calendar year 2014’ for ‘calendar year 1992’ in subparagraph (B) thereof.

“(2) ROUNDING.—If any amount as adjusted under paragraph (1) is not a multiple of \$0.01, such amount shall be rounded to the next highest multiple of \$0.01.”.

(h) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) through (4), the amendments made by this section shall apply to articles removed (as defined in section 5702(j) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) after the last day of the month which includes the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) DISCRETE SINGLE-USE UNITS AND PROCESSED TOBACCO.—The amendments made by subsections (b)(1)(C), (b)(2), and (d) shall apply to articles removed (as defined in section 5702(j) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) after the date that is 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) LARGE CIGARS.—The amendments made by subsection (c) shall apply to articles removed after December 31, 2015.

(4) OTHER TOBACCO PRODUCTS.—The amendments made by subsection (e)(1) shall apply to products removed after the last day of the month which includes the date that the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary of the Treasury’s delegate) issues final regulations establishing the level of tax for such product.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. WICKER, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. VITTER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 452. A bill to provide lethal weapons to the Government of Ukraine in order to defend itself against Russian-backed rebel separatists in eastern Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I am introducing a bill today because there is something going on that people are not as aware of as they should be.

We don’t have a better friend than King Abdullah in Jordan. I have been pleased to get to know him as a personal friend as well as a friend of America. I was over there with him last October. We were on the Syrian border looking at all the things that are going on right now with ISIL and ISIS, and it has been a real tragedy.

Last week King Abdullah was in the United States for the National Prayer Breakfast. While he was here, there were several of us who were with him when he got the news that his friend and relative, an F-16 pilot, had been caged, soaked with gasoline, and burned alive.

America and the whole world saw what happened and asked: What kind of monsters are these people who are

doing this over there? They are beheading children and pregnant women and burning people alive. Yet this is going on. People have to understand this.

They do understand it in terms of ISIS. But what I want to share with you, and introduce legislation to correct, is that it is not just happening there, it is also happening in Ukraine right now.

I happened to be in Ukraine in late October of this year. I went over there because they were having their parliamentary elections at the time. Ukraine has been such a good friend to us—not just Poroshenko, but the rest of the administration that went through the parliamentary election has also been a friend.

Let’s keep in mind that the Presidential elections were way back in May. This last election was the parliamentary election, and we were there to see what was happening in the Ukraine.

In the Ukraine they have a constitutional requirement that you cannot have a seat in Parliament unless you have 5 percent of the vote. This is the first time, after the vote when we were there in October, that they had a parliamentary election and not one Communist got a seat in Parliament. This is the first time in 96 years that not one Communist has a seat in the Parliament.

As bad as things are with ISIS, I suggest that what is going on—and I only preface what I am saying so I can demonstrate what a good friend Poroshenko and the leadership of the Ukraine is to the United States. We have the Russians in there with the separatists doing horrible things—things that are just as bad as what is taking place in Syria with ISIS and in other places.

To demonstrate this—it is not a very fun thing to look at, but you have to understand what is happening. These are T-72 tanks. Putin keeps saying: We don’t have any Russians in there with the separatists. It is not us. We are not doing it.

Well, here they are. These are the pictures we brought back with us. All those tanks are lined up within Ukraine, and that is clearly what they are.

If you want to see how brutal Putin and everyone else is—it is not something anyone enjoys looking at, but you have to know this is going on. The tragedies that are taking place in Syria and in other parts of the world are also taking place in Ukraine.

This is a picture of the murders and torture that have been taking place there. These people have been disembodied, their heads cut off. These are Ukrainian citizens. They are legal citizens. They are the ones whom Putin and the rest of them are fighting. For that reason, I have introduced legislation to require that the United States offer the weaponry.

By the way, I was making a presentation about this issue and Senator

MCCAIN was there. He said: If you look at all of those tanks, they don't have one piece of equipment that could offer a defense against those tanks. What have we been giving them? We have been giving them MREs and blankets.

When Poroshenko was here in the United States, he made a speech to both Houses. He said that "one can't win the war with blankets. . . . Even more, we cannot keep the peace with a blanket." In other words, we have to share the very best defensive weapons or weapons that can be used offensively with them. They cannot be left naked there when facing this kind of abuse. We know that shortly after the heavily armed Russian soldiers invaded and took control of the Crimean region in February of 2014, the Ukrainian Government and its people faced and sustained a deadly force from heavily armed rebel separatists who were equipped, trained, and supported by the Russian Federation. We have seen pictures of that. This is the first time we have shown pictures that document, No. 1, that the equipment came from Russia and Putin, and, No. 2, the type of things they are doing over there.

We passed a law last year that said we would give defensive weaponry to the Ukrainians, but it fell short because of one thing—it was prescriptive. It said what kind of equipment it would be.

The bill I am introducing today does two things. It offers the equipment we can give them with no restrictions whatsoever, and secondly, it does something else I think is very significant, and that is we require the President to come up with a strategy. People always say: Well, the President doesn't have a strategy against ISIS. It is true he doesn't have one, and it is deplorable that he doesn't have one. He also doesn't have a strategy for Ukraine. Without a strategy, it is not going to work.

Last week we had a hearing in the Senate Armed Services Committee. It was kind of funny because we had people from the past. We had George Shultz, Madeleine Albright, and Henry Kissinger. We were talking about the Ukraine at that time and talked about offering some equipment we thought should go there, and they said: Well, you have to do that, but you can't just send them equipment. You have to specifically demand a strategy. In this bill we are saying to the President of the United States to not only send over equipment but we need to also provide a strategy we can massage as time goes on.

On February 2, 2015, eight of the former senior ranking diplomatic and military officials testified. They included the former U.S. Ambassador to the Ukraine, Steven Pifer; former Under Secretary of Defense Michele Flournoy; former Supreme Allied Commander ADM James Stavridis, and former Deputy Commander to the U.S. Command, Gen. Charles Wald. They all served under both Republican and

Democratic administrations. They released a nonpartisan report calling on President Obama to provide Ukraine with lethal weaponry, and this is what we talked about in the bill. They encouraged other NATO countries to do the same, particularly those that possess and used former Soviet equipment and weaponry.

On January 25, when President Obama stated at a news conference in New Delhi, India that the aggression by the rebel separatists in eastern Ukraine had Russian backing, Russian equipment, Russian financing, Russian training, and Russian troops—so he finally agreed. It is not something that is debatable or might be happening; it is something that is happening. You can see the horrible things that are going on there, and you can see the reason it is necessary to get this done.

Some time ago, back when Carl Levin was still here—he is retired, and he did such a great job as the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee for so many years when I was the ranking Republican on the Committee on Armed Services. At that time, a year ago in October, we wrote the following in the Washington Post:

We believe that the United States should begin providing defensive weapons that would help Ukraine defend its territory. Such weapons could include anti-tank weapons to defend against Russian-provided armored personnel carriers, ammunition, vehicles and secure communications equipment. This would present no threat to Russia unless its forces launch further aggression against Ukraine. In other words, these weapons are lethal, but not provocative because they are defensive.

That came from Carl Levin and me. This is back before we knew the results of the parliamentary election that was so successful and so complementary to the West.

This has been long overdue. There is no one who disagrees with it, and even the President recognizes they have the equipment and we are not doing the job we should be doing.

So, with that, I am going to introduce S. 452, and we are going to ask for cosponsors to come down and speak on this topic. We have quite a long list of cosponsors.

It doesn't bother me if other Members want to introduce like resolutions because we need to get something passed. We need to raise the visibility so the people of America know this is not just going on in Syria and some of these other countries, but it is also in the country of one of our very best friends worldwide, and that best friend is the Ukraine.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 452

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 "Defense of Ukraine Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION TO PROVIDE LETHAL WEAPONS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF UKRAINE.

The President is authorized to provide lethal weapons to the Government of Ukraine in order to defend itself against Russian-backed rebel separatists in eastern Ukraine.

SEC. 3. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) STRATEGY.—Not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a written report setting forth a comprehensive strategy of the United States to provide lethal weapons to the Government of Ukraine so that it may effectively defend itself from Russian-back rebel aggression.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGY.—

(1) REPORTS REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after submitting the report required under subsection (a), and every 90 days thereafter, the President shall submit to Congress a written report setting forth a current comprehensive description and assessment of the implementation of the comprehensive strategy set forth in the report required under such subsection.

(2) UPDATES.—If the President makes a substantive change to the comprehensive strategy required under subsection (a), the President shall immediately submit a written report to Congress that articulates the change, the reason for the change, and the effect of the change on the overall comprehensive strategy.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 458. A bill to provide emergency funding for port of entry personnel and infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 458

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 "Emergency Port of Entry Personnel and Infrastructure Funding Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the General Services Administration.

(2) COMMISSIONER.—The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(3) NORTHERN BORDER.—The term "Northern border" means the international border between the United States and Canada.

(4) RELEVANT COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term "relevant committees of Congress" means—

(A) the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(E) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives;

(F) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

(G) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(6) SOUTHERN BORDER.—The term “Southern border” means the international border between the United States and Mexico.

SEC. 3. U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION PERSONNEL.

(a) STAFF ENHANCEMENTS.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION.—In addition to positions authorized before the date of the enactment of this Act and any existing officer vacancies within U.S. Customs and Border Protection on such date, the Secretary, subject to the availability of appropriations for such purpose, shall hire, train, and assign to duty, by not later than September 30, 2020—

(A) 5,000 full-time U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers to serve on all inspection lanes (primary, secondary, incoming, and outgoing) and enforcement teams at United States land ports of entry on the Northern border and the Southern border; and

(B) 350 full-time support staff for all United States ports of entry.

(2) WAIVER OF FTE LIMITATION.—The Secretary may waive any limitation on the number of full-time equivalent personnel assigned to the Department of Homeland Security in order to carry out paragraph (1).

(b) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

(1) OUTBOUND INSPECTIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the relevant committees of Congress that includes a plan for ensuring the placement of sufficient U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers on outbound inspections, and adequate outbound infrastructure, at all Southern border land ports of entry.

(2) SUFFICIENT AGRICULTURAL SPECIALISTS AND PERSONNEL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall submit a report to the relevant committees of Congress that contains plans for the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Health and Human Services, respectively, for ensuring the placement of sufficient U.S. Customs and Border Protection agriculture specialists, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service entomologist identifier specialists, Food and Drug Administration consumer safety officers, and other relevant and related personnel at all Southern border land ports of entry.

(3) ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit a report to the relevant committees of Congress that—

(A) details the Department of Homeland Security’s implementation plan for the staff enhancements required under subsection (a)(1)(A);

(B) includes the number of additional personnel assigned to duty at land ports of entry, classified by location;

(C) describes the methodology used to determine the distribution of additional personnel to address northbound and southbound cross-border inspections; and

(D) includes—

(i) the strategic plan required under section 5(a)(1);

(ii) the model required under section 5(b), including the underlying assumptions, factors, and concerns that guide the decision-making and allocation process; and

(iii) the new outcome-based performance measures adopted under section 5(c).

(c) SECURE COMMUNICATION.—The Secretary shall ensure that each U.S. Customs and Border Protection officer is equipped with a secure 2-way communication and satellite-enabled device, supported by system interoper-

ability, that allows U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers to communicate—

(1) between ports of entry and inspection stations; and

(2) with other Federal, State, tribal, and local law enforcement entities.

(d) BORDER AREA SECURITY INITIATIVE GRANT PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall establish a program for awarding grants for the purchase of—

(1) identification and detection equipment; and

(2) mobile, hand-held, 2-way communication devices for State and local law enforcement officers serving on the Southern border.

(e) PORT OF ENTRY INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner may aid in the enforcement of Federal customs, immigration, and agriculture laws by—

(A) designing, constructing, and modifying—

(i) United States ports of entry;

(ii) living quarters for officers, agents, and personnel;

(iii) technology and equipment, including those deployed in support of standardized and automated collection of vehicular travel time; and

(iv) other structures and facilities, including those owned by municipalities, local governments, or private entities located at land ports of entry;

(B) acquiring, by purchase, donation, exchange, or otherwise, land or any interest in land determined to be necessary to carry out the Commissioner’s duties under this section; and

(C) constructing additional ports of entry along the Southern border and the Northern border.

(2) PRIORITIZATION.—In selecting improvements under this section, the Commissioner, in coordination with the Administrator shall give priority consideration to projects that will substantially—

(A) reduce commercial and passenger vehicle and pedestrian crossing wait times at 1 or more ports of entry on the same border;

(B) increase trade, travel efficiency, and the projected total annual volume at 1 or more ports of entry on the same border; and

(C) enhance safety and security at border facilities at 1 or more ports of entry on the same border.

(f) CONSULTATION.—

(1) LOCATIONS FOR NEW PORTS OF ENTRY.—The Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of State, the International Boundary and Water Commission, the International Joint Commission, and appropriate representatives of States, Indian tribes, local governments, and property owners, as appropriate—

(A) to determine locations for new ports of entry; and

(B) to minimize adverse impacts from such ports on the environment, historic and cultural resources, commerce, and the quality of life of the communities and residents located near such ports.

(2) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed—

(A) to create any right or liability of the parties described in paragraph (1);

(B) to affect the legality or validity of any determination by the Secretary under this Act; or

(C) to affect any consultation requirement under any other law.

(g) AUTHORITY TO ACQUIRE LEASEHOLDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if the Secretary determines that the acquisition of a leasehold interest in real property and the construction or modification of any facility on the leased property are necessary

to facilitate the implementation of this Act, the Secretary may—

(1) acquire such leasehold interest; and

(2) construct or modify such facility.

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, for each of the fiscal years 2015 through 2020, \$1,000,000,000, of which \$5,000,000 shall be used for grants authorized under subsection (d).

(i) OFFSET, RESCISSION OF UNOBLIGATED FEDERAL FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is hereby rescinded, from appropriated discretionary funds that remain available for obligation on the date of the enactment of this Act (other than the unobligated funds referred to in paragraph (4)), amounts determined by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget that are equal, in the aggregate, to the amount authorized to be appropriated under subsection (h).

(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall determine and identify—

(A) the appropriation accounts from which the rescission under paragraph (1) shall apply; and

(B) the amount of the rescission that shall be applied to each such account.

(3) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit a report to Congress and to the Secretary of the Treasury that describes the accounts and amounts determined and identified under paragraph (2) for rescission under paragraph (1).

(4) EXCEPTIONS.—This subsection shall not apply to unobligated funds of—

(A) the Department of Defense;

(B) the Department of Veterans Affairs; or

(C) the Department of Homeland Security.

SEC. 4. CROSS-BORDER TRADE ENHANCEMENT.

(a) AGREEMENTS AUTHORIZED.—Consistent with section 559 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2014 (6 U.S.C. 211 note), during the 10-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner and the Administrator, for purposes of facilitating the construction, alteration, operation, or maintenance of a new or existing facility or other infrastructure at a port of entry under the jurisdiction, custody, and control of the Commissioner or the Administrator, may—

(1) enter into cost-sharing or reimbursement agreements; or

(2) accept donations of—

(A) real or personal property (including monetary donations); or

(B) nonpersonal services.

(b) ALLOWABLE USES OF AGREEMENTS.—The Commissioner and the Administrator may—

(1) use agreements authorized under subsection (a) for activities related to an existing or new port of entry, including expenses relating to—

(A) land acquisition, design, construction, repair, or alternation;

(B) furniture, fixtures, or equipment;

(C) the deployment of technology or equipment; and

(D) operations and maintenance; or

(2) transfer such property or services between the Commissioner and the Administrator for activities described in paragraph (1) relating to a new or existing port of entry under the jurisdiction, custody, and control of the relevant agency, subject to chapter 33 of title 40, United States Code.

(c) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to alter or change agreements or authorities authorized under section 559 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2014 (division F of Public Law 113-76; 6 U.S.C. 211 note) and in place as of the date of enactment of this Act

(d) EVALUATION PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) REQUIREMENT FOR PROCEDURES.—The Commissioner, in consultation with the Administrator and consistent with section 559 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2014 (6 U.S.C. 211 note), shall issue procedures for evaluating a proposal submitted by a person for an agreement authorized under subsection (a).

(B) AVAILABILITY.—The procedures required under subparagraph (A) shall be made available to the public through a website of the Department of Homeland Security.

(2) SPECIFICATION.—Proposals for agreements or donations referred to in subsection (a) may specify—

(A) the land port of entry facility or facilities in support of which the agreement is entered into; and

(B) the time frame in which the contributed property or nonpersonal services shall be used.

(3) SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING.—Any property (including monetary donations) or nonpersonal services donated pursuant to subsection (a)(2) may be used in addition to any other funds, including appropriated funds, property, or services made available for the same purpose.

(4) RETURN OF DONATION.—

(A) REQUIREMENT FOR RETURN.—If the Commissioner or the Administrator does not use the property or services donated pursuant to subsection (a)(2) for the specific facility or facilities designated by the person or within the time frame specified by the person, such donated property or services shall be returned to the person that made the donation.

(B) PROHIBITION ON INTEREST.—No interest may be owed on any donation returned to a person under subparagraph (A).

(5) DETERMINATION AND NOTIFICATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after receiving a proposal pursuant to subsection (a) with respect to the construction or maintenance of a facility or other infrastructure at a land border port of entry, the Commissioner or the Administrator shall—

(i) make a determination with respect to whether or not to approve the proposal; and

(ii) notify the person that submitted the proposal of—

(I) the determination; and

(II) if the Administrator did not approve the proposal, the reasons for such disapproval.

(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—In determining whether or not to approve a proposal under this subsection, the Administrator shall consider—

(i) the impact of the proposal on reducing wait times at that port of entry and other ports of entry on the same border;

(ii) the potential of the proposal to increase trade and travel efficiency through added capacity; and

(iii) the potential of the proposal to enhance the security of the port of entry.

(e) ANNUAL REPORT AND NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—The Commissioner, in collaboration with the Administrator, shall—

(1) submit an annual report to the relevant committees of Congress describing agreements entered into pursuant to subsection (a); and

(2) not later than 3 days before entering into an agreement under subsection (a) with a person, notify the members of Congress that represent the State and district in which the facility is located.

SEC. 5. IMPLEMENTATION OF GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE FINDINGS.

(a) BORDER WAIT TIME DATA COLLECTION.—

(1) STRATEGIC PLAN.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Commissioner, the Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration, State Departments of Transpor-

tation, and other public and private stakeholders, shall develop a strategic plan for standardized collection of vehicle wait times at land ports of entry.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The strategic plan required under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) a description of how U.S. Customs and Border Protection will ensure standardized manual wait time collection practices at ports of entry;

(B) current wait time collection practices at each land port of entry, which shall also be made available through existing online platforms for public reporting;

(C) the identification of a standardized measurement and validation wait time data tool for use at all land ports of entry; and

(D) an assessment of the feasibility and cost for supplementing and replacing manual data collection with automation, which should utilize existing automation efforts and resources.

(3) UPDATES FOR COLLECTION METHODS.—The Secretary shall update the strategic plan required under paragraph (1) to reflect new practices, timelines, tools, and assessments, as appropriate.

(b) STAFF ALLOCATION.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Commissioner and State, municipal, and private sector stakeholders at each port of entry, shall develop a standardized model for the allocation of U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers and support staff at land ports of entry, including allocations specific to field offices and the port level that utilizes—

(1) current and future operational priorities and threats;

(2) historical staffing levels and patterns; and

(3) anticipated traffic flows.

(c) OUTCOME-BASED PERFORMANCE MEASURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Commissioner and relevant public and private sector stakeholders, shall identify and adopt not fewer than 2 new, outcome-based performance measures that support the trade facilitation goals of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(2) EFFECT OF TRUSTED TRAVELER AND SHIPPER PROGRAMS.—Outcome-based performance measures identified under this subsection should include—

(A) the extent to which trusted traveler and shipper program participants experience decreased annual percentage wait time compared to nonparticipants; and

(B) the extent to which trusted traveler and shipper program participants experience an annual reduction in percentage of referrals to secondary inspection facilities compared to nonparticipants.

(3) AGENCY EFFICIENCIES.—The Secretary shall not adopt performance measures that—

(A) solely address U.S. Customs and Border Protection resource efficiency; or

(B) fail to adequately—

(i) gauge the impact of programs or initiatives on trade facilitation goals; or

(ii) measure benefits to stakeholders.

(4) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the relevant committees of Congress that identifies—

(A) the new performance measures developed under this subsection; and

(B) the process for the incorporation of such measures into existing performance measures.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 461. A bill to provide for alternative financing arrangements for the provision of certain services and the

construction and maintenance of infrastructure at land border ports of entry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 461

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Cross-Border Trade Enhancement Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR; ADMINISTRATION.—The terms “Administrator” and “Administration” mean the Administrator of General Services and the General Services Administration, respectively.

(2) COMMISSIONER.—The term “Commissioner” means the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(3) PERSON.—The term “person” means—

(A) an individual; or

(B) a corporation, partnership, trust, association, or any other public or private entity, including a State or local government.

(4) RELEVANT COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term “relevant committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(E) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives;

(F) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

(G) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 3. AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO AGREEMENTS FOR THE PROVISION OF CERTAIN SERVICES AT LAND BORDER PORTS OF ENTRY.

(a) AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1451), and consistent with section 560 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2013 (division D of Public Law 113-6; 127 Stat. 378) and section 559 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2014 (division F of Public Law 113-76, 6 U.S.C. 211 note) the Commissioner may, during the 10-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and upon the request of any person, enter into an agreement with that person under which—

(A) U.S. Customs and Border Protection will provide the services described in paragraph (2) at a land border port of entry; and

(B) that person will pay the fee described in subsection (b) to reimburse U.S. Customs and Border Protection for the costs incurred in providing such services.

(2) SERVICES DESCRIBED.—Services described in this paragraph are any services related to customs, agricultural processing, border security, or inspection-related immigration matters provided by an employee or contractor of U.S. Customs and Border Protection at land border ports of entry.

(3) LIMITATION.—The Commissioner may not modify existing requirements or reimbursement fee agreements in effect as of the

date of the enactment of this Act unless the relevant person requests a modification to include services described in this section.

(4) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to reduce the responsibilities or duties of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to provide services at land border ports of entry that have been authorized or mandated by law and are funded in any appropriation Act or from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees.

(b) FEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A person requesting U.S. Customs and Border Protection services shall pay a fee pursuant to an agreement under subsection (a) in an amount equal to the sum of—

(A) a proportionate share of the salaries and expenses of the individuals employed by U.S. Customs and Border Protection who provided such services; and

(B) other costs incurred by U.S. Customs and Border Protection relating to such services, such as temporary placement or permanent relocation of such individuals.

(2) OVERSIGHT OF FEES.—The Commissioner shall develop a process to oversee the activities reimbursed by the fees authorized under paragraph (1) that includes—

(A) a determination and report on the full cost of providing services, including direct and indirect costs;

(B) a process for increasing such fees, as necessary;

(C) the establishment of a monthly remittance schedule to reimburse appropriations; and

(D) the identification of overtime costs to be reimbursed by such fees.

(3) DEPOSIT OF FUNDS.—Amounts collected in fees under paragraph (1)—

(A) shall be deposited as an offsetting collection;

(B) shall remain available until expended, without fiscal year limitation; and

(C) shall directly reimburse each appropriation account for the amount paid out of such account for—

(i) any expenses incurred for providing U.S. Customs and Border Protection services to the person paying such fee; and

(ii) any other costs incurred by the U.S. Customs and Border Protection relating to such services.

(4) TERMINATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner shall terminate the services provided pursuant to an agreement with a private sector or government entity under subsection (a) upon receiving notice from the Commissioner that such entity failed to pay the fee imposed under paragraph (1) in a timely manner.

(B) EFFECT OF TERMINATION.—At the time services are terminated pursuant to subparagraph (A), all costs incurred by U.S. Customs and Border Protection to provide services to the entity described in subparagraph (A), which have not been reimbursed by the entity, will become immediately due and payable.

(C) INTEREST.—Interest on unpaid fees will accrue from the date of termination based on current Treasury borrowing rates.

(D) PENALTIES.—Any private sector or government entity that fails to pay any fee incurred under paragraph (1) in a timely manner, after notice and demand for payment, shall be liable for a penalty or liquidated damage equal to 2 times the amount of such fee.

(5) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 3 days before entering into an agreement under this section, the Commissioner shall notify—

(A) the relevant committees of Congress; and

(B) the members of Congress who represent the State or district in which the facility at

which services will be provided under the agreement.

SEC. 4. EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVE FINANCING ARRANGEMENTS FOR CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE OF INFRASTRUCTURE AT LAND BORDER PORTS OF ENTRY.

(a) AGREEMENTS AUTHORIZED.—Consistent with section 559 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2014 (division F of Public Law 113-76, 6 U.S.C. 211 note), during the 10-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner and the Administrator may, for purposes of facilitating the construction, alteration, operation, or maintenance of a new or existing facility or other infrastructure at a port of entry under the jurisdiction, custody, and control of the Commissioner or the Administrator—

(1) enter into cost-sharing or reimbursement agreements with any person; or

(2) accept donations from any person of—

(A) real or personal property (including monetary donations); or

(B) nonpersonal services.

(b) ALLOWABLE USES OF AGREEMENTS.—The Commissioner and the Administrator, with respect to an agreement authorized under subsection (a), may—

(1) use such agreements for activities related to an existing or new port of entry, including expenses related to—

(A) land acquisition, design, construction, repair, or alternation;

(B) furniture, fixtures, or equipment;

(C) the deployment of technology or equipment; or

(D) operations and maintenance; or

(2) subject to chapter 33 of title 40, United States Code, transfer such property or services between the Commissioner and the Administrator for activities described in paragraph (1) that are related to a new or existing port of entry under the jurisdiction, custody, and control of the relevant agency.

(c) EVALUATION PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) REQUIREMENTS FOR PROCEDURES.—The Commissioner, in consultation with the Administrator and consistent with section 559 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2014 (division F of Public Law 113-76; 6 U.S.C. 211 note), shall issue procedures for evaluating a proposal submitted by a person for an agreement authorized under subsection (a).

(B) AVAILABILITY.—The procedures issued under subparagraph (A) shall be made available to the public through the Department of Homeland Security website.

(2) SPECIFICATION.—In making a donation under subsection (a)(2), a person may—

(A) designate the land port of entry facility or facilities that the donation is intended to support; and

(B) specify the period during which the contributed property or nonpersonal services shall be used.

(3) SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING.—Any property, including monetary donations and nonpersonal services donated pursuant to subsection (a) may be used in addition to any other funds, including appropriated funds, property, or services made available for the same purpose.

(4) RETURN OF DONATION.—

(A) RETURN REQUIRED.—If the Commissioner or the Administrator does not use the property or services donated pursuant to subsection (a) for the specific facility or facilities designated under paragraph (2)(A) or during the period specified under paragraph (2)(B), such donated property or services shall be returned to the person that made the donation.

(B) INTEREST PROHIBITED.—No interest may be owed on any donation returned to a person pursuant to subparagraph (A).

(5) DETERMINATION AND NOTIFICATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after receiving a proposal pursuant to subsection (a) with respect to the construction or maintenance of a facility or other infrastructure at a land border port of entry, the Commissioner or the Administrator shall—

(i) make a determination with respect to whether or not to approve the proposal; and

(ii) notify the person that submitted the proposal of—

(I) the determination; and

(II) if the Administrator did not approve the proposal, the reasons for such determination.

(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—In making the determination under subparagraph (A)(i), the Commissioner or the Administrator shall consider—

(i) the impact of the proposal on reducing wait times at that port of entry and other ports of entry on the same border;

(ii) the potential of the proposal to increase trade and travel efficiency through added capacity; and

(iii) the potential of the proposal to enhance the security of the port of entry.

(d) ANNUAL REPORT AND NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—The Commissioner, in collaboration with the Administrator, shall—

(1) submit an annual report to the relevant committees of Congress on the agreements entered into under subsection (a); and

(2) not less than 3 days before entering into an agreement with a person under subsection (a), notify the members of Congress that represent the State or district in which the affected facility is located.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 465. A bill to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe-Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President. I am pleased to reintroduce the Thomasina E. Jordan Indian Tribes of Virginia Federal Recognition Act of 2015. This legislation was voted out of Committee in the previous Congress, and I remain hopeful that the full Senate will vote to approve this tribes bill this year.

This legislation is critically important because it strives toward reconciling an historic wrong for Virginia and the Nation. While the Virginia Tribes have received official recognition from the Commonwealth of Virginia, acknowledgement and officially-recognized status from the federal government has been considerably more difficult due to their systematic mistreatment over the past century.

More specifically, Virginia's Racial Integrity Act, a state law in effect from 1924 to 1967, stripped the identities of the tribal members of Virginia's Indian Tribes. The Act changed the racial identifications of those who lacked white ancestry to "colored" on birth certificates during that period. In addition, five of the six courthouses that held the vast majority of the Virginia Indian Tribal records were destroyed in the Civil War. Those records were crucial for documenting the history of the tribes for recognition by the Bureau of

Indian Affairs Office of Federal Acknowledgement.

Furthermore, Virginia Indians made peace when they signed the Treaty of Middle Plantation with England in 1677. This predated the creation of the United States of America by about 100 years; the founding fathers of the United States never recognized the treaty. Therefore, unlike tribes that received federal recognition upon the signing of a treaty with the United States, the Virginia Tribes did not receive federal recognition because they made peace with England prior to the founding of our Nation.

I am proud of Virginia's recognized Indian Tribes and their contributions to our Commonwealth. The Virginia Tribes are not only part of our history, but they remain ever present today. We go to school and work together, and serve the Commonwealth and nation together every day. These contributions should be acknowledged, and this Federal recognition for Virginia's native peoples is long overdue.

Virginia's Indian Tribes contributed to the successful founding of our country and continue to help define our national identity. Their members have attended our schools, worked next to us, and served in every American war since the Revolution, all while maintaining a unique identity and culture. I am hopeful the Senate will act upon my legislation this year, to give these six Virginia Native American Tribes the Federal recognition that is long overdue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 465

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Thomasina E. Jordan Indian Tribes of Virginia Federal Recognition Act of 2015”.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978.

TITLE I—CHICKAHOMINY INDIAN TRIBE

Sec. 101. Findings.

Sec. 102. Definitions.

Sec. 103. Federal recognition.

Sec. 104. Membership; governing documents.

Sec. 105. Governing body.

Sec. 106. Reservation of the Tribe.

Sec. 107. Hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, and water rights.

TITLE II—CHICKAHOMINY INDIAN TRIBE—EASTERN DIVISION

Sec. 201. Findings.

Sec. 202. Definitions.

Sec. 203. Federal recognition.

Sec. 204. Membership; governing documents.

Sec. 205. Governing body.

Sec. 206. Reservation of the Tribe.

Sec. 207. Hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, and water rights.

TITLE III—UPPER MATTAPONI TRIBE

Sec. 301. Findings.

Sec. 302. Definitions.

Sec. 303. Federal recognition.

Sec. 304. Membership; governing documents.

Sec. 305. Governing body.

Sec. 306. Reservation of the Tribe.

Sec. 307. Hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, and water rights.

TITLE IV—RAPPAHANNOCK TRIBE, INC.

Sec. 401. Findings.

Sec. 402. Definitions.

Sec. 403. Federal recognition.

Sec. 404. Membership; governing documents.

Sec. 405. Governing body.

Sec. 406. Reservation of the Tribe.

Sec. 407. Hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, and water rights.

TITLE V—MONACAN INDIAN NATION

Sec. 501. Findings.

Sec. 502. Definitions.

Sec. 503. Federal recognition.

Sec. 504. Membership; governing documents.

Sec. 505. Governing body.

Sec. 506. Reservation of the Tribe.

Sec. 507. Hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, and water rights.

TITLE VI—NANSEMOND INDIAN TRIBE

Sec. 601. Findings.

Sec. 602. Definitions.

Sec. 603. Federal recognition.

Sec. 604. Membership; governing documents.

Sec. 605. Governing body.

Sec. 606. Reservation of the Tribe.

Sec. 607. Hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, and water rights.

TITLE VII—EMINENT DOMAIN

Sec. 701. Limitation.

SEC. 2. INDIAN CHILD WELFARE ACT OF 1978.

Nothing in this Act affects the application of section 109 of the Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 1919).

TITLE I—CHICKAHOMINY INDIAN TRIBE

SEC. 101. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) in 1607, when the English settlers set shore along the Virginia coastline, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe was 1 of about 30 tribes that received them;

(2) in 1614, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe entered into a treaty with Sir Thomas Dale, Governor of the Jamestown Colony, under which—

(A) the Chickahominy Indian Tribe agreed to provide 2 bushels of corn per man and send warriors to protect the English; and

(B) Sir Thomas Dale agreed in return to allow the Tribe to continue to practice its own tribal governance;

(3) in 1646, a treaty was signed which forced the Chickahominy from their homeland to the area around the York Mattaponi River in present-day King William County, leading to the formation of a reservation;

(4) in 1677, following Bacon's Rebellion, the Queen of Pamunkey signed the Treaty of Middle Plantation on behalf of the Chickahominy;

(5) in 1702, the Chickahominy were forced from their reservation, which caused the loss of a land base;

(6) in 1711, the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg established a grammar school for Indians called Brafferton College;

(7) a Chickahominy child was 1 of the first Indians to attend Brafferton College;

(8) in 1750, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe began to migrate from King William County back to the area around the Chickahominy River in New Kent and Charles City Counties;

(9) in 1793, a Baptist missionary named Bradby took refuge with the Chickahominy and took a Chickahominy woman as his wife;

(10) in 1831, the names of the ancestors of the modern-day Chickahominy Indian Tribe began to appear in the Charles City County census records;

(11) in 1901, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe formed Samaria Baptist Church;

(12) from 1901 to 1935, Chickahominy men were assessed a tribal tax so that their children could receive an education;

(13) the Tribe used the proceeds from the tax to build the first Samaria Indian School, buy supplies, and pay a teacher's salary;

(14) in 1919, C. Lee Moore, Auditor of Public Accounts for Virginia, told Chickahominy Chief O.W. Adkins that he had instructed the Commissioner of Revenue for Charles City County to record Chickahominy tribal members on the county tax rolls as Indian, and not as White or colored;

(15) during the period of 1920 through 1930, various Governors of the Commonwealth of Virginia wrote letters of introduction for Chickahominy Chiefs who had official business with Federal agencies in Washington, DC;

(16) in 1934, Chickahominy Chief O.O. Adkins wrote to John Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, requesting money to acquire land for the Chickahominy Indian Tribe's use, to build school, medical, and library facilities and to buy tractors, implements, and seed;

(17) in 1934, John Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, wrote to Chickahominy Chief O.O. Adkins, informing him that Congress had passed the Act of June 18, 1934 (commonly known as the “Indian Reorganization Act”) (25 U.S.C. 461 et seq.), but had not made the appropriation to fund the Act;

(18) in 1942, Chickahominy Chief O.O. Adkins wrote to John Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, asking for help in getting the proper racial designation on Selective Service records for Chickahominy soldiers;

(19) in 1943, John Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, asked Douglas S. Freeman, editor of the Richmond News-Leader newspaper of Richmond, Virginia, to help Virginia Indians obtain proper racial designation on birth records;

(20) Collier stated that his office could not officially intervene because it had no responsibility for the Virginia Indians, “as a matter largely of historical accident”, but was “interested in them as descendants of the original inhabitants of the region”;

(21) in 1948, the Veterans' Education Committee of the Virginia State Board of Education approved Samaria Indian School to provide training to veterans;

(22) that school was established and run by the Chickahominy Indian Tribe;

(23) in 1950, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe purchased and donated to the Charles City County School Board land to be used to build a modern school for students of the Chickahominy and other Virginia Indian tribes;

(24) the Samaria Indian School included students in grades 1 through 8;

(25) in 1961, Senator Sam Ervin, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, requested Chickahominy Chief O.O. Adkins to provide assistance in analyzing the status of the constitutional rights of Indians “in your area”;

(26) in 1967, the Charles City County school board closed Samaria Indian School and converted the school to a countywide primary school as a step toward full school integration of Indian and non-Indian students;

(27) in 1972, the Charles City County school board began receiving funds under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 458aa et seq.) on behalf of Chickahominy students, which funding is provided as of the date of enactment of this Act under title V of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 458aaa et seq.);

(28) in 1974, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe bought land and built a tribal center using

monthly pledges from tribal members to finance the transactions;

(29) in 1983, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe was granted recognition as an Indian tribe by the Commonwealth of Virginia, along with 5 other Indian tribes; and

(30) in 1985, Governor Gerald Baliles was the special guest at an intertribal Thanksgiving Day dinner hosted by the Chickahominy Indian Tribe.

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) TRIBAL MEMBER.—The term “tribal member” means—

(A) an individual who is an enrolled member of the Tribe as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) an individual who has been placed on the membership rolls of the Tribe in accordance with this title.

(3) TRIBE.—The term “Tribe” means the Chickahominy Indian Tribe.

SEC. 103. FEDERAL RECOGNITION.

(a) FEDERAL RECOGNITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Federal recognition is extended to the Tribe.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.—All laws (including regulations) of the United States of general applicability to Indians or nations, Indian tribes, or bands of Indians (including the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 461 et seq.)) that are not inconsistent with this title shall be applicable to the Tribe and tribal members.

(b) FEDERAL SERVICES AND BENEFITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date of enactment of this Act, the Tribe and tribal members shall be eligible for all services and benefits provided by the Federal Government to federally recognized Indian tribes without regard to the existence of a reservation for the Tribe.

(2) SERVICE AREA.—For the purpose of the delivery of Federal services to tribal members, the service area of the Tribe shall be considered to be the area comprised of New Kent County, James City County, Charles City County, and Henrico County, Virginia.

SEC. 104. MEMBERSHIP; GOVERNING DOCUMENTS.

The membership roll and governing documents of the Tribe shall be the most recent membership roll and governing documents, respectively, submitted by the Tribe to the Secretary before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 105. GOVERNING BODY.

The governing body of the Tribe shall be—

(1) the governing body of the Tribe in place as of the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) any subsequent governing body elected in accordance with the election procedures specified in the governing documents of the Tribe.

SEC. 106. RESERVATION OF THE TRIBE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Upon the request of the Tribe, the Secretary of the Interior—

(1) shall take into trust for the benefit of the Tribe any land held in fee by the Tribe that was acquired by the Tribe on or before January 1, 2007, if such lands are located within the boundaries of New Kent County, James City County, Charles City County, or Henrico County, Virginia; and

(2) may take into trust for the benefit of the Tribe any land held in fee by the Tribe, if such lands are located within the boundaries of New Kent County, James City County, Charles City County, or Henrico County, Virginia.

(b) DEADLINE FOR DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall make a final written determination not later than three years of the date which the Tribe submits a request for land to be taken into trust under subsection

(a)(2) and shall immediately make that determination available to the Tribe.

(c) RESERVATION STATUS.—Any land taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe pursuant to this paragraph shall, upon request of the Tribe, be considered part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(d) GAMING.—The Tribe may not conduct gaming activities as a matter of claimed inherent authority or under the authority of any Federal law, including the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) or under any regulations thereunder promulgated by the Secretary or the National Indian Gaming Commission.

SEC. 107. HUNTING, FISHING, TRAPPING, GATHERING, AND WATER RIGHTS.

Nothing in this title expands, reduces, or affects in any manner any hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, or water rights of the Tribe and members of the Tribe.

TITLE II—CHICKAHOMINY INDIAN TRIBE—EASTERN DIVISION

SEC. 201. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) in 1607, when the English settlers set shore along the Virginia coastline, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe was 1 of about 30 tribes that received them;

(2) in 1614, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe entered into a treaty with Sir Thomas Dale, Governor of the Jamestown Colony, under which—

(A) the Chickahominy Indian Tribe agreed to provide 2 bushels of corn per man and send warriors to protect the English; and

(B) Sir Thomas Dale agreed in return to allow the Tribe to continue to practice its own tribal governance;

(3) in 1646, a treaty was signed which forced the Chickahominy from their homeland to the area around the York River in present-day King William County, leading to the formation of a reservation;

(4) in 1677, following Bacon’s Rebellion, the Queen of Pamunkey signed the Treaty of Middle Plantation on behalf of the Chickahominy;

(5) in 1702, the Chickahominy were forced from their reservation, which caused the loss of a land base;

(6) in 1711, the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg established a grammar school for Indians called Brafferton College;

(7) a Chickahominy child was 1 of the first Indians to attend Brafferton College;

(8) in 1750, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe began to migrate from King William County back to the area around the Chickahominy River in New Kent and Charles City Counties;

(9) in 1793, a Baptist missionary named Bradby took refuge with the Chickahominy and took a Chickahominy woman as his wife;

(10) in 1831, the names of the ancestors of the modern-day Chickahominy Indian Tribe began to appear in the Charles City County census records;

(11) in 1870, a census revealed an enclave of Indians in New Kent County that is believed to be the beginning of the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division;

(12) other records were destroyed when the New Kent County courthouse was burned, leaving a State census as the only record covering that period;

(13) in 1901, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe formed Samaria Baptist Church;

(14) from 1901 to 1935, Chickahominy men were assessed a tribal tax so that their children could receive an education;

(15) the Tribe used the proceeds from the tax to build the first Samaria Indian School, buy supplies, and pay a teacher’s salary;

(16) in 1910, a 1-room school covering grades 1 through 8 was established in New Kent County for the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division;

(17) during the period of 1920 through 1921, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division began forming a tribal government;

(18) E.P. Bradby, the founder of the Tribe, was elected to be Chief;

(19) in 1922, Tsena Commocko Baptist Church was organized;

(20) in 1925, a certificate of incorporation was issued to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division;

(21) in 1950, the 1-room Indian school in New Kent County was closed and students were bused to Samaria Indian School in Charles City County;

(22) in 1967, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe and the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division lost their schools as a result of the required integration of students;

(23) during the period of 1982 through 1984, Tsena Commocko Baptist Church built a new sanctuary to accommodate church growth;

(24) in 1983 the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division was granted State recognition along with 5 other Virginia Indian tribes;

(25) in 1985—

(A) the Virginia Council on Indians was organized as a State agency; and

(B) the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division was granted a seat on the Council;

(26) in 1988, a nonprofit organization known as the “United Indians of Virginia” was formed; and

(27) Chief Marvin “Strongoak” Bradby of the Eastern Band of the Chickahominy presently chairs the organization.

SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) TRIBAL MEMBER.—The term “tribal member” means—

(A) an individual who is an enrolled member of the Tribe as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) an individual who has been placed on the membership rolls of the Tribe in accordance with this title.

(3) TRIBE.—The term “Tribe” means the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division.

SEC. 203. FEDERAL RECOGNITION.

(a) FEDERAL RECOGNITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Federal recognition is extended to the Tribe.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.—All laws (including regulations) of the United States of general applicability to Indians or nations, Indian tribes, or bands of Indians (including the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 461 et seq.)) that are not inconsistent with this title shall be applicable to the Tribe and tribal members.

(b) FEDERAL SERVICES AND BENEFITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date of enactment of this Act, the Tribe and tribal members shall be eligible for all future services and benefits provided by the Federal Government to federally recognized Indian tribes without regard to the existence of a reservation for the Tribe.

(2) SERVICE AREA.—For the purpose of the delivery of Federal services to tribal members, the service area of the Tribe shall be considered to be the area comprised of New Kent County, James City County, Charles City County, and Henrico County, Virginia.

SEC. 204. MEMBERSHIP; GOVERNING DOCUMENTS.

The membership roll and governing documents of the Tribe shall be the most recent membership roll and governing documents, respectively, submitted by the Tribe to the Secretary before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 205. GOVERNING BODY.

The governing body of the Tribe shall be—

(1) the governing body of the Tribe in place as of the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) any subsequent governing body elected in accordance with the election procedures specified in the governing documents of the Tribe.

SEC. 206. RESERVATION OF THE TRIBE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Upon the request of the Tribe, the Secretary of the Interior—

(1) shall take into trust for the benefit of the Tribe any land held in fee by the Tribe that was acquired by the Tribe on or before January 1, 2007, if such lands are located within the boundaries of New Kent County, James City County, Charles City County, or Henrico County, Virginia; and

(2) may take into trust for the benefit of the Tribe any land held in fee by the Tribe, if such lands are located within the boundaries of New Kent County, James City County, Charles City County, or Henrico County, Virginia.

(b) DEADLINE FOR DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall make a final written determination not later than three years of the date which the Tribe submits a request for land to be taken into trust under subsection (a)(2) and shall immediately make that determination available to the Tribe.

(c) RESERVATION STATUS.—Any land taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe pursuant to this paragraph shall, upon request of the Tribe, be considered part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(d) GAMING.—The Tribe may not conduct gaming activities as a matter of claimed inherent authority or under the authority of any Federal law, including the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) or under any regulations thereunder promulgated by the Secretary or the National Indian Gaming Commission.

SEC. 207. HUNTING, FISHING, TRAPPING, GATHERING, AND WATER RIGHTS.

Nothing in this title expands, reduces, or affects in any manner any hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, or water rights of the Tribe and members of the Tribe.

TITLE III—UPPER MATTAPONI TRIBE

SEC. 301. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) during the period of 1607 through 1646, the Chickahominy Indian Tribes—

(A) lived approximately 20 miles from Jamestown; and

(B) were significantly involved in English-Indian affairs;

(2) Mattaponi Indians, who later joined the Chickahominy Indians, lived a greater distance from Jamestown;

(3) in 1646, the Chickahominy Indians moved to Mattaponi River basin, away from the English;

(4) in 1661, the Chickahominy Indians sold land at a place known as “the cliffs” on the Mattaponi River;

(5) in 1669, the Chickahominy Indians—

(A) appeared in the Virginia Colony’s census of Indian bowmen; and

(B) lived in “New Kent” County, which included the Mattaponi River basin at that time;

(6) in 1677, the Chickahominy and Mattaponi Indians were subjects of the Queen of Pamunkey, who was a signatory to the Treaty of 1677 with the King of England;

(7) in 1683, after a Mattaponi town was attacked by Seneca Indians, the Mattaponi Indians took refuge with the Chickahominy Indians, and the history of the 2 groups was intertwined for many years thereafter;

(8) in 1695, the Chickahominy and Mattaponi Indians—

(A) were assigned a reservation by the Virginia Colony; and

(B) traded land of the reservation for land at the place known as “the cliffs” (which, as

of the date of enactment of this Act, is the Mattaponi Indian Reservation), which had been owned by the Mattaponi Indians before 1661;

(9) in 1711, a Chickahominy boy attended the Indian School at the College of William and Mary;

(10) in 1726, the Virginia Colony discontinued funding of interpreters for the Chickahominy and Mattaponi Indian Tribes;

(11) James Adams, who served as an interpreter to the Indian tribes known as of the date of enactment of this Act as the “Upper Mattaponi Indian Tribe” and “Chickahominy Indian Tribe”, elected to stay with the Upper Mattaponi Indians;

(12) today, a majority of the Upper Mattaponi Indians have “Adams” as their surname;

(13) in 1787, Thomas Jefferson, in Notes on the Commonwealth of Virginia, mentioned the Mattaponi Indians on a reservation in King William County and said that Chickahominy Indians were “blended” with the Mattaponi Indians and nearby Pamunkey Indians;

(14) in 1850, the census of the United States revealed a nucleus of approximately 10 families, all ancestral to modern Upper Mattaponi Indians, living in central King William County, Virginia, approximately 10 miles from the reservation;

(15) during the period of 1853 through 1884, King William County marriage records listed Upper Mattaponis as “Indians” in marrying people residing on the reservation;

(16) during the period of 1884 through the present, county marriage records usually refer to Upper Mattaponis as “Indians”;

(17) in 1901, Smithsonian anthropologist James Mooney heard about the Upper Mattaponi Indians but did not visit them;

(18) in 1928, University of Pennsylvania anthropologist Frank Speck published a book on modern Virginia Indians with a section on the Upper Mattaponis;

(19) from 1929 until 1930, the leadership of the Upper Mattaponi Indians opposed the use of a “colored” designation in the 1930 United States census and won a compromise in which the Indian ancestry of the Upper Mattaponis was recorded but questioned;

(20) during the period of 1942 through 1945—

(A) the leadership of the Upper Mattaponi Indians, with the help of Frank Speck and others, fought against the induction of young men of the Tribe into “colored” units in the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(B) a tribal roll for the Upper Mattaponi Indians was compiled;

(21) from 1945 to 1946, negotiations took place to admit some of the young people of the Upper Mattaponi to high schools for Federal Indians (especially at Cherokee) because no high school coursework was available for Indians in Virginia schools; and

(22) in 1983, the Upper Mattaponi Indians applied for and won State recognition as an Indian tribe.

SEC. 302. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) TRIBAL MEMBER.—The term “tribal member” means—

(A) an individual who is an enrolled member of the Tribe as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) an individual who has been placed on the membership rolls of the Tribe in accordance with this title.

(3) TRIBE.—The term “Tribe” means the Upper Mattaponi Tribe.

SEC. 303. FEDERAL RECOGNITION.

(a) FEDERAL RECOGNITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Federal recognition is extended to the Tribe.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.—All laws (including regulations) of the United States of general applicability to Indians or nations, Indian tribes, or bands of Indians (including the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 461 et seq.)) that are not inconsistent with this title shall be applicable to the Tribe and tribal members.

(b) FEDERAL SERVICES AND BENEFITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date of enactment of this Act, the Tribe and tribal members shall be eligible for all services and benefits provided by the Federal Government to federally recognized Indian tribes without regard to the existence of a reservation for the Tribe.

(2) SERVICE AREA.—For the purpose of the delivery of Federal services to tribal members, the service area of the Tribe shall be considered to be the area within 25 miles of the Sharon Indian School at 13383 King William Road, King William County, Virginia.

SEC. 304. MEMBERSHIP; GOVERNING DOCUMENTS.

The membership roll and governing documents of the Tribe shall be the most recent membership roll and governing documents, respectively, submitted by the Tribe to the Secretary before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 305. GOVERNING BODY.

The governing body of the Tribe shall be—

(1) the governing body of the Tribe in place as of the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) any subsequent governing body elected in accordance with the election procedures specified in the governing documents of the Tribe.

SEC. 306. RESERVATION OF THE TRIBE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Upon the request of the Tribe, the Secretary of the Interior—

(1) shall take into trust for the benefit of the Tribe any land held in fee by the Tribe that was acquired by the Tribe on or before January 1, 2007, if such lands are located within the boundaries of King William County, Caroline County, Hanover County, King and Queen County, and New Kent County, Virginia; and

(2) may take into trust for the benefit of the Tribe any land held in fee by the Tribe, if such lands are located within the boundaries of King William County, Caroline County, Hanover County, King and Queen County, and New Kent County, Virginia.

(b) DEADLINE FOR DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall make a final written determination not later than three years of the date which the Tribe submits a request for land to be taken into trust under subsection (a)(2) and shall immediately make that determination available to the Tribe.

(c) RESERVATION STATUS.—Any land taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe pursuant to this paragraph shall, upon request of the Tribe, be considered part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(d) GAMING.—The Tribe may not conduct gaming activities as a matter of claimed inherent authority or under the authority of any Federal law, including the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) or under any regulations thereunder promulgated by the Secretary or the National Indian Gaming Commission.

SEC. 307. HUNTING, FISHING, TRAPPING, GATHERING, AND WATER RIGHTS.

Nothing in this title expands, reduces, or affects in any manner any hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, or water rights of the Tribe and members of the Tribe.

TITLE IV—RAPPAHANNOCK TRIBE, INC.

SEC. 401. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) during the initial months after Virginia was settled, the Rappahannock Indians had 3 encounters with Captain John Smith;

(2) the first encounter occurred when the Rappahannock weroance (headman)—

(A) traveled to Quiyocohannock (a principal town across the James River from Jamestown), where he met with Smith to determine whether Smith had been the “great man” who had previously sailed into the Rappahannock River, killed a Rappahannock weroance, and kidnapped Rappahannock people; and

(B) determined that Smith was too short to be that “great man”;

(3) on a second meeting, during John Smith’s captivity (December 16, 1607 to January 8, 1608), Smith was taken to the Rappahannock principal village to show the people that Smith was not the “great man”;

(4) a third meeting took place during Smith’s exploration of the Chesapeake Bay (July to September 1608), when, after the Moraughtacund Indians had stolen 3 women from the Rappahannock King, Smith was prevailed upon to facilitate a peaceful truce between the Rappahannock and the Moraughtacund Indians;

(5) in the settlement, Smith had the 2 Indian tribes meet on the spot of their first fight;

(6) when it was established that both groups wanted peace, Smith told the Rappahannock King to select which of the 3 stolen women he wanted;

(7) the Moraughtacund King was given second choice among the 2 remaining women, and Mosco, a Wighcomoco (on the Potomac River) guide, was given the third woman;

(8) in 1645, Captain William Claiborne tried unsuccessfully to establish treaty relations with the Rappahannocks, as the Rappahannocks had not participated in the Pamunkey-led uprising in 1644, and the English wanted to “treat with the Rappahannocks or any other Indians not in amity with Opechancanough, concerning serving the county against the Pamunkeys”;

(9) in April 1651, the Rappahannocks conveyed a tract of land to an English settler, Colonel Morre Fauntleroy;

(10) the deed for the conveyance was signed by Accopatough, weroance of the Rappahannock Indians;

(11) in September 1653, Lancaster County signed a treaty with Rappahannock Indians, the terms of which treaty—

(A) gave Rappahannocks the rights of Englishmen in the county court; and

(B) attempted to make the Rappahannocks more accountable under English law;

(12) in September 1653, Lancaster County defined and marked the bounds of its Indian settlements;

(13) according to the Lancaster clerk of court, “the tribe called the great Rappahannocks lived on the Rappahannock Creek just across the river above Tappahannock”;

(14) in September 1656, (Old) Rappahannock County (which, as of the date of enactment of this Act, is comprised of Richmond and Essex Counties, Virginia) signed a treaty with Rappahannock Indians that—

(A) mirrored the Lancaster County treaty from 1653; and

(B) stated that—

(i) Rappahannocks were to be rewarded, in Roanoke, for returning English fugitives; and

(ii) the English encouraged the Rappahannocks to send their children to live among the English as servants, who the English promised would be well-treated;

(15) in 1658, the Virginia Assembly revised a 1652 Act stating that “there be no grants of land to any Englishman whatsoever de futuro until the Indians be first served with the proportion of 50 acres of land for each bowman”;

(16) in 1669, the colony conducted a census of Virginia Indians;

(17) as of the date of that census—

(A) the majority of the Rappahannocks were residing at their hunting village on the north side of the Mattaponi River; and

(B) at the time of the visit, census-takers were counting only the Indian tribes along the rivers, which explains why only 30 Rappahannock bowmen were counted on that river;

(18) the Rappahannocks used the hunting village on the north side of the Mattaponi River as their primary residence until the Rappahannocks were removed in 1684;

(19) in May 1677, the Treaty of Middle Plantation was signed with England;

(20) the Pamunkey Queen Cockacoeske signed on behalf of the Rappahannocks, “who were supposed to be her tributaries”, but before the treaty could be ratified, the Queen of Pamunkey complained to the Virginia Colonial Council “that she was having trouble with Rappahannocks and Chickahominies, supposedly tributaries of hers”;

(21) in November 1682, the Virginia Colonial Council established a reservation for the Rappahannock Indians of 3,474 acres “about the town where they dwelt”;

(22) the Rappahannock “town” was the hunting village on the north side of the Mattaponi River, where the Rappahannocks had lived throughout the 1670s;

(23) the acreage allotment of the reservation was based on the 1658 Indian land act, which translates into a bowman population of 70, or an approximate total Rappahannock population of 350;

(24) in 1683, following raids by Iroquoian warriors on both Indian and English settlements, the Virginia Colonial Council ordered the Rappahannocks to leave their reservation and unite with the Nanzatico Indians at Nanzatico Indian Town, which was located across and up the Rappahannock River some 30 miles;

(25) between 1687 and 1699, the Rappahannocks migrated out of Nanzatico, returning to the south side of the Rappahannock River at Portobacco Indian Town;

(26) in 1706, by order of Essex County, Lieutenant Richard Covington “escorted” the Portobaccos and Rappahannocks out of Portobacco Indian Town, out of Essex County, and into King and Queen County where they settled along the ridgeline between the Rappahannock and Mattaponi Rivers, the site of their ancient hunting village and 1682 reservation;

(27) during the 1760s, 3 Rappahannock girls were raised on Thomas Nelson’s Bleak Hill Plantation in King William County;

(28) of those girls—

(A) 1 married a Saunders man;

(B) 1 married a Johnson man; and

(C) 1 had 2 children, Edmund and Carter Nelson, fathered by Thomas Cary Nelson;

(29) in the 19th century, those Saunders, Johnson, and Nelson families are among the core Rappahannock families from which the modern Tribe traces its descent;

(30) in 1819 and 1820, Edward Bird, John Bird (and his wife), Carter Nelson, Edmund Nelson, and Carter Spurlock (all Rappahannock ancestors) were listed on the tax roles of King and Queen County and taxed at the county poor rate;

(31) Edmund Bird was added to the tax roles in 1821;

(32) those tax records are significant documentation because the great majority of pre-1864 records for King and Queen County were destroyed by fire;

(33) beginning in 1819, and continuing through the 1880s, there was a solid Rappahannock presence in the membership at Upper Essex Baptist Church;

(34) that was the first instance of conversion to Christianity by at least some Rappahannock Indians;

(35) while 26 identifiable and traceable Rappahannock surnames appear on the pre-1863 membership list, and 28 were listed on the 1863 membership roster, the number of surnames listed had declined to 12 in 1878 and had risen only slightly to 14 by 1888;

(36) a reason for the decline is that in 1870, a Methodist circuit rider, Joseph Mastin, secured funds to purchase land and construct St. Stephens Baptist Church for the Rappahannocks living nearby in Caroline County;

(37) Mastin referred to the Rappahannocks during the period of 1850 to 1870 as “Indians, having a great need for moral and Christian guidance”;

(38) St. Stephens was the dominant tribal church until the Rappahannock Indian Baptist Church was established in 1964;

(39) at both churches, the core Rappahannock family names of Bird, Clarke, Fortune, Johnson, Nelson, Parker, and Richardson predominate;

(40) during the early 1900s, James Mooney, noted anthropologist, maintained correspondence with the Rappahannocks, surveying them and instructing them on how to formalize their tribal government;

(41) in November 1920, Speck visited the Rappahannocks and assisted them in organizing the fight for their sovereign rights;

(42) in 1921, the Rappahannocks were granted a charter from the Commonwealth of Virginia formalizing their tribal government;

(43) Speck began a professional relationship with the Tribe that would last more than 30 years and document Rappahannock history and traditions as never before;

(44) in April 1921, Rappahannock Chief George Nelson asked the Governor of Virginia, Westmoreland Davis, to forward a proclamation to the President of the United States, along with an appended list of tribal members and a handwritten copy of the proclamation itself;

(45) the letter concerned Indian freedom of speech and assembly nationwide;

(46) in 1922, the Rappahannocks established a formal school at Lloyds, Essex County, Virginia;

(47) prior to establishment of the school, Rappahannock children were taught by a tribal member in Central Point, Caroline County, Virginia;

(48) in December 1923, Rappahannock Chief George Nelson testified before Congress appealing for a \$50,000 appropriation to establish an Indian school in Virginia;

(49) in 1930, the Rappahannocks were engaged in an ongoing dispute with the Commonwealth of Virginia and the United States Census Bureau about their classification in the 1930 Federal census;

(50) in January 1930, Rappahannock Chief Otho S. Nelson wrote to Leon Truesdell, Chief Statistician of the United States Census Bureau, asking that the 218 enrolled Rappahannocks be listed as Indians;

(51) in February 1930, Truesdell replied to Nelson saying that “special instructions” were being given about classifying Indians;

(52) in April 1930, Nelson wrote to William M. Steuart at the Census Bureau asking about the enumerators’ failure to classify his people as Indians, saying that enumerators had not asked the question about race when they interviewed his people;

(53) in a followup letter to Truesdell, Nelson reported that the enumerators were “flatly denying” his people’s request to be listed as Indians and that the race question was completely avoided during interviews;

(54) the Rappahannocks had spoken with Caroline and Essex County enumerators, and

with John M.W. Green at that point, without success;

(55) Nelson asked Truesdell to list people as Indians if he sent a list of members;

(56) the matter was settled by William Steuart, who concluded that the Bureau's rule was that people of Indian descent could be classified as "Indian" only if Indian "blood" predominated and "Indian" identity was accepted in the local community;

(57) the Virginia Vital Statistics Bureau classed all nonreservation Indians as "Negro", and it failed to see why "an exception should be made" for the Rappahannocks;

(58) therefore, in 1925, the Indian Rights Association took on the Rappahannock case to assist the Rappahannocks in fighting for their recognition and rights as an Indian tribe;

(59) during the Second World War, the Pamunkeys, Mattaponis, Chickahomines, and Rappahannocks had to fight the draft boards with respect to their racial identities;

(60) the Virginia Vital Statistics Bureau insisted that certain Indian draftees be inducted into Negro units;

(61) finally, 3 Rappahannocks were convicted of violating the Federal draft laws and, after spending time in a Federal prison, were granted conscientious objector status and served out the remainder of the war working in military hospitals;

(62) in 1943, Frank Speck noted that there were approximately 25 communities of Indians left in the Eastern United States that were entitled to Indian classification, including the Rappahannocks;

(63) in the 1940s, Leon Truesdell, Chief Statistician, of the United States Census Bureau, listed 118 members in the Rappahannock Tribe in the Indian population of Virginia;

(64) on April 25, 1940, the Office of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior included the Rappahannocks on a list of Indian tribes classified by State and by agency;

(65) in 1948, the Smithsonian Institution Annual Report included an article by William Harlan Gilbert entitled, "Surviving Indian Groups of the Eastern United States", which included and described the Rappahannock Tribe;

(66) in the late 1940s and early 1950s, the Rappahannocks operated a school at Indian Neck;

(67) the State agreed to pay a tribal teacher to teach 10 students bused by King and Queen County to Sharon Indian School in King William County, Virginia;

(68) in 1965, Rappahannock students entered Marriott High School (a White public school) by executive order of the Governor of Virginia;

(69) in 1972, the Rappahannocks worked with the Coalition of Eastern Native Americans to fight for Federal recognition;

(70) in 1979, the Coalition established a pottery and artisans company, operating with other Virginia tribes;

(71) in 1980, the Rappahannocks received funding through the Administration for Native Americans of the Department of Health and Human Services to develop an economic program for the Tribe; and

(72) in 1983, the Rappahannocks received State recognition as an Indian tribe.

SEC. 402. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

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

(2) TRIBAL MEMBER.—The term "tribal member" means—

(A) an individual who is an enrolled member of the Tribe as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) an individual who has been placed on the membership rolls of the Tribe in accordance with this title.

(3) TRIBE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term "Tribe" means the organization possessing the legal name Rappahannock Tribe, Inc.

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term "Tribe" does not include any other Indian tribe, subtribe, band, or splinter group the members of which represent themselves as Rappahannock Indians.

SEC. 403. FEDERAL RECOGNITION.

(a) FEDERAL RECOGNITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Federal recognition is extended to the Tribe.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.—All laws (including regulations) of the United States of general applicability to Indians or nations, Indian tribes, or bands of Indians (including the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 461 et seq.)) that are not inconsistent with this title shall be applicable to the Tribe and tribal members.

(b) FEDERAL SERVICES AND BENEFITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date of enactment of this Act, the Tribe and tribal members shall be eligible for all services and benefits provided by the Federal Government to federally recognized Indian tribes without regard to the existence of a reservation for the Tribe.

(2) SERVICE AREA.—For the purpose of the delivery of Federal services to tribal members, the service area of the Tribe shall be considered to be the area comprised of King and Queen County, Caroline County, Essex County, and King William County, Virginia.

SEC. 404. MEMBERSHIP; GOVERNING DOCUMENTS.

The membership roll and governing documents of the Tribe shall be the most recent membership roll and governing documents, respectively, submitted by the Tribe to the Secretary before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 405. GOVERNING BODY.

The governing body of the Tribe shall be—

(1) the governing body of the Tribe in place as of the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) any subsequent governing body elected in accordance with the election procedures specified in the governing documents of the Tribe.

SEC. 406. RESERVATION OF THE TRIBE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Upon the request of the Tribe, the Secretary of the Interior—

(1) shall take into trust for the benefit of the Tribe any land held in fee by the Tribe that was acquired by the Tribe on or before January 1, 2007, if such lands are located within the boundaries of King and Queen County, Stafford County, Spotsylvania County, Richmond County, Essex County, and Caroline County, Virginia; and

(2) may take into trust for the benefit of the Tribe any land held in fee by the Tribe, if such lands are located within the boundaries of King and Queen County, Richmond County, Lancaster County, King George County, Essex County, Caroline County, New Kent County, King William County, and James City County, Virginia.

(b) DEADLINE FOR DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall make a final written determination not later than three years of the date which the Tribe submits a request for land to be taken into trust under subsection (a)(2) and shall immediately make that determination available to the Tribe.

(c) RESERVATION STATUS.—Any land taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe pursuant to this paragraph shall, upon request of the Tribe, be considered part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(d) GAMING.—The Tribe may not conduct gaming activities as a matter of claimed in-

herent authority or under the authority of any Federal law, including the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) or under any regulations thereunder promulgated by the Secretary or the National Indian Gaming Commission.

SEC. 407. HUNTING, FISHING, TRAPPING, GATHERING, AND WATER RIGHTS.

Nothing in this title expands, reduces, or affects in any manner any hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, or water rights of the Tribe and members of the Tribe.

TITLE V—MONACAN INDIAN NATION

SEC. 501. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) in 1677, the Monacan Tribe signed the Treaty of Middle Plantation between Charles II of England and 12 Indian "Kings and Chief Men";

(2) in 1722, in the Treaty of Albany, Governor Spotswood negotiated to save the Virginia Indians from extinction at the hands of the Iroquois;

(3) specifically mentioned in the negotiations were the Monacan tribes of the Totero (Tutelo), Saponi, Ocheneeches (Occaneechi), Stengenocks, and Meipontskys;

(4) in 1790, the first national census recorded Benjamin Evans and Robert Johns, both ancestors of the present Monacan community, listed as "white" with mulatto children;

(5) in 1782, tax records also began for those families;

(6) in 1850, the United States census recorded 29 families, mostly large, with Monacan surnames, the members of which are genealogically related to the present community;

(7) in 1870, a log structure was built at the Bear Mountain Indian Mission;

(8) in 1908, the structure became an Episcopal Mission and, as of the date of enactment of this Act, the structure is listed as a landmark on the National Register of Historic Places;

(9) in 1920, 304 Amherst Indians were identified in the United States census;

(10) from 1930 through 1931, numerous letters from Monacans to the Bureau of the Census resulted from the decision of Dr. Walter Plecker, former head of the Bureau of Vital Statistics of the Commonwealth of Virginia, not to allow Indians to register as Indians for the 1930 census;

(11) the Monacans eventually succeeded in being allowed to claim their race, albeit with an asterisk attached to a note from Dr. Plecker stating that there were no Indians in Virginia;

(12) in 1947, D'Arcy McNickle, a Salish Indian, saw some of the children at the Amherst Mission and requested that the Cherokee Agency visit them because they appeared to be Indian;

(13) that letter was forwarded to the Department of the Interior, Office of Indian Affairs, Chicago, Illinois;

(14) Chief Jarrett Blythe of the Eastern Band of Cherokee did visit the Mission and wrote that he "would be willing to accept these children in the Cherokee school";

(15) in 1979, a Federal Coalition of Eastern Native Americans established the entity known as "Monacan Co-operative Pottery" at the Amherst Mission;

(16) some important pieces were produced at Monacan Co-operative Pottery, including a piece that was sold to the Smithsonian Institution;

(17) the Mattaponi-Pamunkey-Monacan Consortium, established in 1981, has since been organized as a nonprofit corporation that serves as a vehicle to obtain funds for those Indian tribes from the Department of Labor under Native American programs;

(18) in 1989, the Monacan Tribe was recognized by the Commonwealth of Virginia,

which enabled the Tribe to apply for grants and participate in other programs; and

(19) in 1993, the Monacan Tribe received tax-exempt status as a nonprofit corporation from the Internal Revenue Service.

SEC. 502. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) **TRIBAL MEMBER.**—The term “tribal member” means—

(A) an individual who is an enrolled member of the Tribe as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) an individual who has been placed on the membership rolls of the Tribe in accordance with this title.

(3) **TRIBE.**—The term “Tribe” means the Monacan Indian Nation.

SEC. 503. FEDERAL RECOGNITION.

(a) **FEDERAL RECOGNITION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Federal recognition is extended to the Tribe.

(2) **APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.**—All laws (including regulations) of the United States of general applicability to Indians or nations, Indian tribes, or bands of Indians (including the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 461 et seq.)) that are not inconsistent with this title shall be applicable to the Tribe and tribal members.

(b) **FEDERAL SERVICES AND BENEFITS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—On and after the date of enactment of this Act, the Tribe and tribal members shall be eligible for all services and benefits provided by the Federal Government to federally recognized Indian tribes without regard to the existence of a reservation for the Tribe.

(2) **SERVICE AREA.**—For the purpose of the delivery of Federal services to tribal members, the service area of the Tribe shall be considered to be the area comprised of all land within 25 miles from the center of Amherst, Virginia.

SEC. 504. MEMBERSHIP; GOVERNING DOCUMENTS.

The membership roll and governing documents of the Tribe shall be the most recent membership roll and governing documents, respectively, submitted by the Tribe to the Secretary before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 505. GOVERNING BODY.

The governing body of the Tribe shall be—

(1) the governing body of the Tribe in place as of the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) any subsequent governing body elected in accordance with the election procedures specified in the governing documents of the Tribe.

SEC. 506. RESERVATION OF THE TRIBE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon the request of the Tribe, the Secretary of the Interior—

(1) shall take into trust for the benefit of the Tribe any land held in fee by the Tribe that was acquired by the Tribe on or before January 1, 2007, if such lands are located within the boundaries of Amherst County, Virginia; and

(2) may take into trust for the benefit of the Tribe any land held in fee by the Tribe, if such lands are located within the boundaries of Amherst County, Virginia, and those parcels in Rockbridge County, Virginia (subject to the consent of the local unit of government), owned by Mr. J. Poole, described as East 731 Sandbridge (encompassing approximately 4.74 acres) and East 731 (encompassing approximately 5.12 acres).

(b) **DEADLINE FOR DETERMINATION.**—The Secretary shall make a final written determination not later than three years of the date which the Tribe submits a request for land to be taken into trust under subsection (a)(2) and shall immediately make that determination available to the Tribe.

(c) **RESERVATION STATUS.**—Any land taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe pursuant to this paragraph shall, upon request of the Tribe, be considered part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(d) **GAMING.**—The Tribe may not conduct gaming activities as a matter of claimed inherent authority or under the authority of any Federal law, including the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) or under any regulations thereunder promulgated by the Secretary or the National Indian Gaming Commission.

SEC. 507. HUNTING, FISHING, TRAPPING, GATHERING, AND WATER RIGHTS.

Nothing in this title expands, reduces, or affects in any manner any hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, or water rights of the Tribe and members of the Tribe.

TITLE VI—NANSEMOND INDIAN TRIBE

SEC. 601. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) from 1607 until 1646, Nansemond Indians—

(A) lived approximately 30 miles from Jamestown; and

(B) were significantly involved in English-Indian affairs;

(2) after 1646, there were 2 sections of Nansemonds in communication with each other, the Christianized Nansemonds in Norfolk County, who lived as citizens, and the traditionalist Nansemonds, who lived further west;

(3) in 1638, according to an entry in a 17th century sermon book still owned by the Chief's family, a Norfolk County Englishman married a Nansemond woman;

(4) that man and woman are lineal ancestors of all of members of the Nansemond Indian tribe alive as of the date of enactment of this Act, as are some of the traditionalist Nansemonds;

(5) in 1669, the 2 Nansemond sections appeared in Virginia Colony's census of Indian bowmen;

(6) in 1677, Nansemond Indians were signatories to the Treaty of 1677 with the King of England;

(7) in 1700 and 1704, the Nansemonds and other Virginia Indian tribes were prevented by Virginia Colony from making a separate peace with the Iroquois;

(8) Virginia represented those Indian tribes in the final Treaty of Albany, 1722;

(9) in 1711, a Nansemond boy attended the Indian School at the College of William and Mary;

(10) in 1727, Norfolk County granted William Bass and his kinsmen the “Indian privileges” of clearing swamp land and bearing arms (which privileges were forbidden to other non-Whites) because of their Nansemond ancestry, which meant that Bass and his kinsmen were original inhabitants of that land;

(11) in 1742, Norfolk County issued a certificate of Nansemond descent to William Bass;

(12) from the 1740s to the 1790s, the traditionalist section of the Nansemond tribe, 40 miles west of the Christianized Nansemonds, was dealing with reservation land;

(13) the last surviving members of that section sold out in 1792 with the permission of the Commonwealth of Virginia;

(14) in 1797, Norfolk County issued a certificate stating that William Bass was of Indian and English descent, and that his Indian line of ancestry ran directly back to the early 18th century elder in a traditionalist section of Nansemonds on the reservation;

(15) in 1833, Virginia enacted a law enabling people of European and Indian descent to obtain a special certificate of ancestry;

(16) the law originated from the county in which Nansemonds lived, and mostly Nansemonds, with a few people from other counties, took advantage of the new law;

(17) a Methodist mission established around 1850 for Nansemonds is currently a standard Methodist congregation with Nansemond members;

(18) in 1901, Smithsonian anthropologist James Mooney—

(A) visited the Nansemonds; and

(B) completed a tribal census that counted 61 households and was later published;

(19) in 1922, Nansemonds were given a special Indian school in the segregated school system of Norfolk County;

(20) the school survived only a few years;

(21) in 1928, University of Pennsylvania anthropologist Frank Speck published a book on modern Virginia Indians that included a section on the Nansemonds; and

(22) the Nansemonds were organized formally, with elected officers, in 1984, and later applied for and received State recognition.

SEC. 602. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) **TRIBAL MEMBER.**—The term “tribal member” means—

(A) an individual who is an enrolled member of the Tribe as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) an individual who has been placed on the membership rolls of the Tribe in accordance with this title.

(3) **TRIBE.**—The term “Tribe” means the Nansemond Indian Tribe.

SEC. 603. FEDERAL RECOGNITION.

(a) **FEDERAL RECOGNITION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Federal recognition is extended to the Tribe.

(2) **APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.**—All laws (including regulations) of the United States of general applicability to Indians or nations, Indian tribes, or bands of Indians (including the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 461 et seq.)) that are not inconsistent with this title shall be applicable to the Tribe and tribal members.

(b) **FEDERAL SERVICES AND BENEFITS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—On and after the date of enactment of this Act, the Tribe and tribal members shall be eligible for all services and benefits provided by the Federal Government to federally recognized Indian tribes without regard to the existence of a reservation for the Tribe.

(2) **SERVICE AREA.**—For the purpose of the delivery of Federal services to tribal members, the service area of the Tribe shall be considered to be the area comprised of the cities of Chesapeake, Hampton, Newport News, Norfolk, Portsmouth, Suffolk, and Virginia Beach, Virginia.

SEC. 604. MEMBERSHIP; GOVERNING DOCUMENTS.

The membership roll and governing documents of the Tribe shall be the most recent membership roll and governing documents, respectively, submitted by the Tribe to the Secretary before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 605. GOVERNING BODY.

The governing body of the Tribe shall be—

(1) the governing body of the Tribe in place as of the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) any subsequent governing body elected in accordance with the election procedures specified in the governing documents of the Tribe.

SEC. 606. RESERVATION OF THE TRIBE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon the request of the Tribe, the Secretary of the Interior—

(1) shall take into trust for the benefit of the Tribe any land held in fee by the Tribe that was acquired by the Tribe on or before January 1, 2007, if such lands are located within the boundaries of the city of Suffolk, the city of Chesapeake, or Isle of Wight County, Virginia; and

(2) may take into trust for the benefit of the Tribe any land held in fee by the Tribe, if such lands are located within the boundaries of the city of Suffolk, the city of Chesapeake, or Isle of Wight County, Virginia.

(b) **DEADLINE FOR DETERMINATION.**—The Secretary shall make a final written determination not later than three years of the date which the Tribe submits a request for land to be taken into trust under subsection (a)(2) and shall immediately make that determination available to the Tribe.

(c) **RESERVATION STATUS.**—Any land taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe pursuant to this paragraph shall, upon request of the Tribe, be considered part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(d) **GAMING.**—The Tribe may not conduct gaming activities as a matter of claimed inherent authority or under the authority of any Federal law, including the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) or under any regulations thereunder promulgated by the Secretary or the National Indian Gaming Commission.

SEC. 607. HUNTING, FISHING, TRAPPING, GATHERING, AND WATER RIGHTS.

Nothing in this title expands, reduces, or affects in any manner any hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, or water rights of the Tribe and members of the Tribe.

TITLE VII—EMINENT DOMAIN

SEC. 701. LIMITATION.

Eminent domain may not be used to acquire lands in fee or in trust for an Indian tribe recognized under this Act.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. LEE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. HATCH, Mr. COONS, and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 467. A bill to reduce recidivism and increase public safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 467

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 “Corrections Oversight, Recidivism Reduction, and Eliminating Costs for Taxpayers In Our National System Act of 2015” or the “CORRECTIONS Act”.

SEC. 2. RECIDIVISM REDUCTION PROGRAMMING AND PRODUCTIVE ACTIVITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall—

(1) conduct a review of recidivism reduction programming and productive activities, including prison jobs, offered in correctional institutions, including programming and activities offered in State correctional institutions, which shall include a review of research on the effectiveness of such programs;

(2) conduct a survey to identify products, including products purchased by Federal agencies, that are currently manufactured overseas and could be manufactured by prisoners participating in a prison work program without reducing job opportunities for other workers in the United States; and

(3) submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of

the House of Representatives a strategic plan for the expansion of recidivism reduction programming and productive activities, including prison jobs, in Bureau of Prisons facilities required by section 3621(h)(1) of title 18, United States Code, as added by subsection (b).

(b) **AMENDMENT.**—Section 3621 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) **RECIDIVISM REDUCTION PROGRAMMING AND PRODUCTIVE ACTIVITIES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the Bureau of Prisons, shall, subject to the availability of appropriations, make available to all eligible prisoners appropriate recidivism reduction programming or productive activities, including prison jobs, in accordance with paragraph (2).

“(2) **EXPANSION PERIOD.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In carrying out this subsection, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall have 6 years beginning on the date of enactment of this subsection to ensure appropriate recidivism reduction programming and productive activities, including prison jobs, are available for all eligible prisoners.

“(B) **CERTIFICATION.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The National Institute of Corrections shall evaluate all recidivism reduction programming or productive activities that are made available to eligible prisoners and determine whether such programming or activities may be certified as evidence-based and effective at reducing or mitigating offender risk and recidivism.

“(ii) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In determining whether or not to issue a certification under clause (i), the National Institute of Corrections shall consult with internal or external program evaluation experts, including the Office of Management and Budget and the Comptroller General of the United States to identify appropriate evaluation methodologies for each type of program offered, and may use analyses of similar programs conducted in other correctional settings.

“(3) **RECIDIVISM REDUCTION PARTNERSHIPS.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall issue regulations requiring the official in charge of each correctional facility to ensure, subject to the availability of appropriations, that appropriate recidivism reduction programming and productive activities, including prison jobs, are available for all eligible prisoners within the time period specified in paragraph (2), by entering into partnerships with the following:

“(A) Nonprofit organizations, including faith-based and community-based organizations, that provide recidivism reduction programming, on a paid or volunteer basis.

“(B) Educational institutions that will deliver academic classes in Bureau of Prisons facilities, on a paid or volunteer basis.

“(C) Private entities that will, on a volunteer basis—

“(i) deliver occupational and vocational training and certifications in Bureau of Prisons facilities;

“(ii) provide equipment to facilitate occupational and vocational training or employment opportunities for prisoners;

“(iii) employ prisoners; or

“(iv) assist prisoners in prerelease custody or supervised release in finding employment.

“(4) **ASSIGNMENTS.**—In assigning prisoners to recidivism reduction programming and productive activities, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall use the Post-Sentencing Risk and Needs Assessment System described in section 3621A and shall ensure that—

“(A) to the extent practicable, prisoners are separated from prisoners of other risk classifications in accordance with best practices for effective recidivism reduction;

“(B) a prisoner who has been classified as low risk and without need for recidivism reduction programming shall participate in and successfully complete productive activities, including prison jobs, in order to maintain a low-risk classification;

“(C) a prisoner who has successfully completed all recidivism reduction programming to which the prisoner was assigned shall participate in productive activities, including a prison job; and

“(D) to the extent practicable, each eligible prisoner shall participate in and successfully complete recidivism reduction programming or productive activities, including prison jobs, throughout the entire term of incarceration of the prisoner.

“(5) **MENTORING SERVICES.**—Any person who provided mentoring services to a prisoner while the prisoner was in a penal or correctional facility of the Bureau of Prisons shall be permitted to continue such services after the prisoner has been transferred into prerelease custody, unless the person in charge of the penal or correctional facility of the Bureau of Prisons demonstrates, in a written document submitted to the person, that such services would be a significant security risk to the prisoner, persons who provide such services, or any other person.

“(6) **RECIDIVISM REDUCTION PROGRAM INCENTIVES AND REWARDS.**—Prisoners who have successfully completed recidivism reduction programs and productive activities shall be eligible for the following:

“(A) **TIME CREDITS.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to clauses (ii) and (iii), a prisoner who has successfully completed a recidivism reduction program or productive activity that has been certified under paragraph (2)(B) shall receive time credits of 5 days for each period of 30 days of successful completion of such program or activity. A prisoner who is classified as low risk shall receive additional time credits of 5 days for each period of 30 days of successful completion of such program or activity.

“(ii) **AVAILABILITY.**—A prisoner may not receive time credits under this subparagraph for successfully completing a recidivism reduction program or productive activity—

“(I) before the date of enactment of this subsection; or

“(II) during official detention before the date on which the prisoner’s sentence commences under section 3585(a).

“(iii) **EXCLUSIONS.**—No credit shall be awarded under this subparagraph to a prisoner serving a sentence for a second or subsequent conviction for a Federal offense imposed after the date on which the prisoner’s first such conviction became final. No credit shall be awarded under this subparagraph to a prisoner who is in criminal history category VI at the time of sentencing. No credit shall be awarded under this subparagraph to any prisoner serving a sentence of imprisonment for conviction for any of the following offenses:

“(I) A Federal crime of terrorism, as defined under section 2332b(g)(5).

“(II) A Federal crime of violence, as defined under section 16.

“(III) A Federal sex offense, as described in section 111 of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (42 U.S.C. 16911).

“(IV) A violation of section 1962.

“(V) Engaging in a continuing criminal enterprise, as defined in section 408 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 848).

“(VI) A Federal fraud offense for which the prisoner received a sentence of imprisonment of more than 15 years.

“(VII) A Federal crime involving child exploitation, as defined in section 2 of the PROTECT Our Children Act of 2008 (42 U.S.C. 17601).

“(iv) IDENTIFICATION OF COVERED OFFENSES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the United States Sentencing Commission shall prepare and submit to the Director of the Bureau of Prisons a list of all Federal offenses described in subclauses (I) through (VII) of clause (iii), and shall update such list on an annual basis.

“(B) OTHER INCENTIVES.—The Bureau of Prisons shall develop policies to provide appropriate incentives for successful completion of recidivism reduction programming and productive activities, other than time credit pursuant to subparagraph (A), including incentives for prisoners who are precluded from earning credit under subparagraph (A)(iii). Such incentives may include additional telephone or visitation privileges for use with family, close friends, mentors, and religious leaders.

“(C) PENALTIES.—The Bureau of Prisons may reduce rewards a prisoner has previously earned under subparagraph (A) for prisoners who violate the rules of the penal or correctional facility in which the prisoner is imprisoned, a recidivism reduction program, or a productive activity.

“(D) RELATION TO OTHER INCENTIVE PROGRAMS.—The incentives described in this paragraph shall be in addition to any other rewards or incentives for which a prisoner may be eligible, except that a prisoner shall not be eligible for the time credits described in subparagraph (A) if the prisoner has accrued time credits under another provision of law based solely upon participation in, or successful completion of, such program.

“(7) SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION.—For purposes of this subsection, a prisoner—

“(A) shall be considered to have successfully completed a recidivism reduction program or productive activity, if the Bureau of Prisons determines that the prisoner—

“(i) regularly attended and participated in the recidivism reduction program or productive activity;

“(ii) regularly completed assignments or tasks in a manner that allowed the prisoner to realize the criminogenic benefits of the recidivism reduction program or productive activity;

“(iii) did not regularly engage in disruptive behavior that seriously undermined the administration of the recidivism reduction program or productive activity; and

“(iv) satisfied the requirements of clauses (i) through (iii) for a time period that is not less than 30 days and allowed the prisoner to realize the criminogenic benefits of the recidivism reduction program or productive activity; and

“(B) for purposes of paragraph (6)(A), may be given credit for successful completion of a recidivism reduction program or productive activity for the time period during which the prisoner participated in such program or activity if the prisoner satisfied the requirements of subparagraph (A) during such time period, notwithstanding that the prisoner continues to participate in such program or activity.

“(8) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) ELIGIBLE PRISONER.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘eligible prisoner’—

“(i) means a prisoner serving a sentence of incarceration for conviction of a Federal offense; and

“(ii) does not include any prisoner who the Bureau of Prisons determines—

“(I) is medically unable to successfully complete recidivism reduction programming or productive activities;

“(II) would present a security risk if permitted to participate in recidivism reduction programming; or

“(III) is serving a sentence of incarceration of less than 1 month.

“(B) PRODUCTIVE ACTIVITY.—The term ‘productive activity’—

“(i) means a group or individual activity, including holding a job as part of a prison work program, that is designed to allow prisoners classified as having a lower risk of recidivism to maintain such classification, when offered to such prisoners; and

“(ii) may include the delivery of the activities described in subparagraph (C)(i)(II) to other prisoners.

“(C) RECIDIVISM REDUCTION PROGRAM.—The term ‘recidivism reduction program’ means—

“(i) a group or individual activity that—

“(I) has been certified to reduce recidivism or promote successful reentry; and

“(II) may include—

“(aa) classes on social learning and life skills;

“(bb) classes on morals or ethics;

“(cc) academic classes;

“(dd) cognitive behavioral treatment;

“(ee) mentoring;

“(ff) occupational and vocational training;

“(gg) faith-based classes or services;

“(hh) domestic violence education and deterrence programming;

“(ii) victim-impact classes or other restorative justice programs; and

“(jj) a prison job; and

“(ii) shall include—

“(I) a productive activity; and

“(II) recovery programming.

“(D) RECOVERY PROGRAMMING.—The term ‘recovery programming’ means a course of instruction or activities, other than a course described in subsection (e), that has been demonstrated to reduce drug or alcohol abuse or dependence among participants, or to promote recovery among individuals who have previously abused alcohol or drugs, to include appropriate medication-assisted treatment.”

SEC. 3. POST-SENTENCING RISK AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter C of chapter 229 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3621 the following:

“§ 3621A. Post-sentencing risk and needs assessment system

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 months after the date of the enactment of this section, the Attorney General shall develop for use by the Bureau of Prisons an offender risk and needs assessment system, to be known as the ‘Post-Sentencing Risk and Needs Assessment System’ or the ‘Assessment System’, which shall—

“(1) assess and determine the recidivism risk level of all prisoners and classify each prisoner as having a low, moderate, or high risk of recidivism;

“(2) to the extent practicable, assess and determine the risk of violence of all prisoners;

“(3) ensure that, to the extent practicable, low-risk prisoners are grouped together in housing and assignment decisions;

“(4) assign each prisoner to appropriate recidivism reduction programs or productive activities based on the prisoner’s risk level and the specific criminogenic needs of the prisoner, and in accordance with section 3621(h)(4);

“(5) reassess and update the recidivism risk level and programmatic needs of each prisoner pursuant to the schedule set forth in subsection (c)(2), and assess changes in the prisoner’s recidivism risk within a particular risk level; and

“(6) provide information on best practices concerning the tailoring of recidivism reduction programs to the specific criminogenic needs of each prisoner so as to effectively lower the prisoner’s risk of recidivating.

“(b) DEVELOPMENT OF SYSTEM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In designing the Assessment System, the Attorney General shall—

“(A) use available research and best practices in the field and consult with academic and other criminal justice experts as appropriate; and

“(B) ensure that the Assessment System measures indicators of progress and improvement, and of regression, including newly acquired skills, attitude, and behavior changes over time, through meaningful consideration of dynamic risk factors, such that—

“(i) all prisoners at each risk level other than low risk have a meaningful opportunity to progress to a lower risk classification during the period of the incarceration of the prisoner through changes in dynamic risk factors; and

“(ii) all prisoners on prerelease custody, other than prisoners classified as low risk, have a meaningful opportunity to progress to a lower risk classification during such custody through changes in dynamic risk factors.

“(2) RISK AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT TOOLS.—In carrying out this subsection, the Attorney General shall—

“(A) develop a suitable intake assessment tool to perform the initial assessments and determinations described in subsection (a)(1), and to make the assignments described in subsection (a)(3);

“(B) develop a suitable reassessment tool to perform the reassessments and updates described in subsection (a)(4); and

“(C) develop a suitable tool to assess the recidivism risk level of prisoners in prerelease custody.

“(3) USE OF EXISTING RISK AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT TOOLS PERMITTED.—In carrying out this subsection, the Attorney General may use existing risk and needs assessment tools, as appropriate, for the assessment tools required under paragraph (2).

“(4) VALIDATION.—In carrying out this subsection, the Attorney General shall statistically validate the risk and needs assessment tools on the Federal prison population, or ensure that the tools have been so validated. To the extent such validation cannot be completed with the time period specified in subsection (a), the Attorney General shall ensure that such validation is completed as soon as is practicable.

“(5) RELATIONSHIP WITH EXISTING CLASSIFICATION SYSTEMS.—The Bureau of Prisons may incorporate its existing Inmate Classification System into the Assessment System if the Assessment System assesses the risk level and criminogenic needs of each prisoner and determines the appropriate security level institution for each prisoner. Before the development of the Assessment System, the Bureau of Prisons may use the existing Inmate Classification System, or a pre-existing risk and needs assessment tool that can be used to classify prisoners consistent with subsection (a)(1), or can be reasonably adapted for such purpose, for purposes of this section, section 3621(h), and section 3624(c).

“(c) RISK ASSESSMENT.—

“(1) INITIAL ASSESSMENTS.—Not later than 30 months after the date on which the Attorney General develops the Assessment System, the Bureau of Prisons shall determine the risk level of each prisoner using the Assessment System.

“(2) REASSESSMENTS AND UPDATES.—The Bureau of Prisons shall update the assessment of each prisoner required under paragraph (1)—

“(A) not less frequently than once each year for any prisoner whose anticipated release date is within 3 years;

“(B) not less frequently than once every 2 years for any prisoner whose anticipated release date is within 10 years; and

“(C) not less frequently than once every 3 years for any other prisoner.

“(d) ASSIGNMENT OF RECIDIVISM REDUCTION PROGRAMS OR PRODUCTIVE ACTIVITIES.—The Assessment System shall provide guidance on the kind and amount of recidivism reduction programming or productive activities appropriate for each prisoner.

“(e) BUREAU OF PRISONS TRAINING.—The Attorney General shall develop training protocols and programs for Bureau of Prisons officials and employees responsible for administering the Assessment System. Such training protocols shall include a requirement that personnel of the Bureau of Prisons demonstrate competence in using the methodology and procedure developed under this section on a regular basis.

“(f) QUALITY ASSURANCE.—In order to ensure that the Bureau of Prisons is using the Assessment System in an appropriate and consistent manner, the Attorney General shall monitor and assess the use of the Assessment System and shall conduct periodic audits of the use of the Assessment System at facilities of the Bureau of Prisons.

“(g) DETERMINATIONS AND CLASSIFICATIONS UNREVIEWABLE.—Subject to any constitutional limitations, there shall be no right of review, right of appeal, cognizable property interest, or cause of action, either administrative or judicial, arising from any determination or classification made by any Federal agency or employee while implementing or administering the Assessment System, or any rules or regulations promulgated under this section.

“(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) DYNAMIC RISK FACTOR.—The term ‘dynamic risk factor’ means a characteristic or attribute that has been shown to be relevant to assessing risk of recidivism and that can be modified based on a prisoner’s actions, behaviors, or attitudes, including through completion of appropriate programming or other means, in a prison setting.

“(2) RECIDIVISM RISK.—The term ‘recidivism risk’ means the likelihood that a prisoner will commit additional crimes for which the prisoner could be prosecuted in a Federal, State, or local court in the United States.

“(3) RECIDIVISM REDUCTION PROGRAM; PRODUCTIVE ACTIVITY; RECOVERY PROGRAMMING.—The terms ‘recidivism reduction program’, ‘productive activity’, and ‘recovery programming’ shall have the meaning given such terms in section 3621(h)(8).”

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter C of chapter 229 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3621 the following:

“3621A. Post-sentencing risk and needs assessment system.”

SEC. 4. PRERELEASE CUSTODY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3624(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking the period at the end of the second sentence and inserting “or home confinement, subject to the limitation that no prisoner may serve more than 10 percent of the prisoner’s imposed sentence in home confinement pursuant to this paragraph.”;

(2) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting the following:

“(2) CREDIT FOR RECIDIVISM REDUCTION.—In addition to any time spent in prerelease custody pursuant to paragraph (1), a prisoner shall spend an additional portion of the final months of the prisoner’s sentence, equivalent to the amount of time credit the prisoner has earned pursuant to section 3621(h)(6)(A), in prerelease custody, if—

“(A) the prisoner’s most recent risk and needs assessment, conducted within 1 year of

the date on which the prisoner would first be eligible for transfer to prerelease custody pursuant to paragraph (1) and this paragraph, reflects that the prisoner is classified as low or moderate risk; and

“(B) for a prisoner classified as moderate risk, the prisoner’s most recent risk and needs assessment reflects that the prisoner’s risk of recidivism has declined during the period of the prisoner’s incarceration.

“(3) TYPES OF PRERELEASE CUSTODY.—A prisoner eligible to serve a portion of the prisoner’s sentence in prerelease custody pursuant to paragraph (2) may serve such portion in a residential reentry center, on home confinement, or, subject to paragraph (5), on community supervision.”;

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (6) as paragraphs (9) through (11), respectively;

(4) by inserting the following after paragraph (3):

“(4) HOME CONFINEMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon placement in home confinement pursuant to paragraph (2), a prisoner shall—

“(i) be subject to 24-hour electronic monitoring that enables the prompt identification of any violation of clause (ii);

“(ii) remain in the prisoner’s residence, with the exception of the following activities, subject to approval by the Director of the Bureau of Prisons—

“(I) participation in a job or job-seeking activities;

“(II) participation in recidivism reduction programming or productive activities assigned by the Post-Sentencing Risk and Needs Assessment System, or similar activities approved in advance by the Director of the Bureau of Prisons;

“(III) participation in community service;

“(IV) crime victim restoration activities;

“(V) medical treatment; or

“(VI) religious activities; and

“(iii) comply with such other conditions as the Director of the Bureau of Prisons deems appropriate.

“(B) ALTERNATIVE MEANS OF MONITORING.—If compliance with subparagraph (A)(i) is infeasible due to technical limitations or religious considerations, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons may employ alternative means of monitoring that are determined to be as effective or more effective than electronic monitoring.

“(C) MODIFICATIONS.—The Director of the Bureau of Prisons may modify the conditions of the prisoner’s home confinement for compelling reasons, if the prisoner’s record demonstrates exemplary compliance with such conditions.

“(5) COMMUNITY SUPERVISION.—

“(A) TIME CREDIT LESS THAN 36 MONTHS.—Any prisoner described in subparagraph (D) who has earned time credit of less than 36 months pursuant to section 3621(h)(6)(A) shall be eligible to serve no more than one-half of the amount of such credit on community supervision, if the prisoner satisfies the conditions set forth in subparagraph (C).

“(B) TIME CREDIT OF 36 MONTHS OR MORE.—Any prisoner described in subparagraph (D) who has earned time credit of 36 months or more pursuant to section 3621(h)(6)(A) shall be eligible to serve the amount of such credit exceeding 18 months on community supervision, if the prisoner satisfies the conditions set forth in subparagraph (C).

“(C) CONDITIONS OF COMMUNITY SUPERVISION.—A prisoner placed on community supervision shall be subject to such conditions as the Director of the Bureau of Prisons deems appropriate. A prisoner on community supervision may remain on community supervision until the conclusion of the prisoner’s sentence of incarceration if the prisoner—

“(i) complies with all conditions of prerelease custody;

“(ii) remains current on any financial obligations imposed as part of the prisoner’s sentence, including payments of court-ordered restitution arising from the offense of conviction; and

“(iii) refrains from committing any State, local, or Federal offense.

“(D) COVERED PRISONERS.—A prisoner described in this subparagraph is a prisoner who—

“(i) is classified as low risk by the Post-Sentencing Risk and Needs Assessment System in the assessment conducted for purposes of paragraph (2); or

“(ii) is subsequently classified as low risk by the Post-Sentencing Risk and Needs Assessment System.

“(6) VIOLATIONS.—If a prisoner violates a condition of the prisoner’s prerelease custody, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons may revoke the prisoner’s prerelease custody and require the prisoner to serve the remainder of the prisoner’s term of incarceration, or any portion thereof, in prison, or impose additional conditions on the prisoner’s prerelease custody as the Director of the Bureau of Prisons deems appropriate. If the violation is non-technical in nature, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall revoke the prisoner’s prerelease custody.

“(7) CREDIT FOR PRERELEASE CUSTODY.—Upon completion of a prisoner’s sentence, any term of supervised release imposed on the prisoner shall be reduced by the amount of time the prisoner served in prerelease custody pursuant to paragraph (2).

“(8) AGREEMENTS WITH UNITED STATES PROBATION AND PRETRIAL SERVICES.—The Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall, to the greatest extent practicable, enter into agreements with the United States Probation and Pretrial Services to supervise prisoners placed in home confinement or community supervision under this subsection. Such agreements shall authorize United States Probation and Pretrial Services to exercise the authority granted to the Director of the Bureau of Prisons pursuant to paragraphs (4), (5), and (12). Such agreements shall take into account the resource requirements of United States Probation and Pretrial Services as a result of the transfer of Bureau of Prisons inmates to prerelease custody and shall provide for the transfer of monetary sums necessary to comply with such requirements. United States Probation and Pretrial Services shall, to the greatest extent practicable, offer assistance to any prisoner not under its supervision during prerelease custody under this subsection.”; and

(5) by inserting at the end the following:

“(12) DETERMINATION OF APPROPRIATE CONDITIONS FOR PRERELEASE CUSTODY.—In determining appropriate conditions for prerelease custody pursuant to this subsection, and in accordance with paragraph (5), the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall, to the extent practicable, subject prisoners who demonstrate continued compliance with the requirements of such prerelease custody to increasingly less restrictive conditions, so as to most effectively prepare such prisoners for reentry. No prisoner shall be transferred to community supervision unless the length of the prisoner’s eligibility for community supervision pursuant to paragraph (5) is equivalent to or greater than the length of the prisoner’s remaining period of prerelease custody.

“(13) ALIENS SUBJECT TO DEPORTATION.—If the prisoner is an alien whose deportation was ordered as a condition of supervised release or who is subject to a detainer filed by Immigration and Customs Enforcement for the purposes of determining the alien’s deportability, the Director of the Bureau of

Prisons shall, upon the prisoner's transfer to prerelease custody pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2), deliver the prisoner to United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement for the purpose of conducting proceedings relating to the alien's deportation.

“(14) NOTICE OF TRANSFER TO PRERELEASE CUSTODY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Bureau of Prisons may not transfer a prisoner to prerelease custody pursuant to paragraph (2) if the prisoner has been sentenced to a term of incarceration of more than 3 years, unless the Director of the Bureau of Prisons provides prior notice to the United States Attorney's Office for the district in which the prisoner was sentenced.

“(B) TIME REQUIREMENT.—The notice required under subparagraph (A) shall be provided not later than 6 months before the date on which the prisoner is to be transferred.

“(C) CONTENTS OF NOTICE.—The notice required under subparagraph (A) shall include the following information:

“(i) The amount of credit earned pursuant to paragraph (2).

“(ii) The anticipated date of the prisoner's transfer.

“(iii) The nature of the prisoner's planned prerelease custody.

“(iv) The prisoner's behavioral record.

“(v) The most recent risk assessment of the prisoner.

“(D) HEARING.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—On motion of the Government, the court may conduct a hearing on the prisoner's transfer to prerelease custody.

“(ii) PRISONER'S PRESENCE.—The prisoner shall have the right to be present at a hearing described in clause (i), which right the prisoner may waive.

“(iii) MOTION.—A motion filed by the Government seeking a hearing—

“(I) shall set forth the basis for the Government's request that the prisoner's transfer be denied or modified pursuant to subparagraph (E); and

“(II) shall not require the Court to conduct a hearing described in clause (i).

“(E) DETERMINATION OF THE COURT.—The court may deny the transfer of the prisoner to prerelease custody or modify the terms of such transfer, if, after conducting a hearing pursuant to subparagraph (D), the court finds in writing, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the transfer of the prisoner is inconsistent with the factors specified in paragraphs (2), (6), and (7) of section 3553(a).”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. REPORTS.

(a) ANNUAL REPORTS.—

(1) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and every year thereafter, the Attorney General, in coordination with the Comptroller General of the United States, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that contains the following:

(A) A summary of the activities and accomplishments of the Attorney General in carrying out this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(B) An assessment of the status and use of the Post-Sentencing Risk and Needs Assessment System by the Bureau of Prisons, including the number of prisoners classified at each risk level under the Post-Sentencing Risk and Needs Assessment System at each facility of the Bureau of Prisons.

(C) A summary and assessment of the types and effectiveness of the recidivism reduction programs and productive activities in facilities operated by the Bureau of Prisons, including—

(i) evidence about which programs and activities have been shown to reduce recidivism;

(ii) the capacity of each program and activity at each facility, including the number of prisoners along with the risk level of each prisoner enrolled in each program and activity; and

(iii) identification of any problems or shortages in capacity of such programs and activities, and how these should be remedied.

(D) An assessment of budgetary savings resulting from this Act and the amendments made by this Act, to include—

(i) a summary of the amount of savings resulting from the transfer of prisoners into prerelease custody under this Act and the amendments made by this Act, including savings resulting from the avoidance or deferral of future construction, acquisition, or operations costs;

(ii) a summary of the amount of savings resulting from any decrease in recidivism that may be attributed to the implementation of the Post-Sentencing Risk and Needs Assessment System or the increase in recidivism reduction programs and productive activities required by this Act and the amendments made by this Act; and

(iii) a strategy to reinvest such savings into other Federal, State, and local law enforcement activities and expansions of recidivism reduction programs and productive activities in the Bureau of Prisons.

(2) REINVESTMENT OF SAVINGS TO FUND PUBLIC SAFETY PROGRAMMING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning in the first fiscal year after the first report is submitted under paragraph (1), and every fiscal year thereafter, the Attorney General shall—

(i) determine the covered amount for the previous fiscal year in accordance with subparagraph (B); and

(ii) use an amount of funds appropriated to the Department of Justice that is not less than 90 percent of the covered amount for the purposes described in subparagraph (C).

(B) COVERED AMOUNT.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term “covered amount” means, using the most recent report submitted under paragraph (1), the amount equal to the sum of the amount described in paragraph (1)(D)(i) for the fiscal year and the amount described in paragraph (1)(D)(ii) for the fiscal year.

(C) USE OF FUNDS.—The funds described in subparagraph (A)(ii) shall be used, consistent with paragraph (1)(D)(iii), to—

(i) ensure that, not later than 6 years after the date of enactment of this Act, recidivism reduction programs or productive activities are available to all eligible prisoners;

(ii) ensure compliance with the resource needs of United States Probation and Pretrial Services resulting from an agreement under section 3624(c)(8) of title 18 United States Code, as added by this Act; and

(iii) supplement funding for programs that increase public safety by providing resources to State and local law enforcement officials.

(b) PRISON WORK PROGRAMS REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the status of prison work programs at facilities operated by the Bureau of Prisons, including—

(1) a strategy to expand the availability of such programs without reducing job opportunities for workers in the United States who are not in the custody of the Bureau of Prisons;

(2) an assessment of the feasibility of expanding such programs, consistent with the strategy required under paragraph (1), so that, not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, not less than 75 percent of eligible low-risk offenders have the

opportunity to participate in a prison work program for not less than 20 hours per week; and

(3) a detailed discussion of legal authorities that would be useful or necessary to achieve the goals described in paragraphs (1) and (2).

(c) REPORTING ON RECIDIVISM RATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and every year thereafter, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, shall report to the appropriate committees of Congress on rates of recidivism among individuals who have been released from Federal prison and who are under judicial supervision.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall contain information on rates of recidivism among former Federal prisoners, including information on rates of recidivism among former Federal prisoners based on the following criteria:

(A) Primary offense charged.

(B) Length of sentence imposed and served.

(C) Bureau of Prisons facility or facilities in which the prisoner's sentence was served.

(D) Recidivism reduction programming that the prisoner successfully completed, if any.

(E) The prisoner's assessed risk of recidivism.

(3) ASSISTANCE.—The Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall provide to the Attorney General any information in its possession that is necessary for the completion of the report required under paragraph (1).

(d) REPORTING ON EXCLUDED PRISONERS.—Not later than 8 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the effectiveness of recidivism reduction programs and productive activities offered to prisoners described in section 3621(h)(6)(A)(iii) of title 18, United States Code, as added by this Act, as well as those ineligible for credit toward prerelease custody under section 3624(c)(2) of title 18, United States Code, as added by this Act, which shall review the effectiveness of different categories of incentives in reducing recidivism.

(e) DEFINITION.—The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on the Judiciary and the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on the Judiciary and the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 6. PROMOTING SUCCESSFUL REENTRY.

(a) FEDERAL PRISONER REENTRY INITIATIVE.—Section 231(g) of the Second Chance Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17541(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “and shall be carried out during fiscal years 2009 and 2010”; and

(2) in paragraph (5)(A)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking “65 years” and inserting “60 years”; and

(B) in clause (ii)—

(i) by striking “the greater of 10 years or”; and

(ii) by striking “75 percent” and inserting “23”.

(b) FEDERAL REENTRY DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—

(1) EVALUATION OF EXISTING BEST PRACTICES FOR REENTRY.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, shall—

(A) evaluate best practices used for the reentry into society of individuals released from the custody of the Bureau of Prisons, including—

(i) conducting examinations of reentry practices in State and local justice systems; and

(ii) consulting with Federal, State, and local prosecutors, Federal, State, and local public defenders, nonprofit organizations that provide reentry services, and criminal justice experts; and

(B) submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that details the evaluation conducted under subparagraph (A).

(2) CREATION OF REENTRY DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, shall, subject to the availability of appropriations, select an appropriate number of Federal judicial districts to conduct Federal reentry demonstration projects using the best practices identified in the evaluation conducted under paragraph (1). The Attorney General shall determine the appropriate number of Federal judicial districts to conduct demonstration projects under this paragraph.

(3) PROJECT DESIGN.—For each Federal judicial district selected under paragraph (2), the United States Attorney, in consultation with the Chief Judge, Chief Federal Defender, the Chief Probation Officer, the Bureau of Justice Assistance, the National Institute of Justice, and criminal justice experts shall design a Federal reentry demonstration project for the Federal judicial district in accordance with paragraph (4).

(4) PROJECT ELEMENTS.—A project designed under paragraph (3) shall coordinate efforts by Federal agencies to assist participating prisoners in preparing for and adjusting to reentry into the community and may include, as appropriate—

(A) the use of community correctional facilities and home confinement, as determined to be appropriate by the Bureau of Prisons;

(B) a reentry review team for each prisoner to develop a reentry plan specific to the needs of the prisoner, and to meet with the prisoner following transfer to monitor the reentry plan;

(C) steps to assist the prisoner in obtaining health care, housing, and employment, before the prisoner's release from a community correctional facility or home confinement;

(D) regular drug testing for participants with a history of substance abuse;

(E) substance abuse treatment, which may include addiction treatment medication, if appropriate, medical treatment, including mental health treatment, occupational, vocational and educational training, life skills instruction, recovery support, conflict resolution training, and other programming to promote effective reintegration into the community;

(F) the participation of volunteers to serve as advisors and mentors to prisoners being released into the community;

(G) steps to ensure that the prisoner makes satisfactory progress toward satisfying any obligations to victims of the prisoner's offense, including any obligation to pay restitution; and

(H) the appointment of a reentry coordinator in the United States Attorney's Office.

(5) REVIEW OF PROJECT OUTCOMES.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall—

(A) evaluate the results from each Federal judicial district selected under paragraph (2), including the extent to which participating prisoners released from the custody of the Bureau of Prisons were successfully reintegrated into their communities, including whether the participating prisoners maintained employment, and refrained from committing further offenses; and

(B) submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that contains—

(i) the evaluation of the best practices identified in the report required under paragraph (1); and

(ii) the results of the demonstration projects required under paragraph (2).

(c) STUDY ON THE IMPACT OF REENTRY ON CERTAIN COMMUNITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report on the impact of reentry of prisoners on communities in which a disproportionate number of individuals reside upon release from incarceration.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall analyze the impact of reentry of individuals released from both State and Federal correctional systems as well as State and Federal juvenile justice systems, and shall include—

(A) an assessment of the reentry burdens borne by local communities;

(B) a review of the resources available in such communities to support successful reentry, including resources provided by State, local, and Federal governments, the extent to which those resources are used effectively; and

(C) recommendations to strengthen the resources in such communities available to support successful reentry and to lessen the burden placed on such communities by the need to support reentry.

(d) FACILITATING REENTRY ASSISTANCE TO VETERANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 months after the date of the commencement of a prisoner's sentence pursuant to section 3585(a) of title 18, United States Code, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall notify the Secretary of Veterans Affairs if the prisoner's presentence report, prepared pursuant to section 3552 of title 18, United States Code, indicates that the prisoner has previously served in the Armed Forces of the United States or if the prisoner has so notified the Bureau of Prisons.

(2) POST-COMMENCEMENT NOTICE.—If the prisoner informs the Bureau of Prisons of the prisoner's prior service in the Armed Forces of the United States after the commencement of the prisoner's sentence, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall notify the Secretary of Veterans Affairs not later than 2 months after the date on which the prisoner provides such notice.

(3) CONTENTS OF NOTICE.—The notice provided by the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs under this subsection shall include the identity of the prisoner, the facility in which the prisoner is located, the prisoner's offense of conviction, and the length of the prisoner's sentence.

(4) ACCESS TO VA.—The Bureau of Prisons shall provide the Department of Veterans Affairs with reasonable access to any prisoner who has previously served in the Armed Forces of the United States for purposes of facilitating that prisoner's reentry.

SEC. 7. ADDITIONAL TOOLS TO PROMOTE RECOVERY AND PREVENT DRUG AND ALCOHOL ABUSE AND DEPENDENCE.—

(a) REENTRY AND RECOVERY PLANNING.—

(1) PRESENTENCE REPORTS.—Section 3552 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), and (d) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively;

(B) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) REENTRY AND RECOVERY PLANNING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the information required by rule 32(d) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, the report submitted pursuant to subsection (a) shall contain the following information, unless such information is required to be excluded pursuant to rule 32(d)(3) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure or except as provided in paragraph (2):

“(A) Information about the defendant's history of substance abuse and addiction, if applicable.

“(B) Information about the defendant's service in the Armed Forces of the United States and veteran status, if applicable.

“(C) A detailed plan, which shall include the identification of programming provided by the Bureau of Prisons that is appropriate for the defendant's needs, that the probation officer determines will—

“(i) reduce the likelihood the defendant will abuse drugs or alcohol if the defendant has a history of substance abuse;

“(ii) reduce the defendant's likelihood of recidivism by addressing the defendant's specific recidivism risk factors; and

“(iii) assist the defendant preparing for reentry into the community.

“(2) EXCEPTIONS.—The information described in paragraph (1)(C)(iii) shall not be required to be included under paragraph (1), in the discretion of the Probation Officer, if the applicable sentencing range under the sentencing guidelines, as determined by the probation officer, includes a sentence of life imprisonment or a sentence of probation.”;

(C) in subsection (c), as redesignated, in the first sentence, by striking “subsection (a) or (c)” and inserting “subsection (a) or (d)”;

(D) in subsection (d), as redesignated, by striking “subsection (a) or (b)” and inserting “subsection (a) or (c)”.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3672 of title 18, United States Code, is amended in the eighth undesignated paragraph by striking “subsection (b) or (c)” and inserting “subsection (c) or (d)”.

(b) PROMOTING FULL UTILIZATION OF RESIDENTIAL DRUG TREATMENT.—Section 3621(e)(2) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) COMMENCEMENT OF TREATMENT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this subparagraph, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall ensure that each eligible prisoner has an opportunity to commence participation in treatment under this subsection by such date as is necessary to ensure that the prisoner completes such treatment not later than 1 year before the date on which the prisoner would otherwise be released from custody prior to the application of any reduction in sentence pursuant to this paragraph.

“(D) OTHER CREDITS.—The Director of the Bureau of Prisons may, in the Director's discretion, reduce the credit awarded under subsection (h)(6)(A) to a prisoner who receives a reduction under subparagraph (B), but such reduction may not exceed one-half the amount of the reduction awarded to the prisoner under subparagraph (A).”.

(c) SUPERVISED RELEASE PILOT PROGRAM TO REDUCE RECIDIVISM AND IMPROVE RECOVERY FROM ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall establish a recidivism reduction and recovery enhancement pilot program, premised on high-intensity supervision and the use of swift, predictable, and graduated sanctions for noncompliance with program rules, in Federal judicial districts selected by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts in consultation with the Attorney General.

(2) REQUIREMENTS OF PROGRAM.—Participation in the pilot program required under paragraph (1) shall be subject to the following requirements:

(A) Upon entry into the pilot program, the court shall notify program participants of the rules of the program and consequences for violating such rules, including the penalties to be imposed as a result of such violations pursuant to subparagraph (E).

(B) Probation officers shall conduct regular drug testing of all pilot program participants with a history of substance abuse.

(C) In the event that a probation officer determines that a participant has violated a term of supervised release, the officer shall notify the court within 24 hours of such determination, absent good cause.

(D) As soon as is practicable, and in no case more than 1 week after the violation was reported by the probation officer, absent good cause, the court shall conduct a hearing on the alleged violation.

(E) If the court determines that a program participant has violated a term of supervised release, it shall impose an appropriate sanction, which may include the following, if appropriate:

(i) Modification of the terms of such participant's supervised release, which may include imposition of a period of home confinement.

(ii) Referral to appropriate substance abuse treatment.

(iii) Revocation of the defendant's supervised release and the imposition of a sentence of incarceration that is no longer than necessary to punish the participant for such violation and deter the participant from committing future violations.

(iv) For participants who habitually fail to abide by program rules or pose a threat to public safety, termination from the program.

(3) STATUS OF PARTICIPANT IF INCARCERATED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In the event that a program participant is sentenced to incarceration as described in paragraph (2)(E)(iii), the participant shall remain in the program upon release from incarceration unless terminated from the program in accordance with paragraph (2)(E)(iv).

(B) POLICIES FOR MAINTAINING EMPLOYMENT.—The Bureau of Prisons, in consultation with the Chief Probation Officers of the Federal judicial districts selected for participation in the pilot program required under paragraph (1), shall develop policies to enable program participants sentenced to terms of incarceration as described in paragraph (2)(E) to, where practicable, serve the terms of incarceration while maintaining employment, including allowing the terms of incarceration to be served on weekends.

(4) ADVISORY SENTENCING POLICIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The United States Sentencing Commission, in consultation with the Chief Probation Officers, the United States Attorneys, Federal Defenders, and Chief Judges of the districts selected for participation in the pilot program required under paragraph (1), shall establish advisory sentencing policies to be used by the district courts in imposing sentences of incarceration in accordance with paragraph (2)(E).

(B) REQUIREMENT.—The advisory sentencing policies established under subparagraph (A) shall be consistent with the stated goal of the pilot program to impose predictable and graduated sentences that are no longer than necessary for violations of program rules.

(5) DURATION OF PROGRAM.—The pilot program required under paragraph (1) shall continue for not less than 5 years and may be extended for not more than 5 years by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

(6) ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM OUTCOMES AND REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall conduct an evaluation of the pilot program and submit to Congress a report on the results of the evaluation.

(B) CONTENTS.—The report required under subparagraph (A) shall include—

(i) the rates of substance abuse among program participants;

(ii) the rates of violations of the terms of supervised release by program participants, and sanctions imposed;

(iii) information about employment of program participants;

(iv) a comparison of outcomes among program participants with outcomes among similarly situated individuals under the supervision of United States Probation and Pretrial Services not participating in the program; and

(v) an assessment of the effectiveness of each of the relevant features of the program.

SEC. 8. ERIC WILLIAMS CORRECTIONAL OFFICER PROTECTION ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 303 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 4049. Officers and employees of the bureau of prisons authorized to carry oleoresin capsicum spray

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall issue, on a routine basis, oleoresin capsicum spray to—

“(1) any officer or employee of the Bureau of Prisons who—

“(A) is employed in a prison that is not a minimum or low security prison; and

“(B) may respond to an emergency situation in such a prison; and

“(2) to such additional officers and employees of prisons as the Director determines appropriate, in accordance with this section.

“(b) TRAINING REQUIREMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In order for an officer or employee of the Bureau of Prisons, including a correctional officer, to be eligible to receive and carry oleoresin capsicum spray pursuant to this section, the officer or employee shall complete a training course before being issued such spray, and annually thereafter, on the use of oleoresin capsicum spray.

“(2) TRANSFERABILITY OF TRAINING.—An officer or employee of the Bureau of Prisons who completes a training course pursuant to paragraph (1) and subsequently transfers to employment at a different prison, shall not be required to complete an additional training course solely due such transfer.

“(3) TRAINING CONDUCTED DURING REGULAR EMPLOYMENT.—An officer or employee of the Bureau of Prisons who completes a training course required under paragraph (1) shall do so during the course of that officer or employee's regular employment, and shall be compensated at the same rate that the officer or employee would be compensated for conducting the officer or employee's regular duties.

“(c) USE OF OLEORESIN CAPSICUM SPRAY.—Officers and employees of the Bureau of Pris-

ons issued oleoresin capsicum spray pursuant to subsection (a) may use such spray to reduce acts of violence—

“(1) committed by prisoners against themselves, other prisoners, prison visitors, and officers and employees of the Bureau of Prisons; and

“(2) committed by prison visitors against themselves, prisoners, other visitors, and officers and employees of the Bureau of Prisons.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 303 of part III of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4048 the following:

“4049. Officers and employees of the bureau of prisons authorized to carry oleoresin capsicum spray.”.

(c) GAO REPORT.—Not later than the date that is 3 years after the date on which the Director of the Bureau of Prisons begins to issue oleoresin capsicum spray to officers and employees of the Bureau of Prisons pursuant to section 4049 of title 18, United States Code (as added by this Act), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report that includes the following:

(1) An evaluation of the effectiveness of issuing oleoresin capsicum spray to officers and employees of the Bureau of Prisons in prisons that are not minimum or low security prisons on—

(A) reducing crime in such prisons; and

(B) reducing acts of violence committed by prisoners against themselves, other prisoners, prison visitors, and officers and employees of the Bureau of Prisons in such prisons.

(2) An evaluation of the advisability of issuing oleoresin capsicum spray to officers and employees of the Bureau of Prisons in prisons that are minimum or low security prisons, including—

(A) the effectiveness that issuing such spray in such prisons would have on reducing acts of violence committed by prisoners against themselves, other prisoners, prison visitors, and officers and employees of the Bureau of Prisons in such prisons; and

(B) the cost of issuing such spray in such prisons. Recommendations to improve the safety of officers and employees of the Bureau of Prisons in prisons.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. TESTER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 469. A bill to improve the reproductive assistance provided by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs to severely wounded, ill, or injured members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their spouses or partners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes to discuss a piece of legislation I am introducing today—legislation I have written to improve access to health care for our Nation's veterans, because there is no more solemn promise we make as a nation than our commitment to care for the men and women who serve in the U.S. military. These men and women put life and limb on the line to protect our country, to protect our freedoms, and to protect our way of life. In return, we as a country make a promise to care for them, no matter what. Just

as important, we make a promise to care for their families—their wives, their husbands, and their children.

Many of the young men and women who serve in the military enter at a very young age, often before they have children of their own. Like so many other Americans, they have big plans for their lives after their service. Many of them plan to buy a house, go back to school, and eventually have a family.

But in a time when our military conflicts involve roadside bombs, make-shift explosives, and life-threatening danger around every corner, many of our service men and women are coming home with injuries that leave them unable to start their own family.

In fact, military data shows that over the last decade, thousands of servicemembers have suffered injuries that make it nearly impossible to have children. We should be doing everything we can, with the best science and health services available, to help our veterans and their loved ones have children, despite their injuries.

But instead, outdated policies at the Pentagon and the VA are making it harder, not easier, for seriously injured veterans to have children. That is because when severely injured service men and women and veterans seek reproductive health services, such as in vitro fertilization, their military and VA health insurance simply doesn't cover this often very expensive procedure. As a result, the only option for these heroes and their partners to have children is to pay out of their own pocket, often tens of thousands of dollars, to try and conceive.

So today I am introducing The Women Veterans and Families Health Services Act of 2015.

It would basically do two things: First, it would expand the reproductive health services available for Active-Duty servicemembers and their families.

Second, it would finally end the ban on in vitro fertilization services at the VA. I have introduced similar legislation in the past, and, as I have done before, I am going to share the story of SSG Matt Keil and his wife Tracy.

Staff Sergeant Keil was shot in the neck while on patrol in Ramadi, Iraq, on February 24, 2007, just 6 weeks after he married the love of his life, Tracy. The bullet went through the right side of his neck, hit a major artery, went through his spinal cord, and exited through his left shoulder blade. He instantly became a quadriplegic. Doctors informed Tracy her husband would be on a ventilator for the rest of his life, and would never move his arms or legs.

Staff Sergeant Keil eventually defied the odds and found himself off the ventilator and beginning a very long journey of physical rehabilitation.

Around that same time, Tracy and her husband started exploring the possibilities of starting a family together. Having children was all they could talk about, once they adjusted to their "new normal."

With Staff Sergeant Keil's injuries preventing him from having children naturally, Tracy turned to the VA for assistance and began to explore her options for fertility treatments. Feeling defeated after being told the VA had no such programs in place for her situation, Tracy and Staff Sergeant Keil decided to pursue IVF through the private sector.

While they were anxious to begin this chapter of their lives, they were confronted with the reality that TRICARE did not cover any of the costs related to Tracy's treatments, because she did not have fertility issues beyond her husband's injury.

Left with no further options, the Keils decided this was important enough to them that they were willing to pay out of pocket to the tune of almost \$32,000 per round of treatment. Thankfully, on November 9, 2010, just after their first round of IVF, Staff Sergeant Keil and Tracy welcomed their twins Matthew and Faith into the world.

Tracy told me:

The day we had our children something changed in both of us. This is exactly what we had always wanted, our dreams had arrived.

The VA, Congress and the American People have said countless times that they want to do everything they can to support my husband or make him feel whole again and this is your chance.

Having a family is exactly what we needed to feel whole again. Please help us make these changes so that other families can share in this experience.

Tracy does not want to see other servicemembers and their families go through the struggle she and Matt did because of outdated policies that don't reflect modern medicine.

While the Keils' story may be unique, they are not alone. Thousands of servicemembers and veterans have returned from their service hoping to have children, only to find that, despite their sacrifices for our country, they are unable to obtain the kind of assistance they need. Some have spent tens of thousands of dollars in the private sector, like Tracy and her husband did, to get the advanced reproductive treatments they need to start a family. Others have, sadly, watched their marriages dissolve because of the stress of infertility, in combination with the stress of readjusting to a new life after a severe injury, driving their relationship to a breaking point.

Any servicemember who sustains this type of serious injury deserves so much more. They deserve our support to help them start a family, and our support to raise that family.

This bill is so important because access to childcare is one of the most significant barriers to care for women veterans and younger veterans. This bill makes permanent the highly successful pilot program in VA and expands it across the country. I am very hopeful today that both Republicans and Democrats can come together to support this bill.

Just a few years ago we were able to pass similar legislation through the Senate, but, unfortunately, it didn't pass the House in time to get the President's signature and become signed into law. This time has to be different, because this bill is about nothing more than giving veterans who have sacrificed so much the option to fulfill the dream of starting a family. It is a bill that shows when we tell our servicemembers deploying to a war zone that we have their back, we mean it. It is a bill that recognizes the men and women who are harmed in the service of this country have bright, full lives ahead of them.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 250. Mr. HATCH proposed an amendment to the bill S. 295, to amend section 2259 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 250. Mr. HATCH proposed an amendment to the bill S. 295, to amend section 2259 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 4, beginning on line 22, strike "sexual conduct (as those terms are defined in section 2246)" and insert "sexual contact (as those terms are defined in section 2246) or sexually explicit conduct (as that term is defined in section 2256)".

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 11, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to hold a meeting during the session of the Senate on February 11, 2015, at 9:45 a.m., in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled, "The Connected World: Examining the Internet of Things."

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

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 11, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, "Oversight Hearing: Examining EPA's proposed carbon dioxide emissions rules from

new, modified, and existing power plants.”

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 11, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 11, 2015, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Ending Modern Slavery: The Role of U.S. Leadership.”

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

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR,
AND PENSIONS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 11, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled “Ambushed: How the NLRB’s New Election Rule Harms Employers & Employees.”

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

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND
GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 11, 2015, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled “Risky Business: Examining GAO’s 2015 List of High Risk Government Programs.”

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 11, 2015, at 3 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 11, 2015, at 2:45 p.m.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREE-
MENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following morning business on Thursday, February 12, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Executive Calendar No. 12, the nomination of Ashton Carter to be Secretary of Defense. I further ask that the time until 2 p.m. be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, and that at 2 p.m. the Senate vote on confirmation. I ask that if the nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action, and the Senate resume legislative session.

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

APPOINTMENTS

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Democratic leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 99-93, as amended by Public Law 99-151, appoints the following Senators as members of the United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control: the Honorable DIANNE FEINSTEIN of California, the Honorable CHARLES E. SCHUMER of New York, and the Honorable SHELDON WHITEHOUSE of Rhode Island.

The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to Public Law 96-388, as amended by Public Law 97-84, and Public Law 106-292, reappoints the following Senators to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council: the Honorable BERNARD SANDERS of Vermont and the Honorable AL FRANKEN of Minnesota.

The Chair announces, on behalf of the Democratic leader, pursuant to Public Law 105-83, the reappointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the National Council on the Arts: the Honorable TAMMY BALDWIN of Wisconsin.

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 94-304, as amended by Public Law 99-7, appoints the following Senators as members of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki) during the 114th Congress: the Honorable BENJAMIN L. CARDIN of Maryland, the Honorable SHELDON WHITEHOUSE of Rhode Island, the Honorable TOM UDALL of New Mexico, and the Honorable JEANNE SHAHEEN of New Hampshire.

The Chair, on behalf of the President of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law

106-286, appoints the following Members to serve on the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People’s Republic of China: the Honorable DIANNE FEINSTEIN of California, the Honorable SHERROD BROWN of Ohio, the Honorable JEFF MERKLEY of Oregon, and the Honorable GARY C. PETERS of Michigan.

The Chair, pursuant to Executive Order 12131, as amended and extended, appoints the following Senators to the President’s Export Council: the Honorable AMY KLOBUCHAR of Minnesota and the Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND of New York.

The Chair, on behalf of the President of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 85-874, as amended, reappoints the following Senator to the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts: the Honorable MARK WARNER of Virginia.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY,
FEBRUARY 12, 2015

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, February 12; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the Democrats controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half; following morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the Carter nomination under the previous order.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. CORNYN. For the information of all Senators, the vote will occur at 2 p.m. tomorrow on the Carter nomination.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:10 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, February 12, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE GILMER HIGH SCHOOL BUCKEYES, 2014 4-A, DIV II STATE FOOTBALL CHAMPIONS

HON. LOUIE GOHMERT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 2015

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise to acknowledge and congratulate the superb performance of the Gilmer High School Buckeyes as they came together as a team resulting in their winning the 2014 Texas State 4-A, Div II Football Championship. The Gilmer Buckeyes displayed great resilience and commitment throughout their season, and it is indeed an honor to bring these outstanding athletes to national attention and retention in our national record.

After the devastating, unexpected death of a beloved member of the team last year, the Buckeyes and the entire Gilmer community pledged to preserve the memory of Desmond Pollard by honoring him throughout the season. Residents of east Texas generously paid tribute to Desmond by raising funds to pay for all his funeral expenses. So much money was donated and accumulated that it not only paid for the service, but there was also enough to establish a memorial scholarship fund in Desmond's name.

The Buckeyes carried Desmond's memory onto the field with them before every game by taking his jersey to midfield for every coin toss. This honorable group of young men created and adopted "DEZign8" as the team motto to pay tribute to Desmond throughout the season by combining his name with his team jersey number, #8. The motto was based on the belief that the team was "DEZign8"-ed to be tested, and to overcome any challenges in order to emerge victorious.

When the Buckeyes began the third quarter of the state championship game, they trailed West Orange-Stark 25-7. The Buckeyes recognized the daunting task before them, but they were not about to give up. Instead, every player reached deep inside themselves, and reinvigorated their strength, skill and commitment to such an incredible level that the Buckeyes became virtually unstoppable, scoring four more touchdowns, overtaking the Mustangs, while shutting down their vaunted opponent's powerful offense, and capturing the state title with a final score of 35-25. This amazing team of caring, committed, yet crushing Buckeyes were successful in achieving their objective. They were victorious in honoring their fallen teammate with an entire season of success resulting in the State Championship in honor of Desmond. Ultimately, the Buckeyes finished the season with a perfect, undefeated record of 16-0, and the honor of finishing with the second-highest point total in a season in Texas high school football history with 950 points.

Special commendations must be offered to each member of this exceptional company of young men. The team includes: Blevin Burns,

Devin Smith, McLane Carter, DeMarco Boyd, Quinn Fluellen, Jamel Jackson, Desmond Pollard, Blake Lynch, Zac Spears, Preston Smith, Kollin Hurt, Brandon Crouch, Ryen Lawhorn, Tanner Harrison, Taylor Lofton, Desmond Jones, Cameron Bowman, Nick Smith, Cambron Granville, Kris Boyd, Kelton Collier, Christian Loyd, Chase Tate, Jamaal Wheeler, LaMarcus Morton, Freddy Curtis, Dustin Brown, Hunter Richardson, CJ Grimmert, Kade Clemens, Tristan Olivares, Juan Esquivel, Nathan Mize, Trendon Brooks, Frankie Coleman, Kaloni Moton, Caleb Gunter, Clayton Williams, Jeremy Kelly, Matthew Caldwell, Jackson Sikes, Brett Rice, Zach Jones, Jake Traylor, Caleb Ritter, Jacob Cullins, Will Harrison, Colin Hardin, Johnny Perez, Dane Jesters, Colton Hendrix, Trevor Lewis, Landry Henson, Cole Hart, Lucas Garrett, Erik Cerda, Dakota Williamson, Andrew Hollis, Cameron Tennon, Colby Gipson, Zack Troell, Zed Heath, and Stoney Fuller.

No matter how talented and committed, no team could achieve so much resulting in an undefeated season without a head coach and coaching staff of extraordinary vision and ability who could lead the Buckeyes to success, both on and off the field. Superintendent Rick Albritton, Principal Greg Watson, Head Coach and Athletic Director Jeff Traylor, Todd Barr, Robert Bero, Colton Bunn, Randall Canady, Wayne Coleman, Russell Cunningham, Tommy Edwards, Todd Fenton, Dustin Gunter, Lonnie Henry, Olan Johnson, Kerry Lane, Terrence Lovely, Max Low, Alan Metzel, Cody Robinson, Keith Tate, Kurt Traylor, Matt Turner, and Brandon Williams; along with athletic trainers Kara Kanutson and Will Bennett.

It is truly an incalculable honor to pay tribute to this sensationally astounding group of young people who became so much more than the sum total of the team's individual parts. And they magnificently represent the very best of the Gilmer community and the entire First District of Texas. Their legacy, along with the memory of their friend and cherished teammate Desmond Pollard, is now recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which will endure as long as there is a United States of America.

A TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF THE LIFE OF CARL DJERASSI, PH.D.

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 2015

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an extraordinary American, Carl Djerassi, a chemist, novelist, poet and philanthropist who excelled in each of these fields. He was the child of two physicians, born in 1923 in Vienna, Austria, and he died on January 15, 2015, at his home in San Francisco, California.

Dr. Djerassi is best known as the "Father of the Pill", the birth control pill which brought

about a cultural revolution. He is less well known for his part in the development of antihistamines to treat allergies, and the synthesis of cortisone. Educated at Kenyon College and the University of Wisconsin, his first job was with the Swiss company, Ciba. From there he went to Syntex, then a small company in Mexico. He became a professor at Stanford University in 1959, and founded Zoecon, a manufacturer of non-toxic pesticides in 1968. He published over 1,200 articles and 7 monographs on chemical subjects.

Dr. Djerassi's brilliant work in chemistry was only a part of his life story. He published numerous poems, short stories, five novels and many plays. He founded the Djerassi Resident Artists Program in honor of his daughter, Pamela. He was the recipient of countless honors, including the National Medal of Science and the Wolf Prize in Chemistry. He was a member of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences and its Institute of Medicine, and he received 32 well-earned honorary doctorates.

Dr. Djerassi was married three times, most recently to the late Diane Middlebrook, a professor of literature at Stanford University.

Dr. Djerassi leaves his son Dale, an independent filmmaker, and his grandson Alexander Maxwell Djerassi. He will be sorely missed by all who had the good fortune to know him. His life's work was a gift to humanity, and his presence made the world a better place.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in honoring the extraordinary life of Carl Djerassi, who was a national treasure, and extend our sympathy to his family.

LIVES WELL-LIVED

HON. RICHARD M. NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 2015

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize four people from the Cromwell/McGregor area of Minnesota who just celebrated turning 100-years-old or more. In some parts of the country, this would be in passing—but for Cromwell (population 231) and McGregor (population 376) it is big news that this many legacy members of their communities have reached this significant milestone. It must be our good Minnesota water.

When you stop to think about it, to be born 100 years ago, there were no tractors to plow the fields and automobiles were just starting to be built. Before that, people walked to town or took a horse-and-buggy. Most schoolrooms were in one-room buildings with an outhouse "out back." Radio communication was just beginning and television had not yet been invented. Penicillin had not been discovered. There were not vaccinations for polio or other deadly childhood diseases. The idea of an airplane was but a dream and the thought of man landing on the moon was unfathomable.

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

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

How exciting it must have been for them witnessing that first countdown as John Glenn was the first American about to orbit the earth.

These citizens lived through two World Wars, the Korean Conflict, Vietnam, Iraq, and Afghanistan.

They were just coming of age when the Depression hit this country and struggled like countless others to have part of the American dream.

They persevered.

Each of them—Mary Dahlberg, Hjalmer Hutar, Allie Costello and Viola Johnson took different paths in their lives. I congratulate each of them for the contributions they brought to their families and communities. They have been lives well lived.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAVID P. ROE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 2015

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote yesterday because of a serious illness in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted:

Roll Call #69—YEA.

Roll Call #70—YEA.

RECOGNIZING HIGHLAND HILLS MIDDLE SCHOOL

HON. TODD C. YOUNG

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, each year since 1999, the National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grades Reform releases a Schools to Watch list to identify high-performing schools across the country. According to the stated criteria, each school on the list is academically excellent, developmentally responsive, and socially equitable.

This list is well-respected and highly exclusive. That's why I'm proud to say that Highland Hills Middle School in Floyd County, Indiana, is a new entry to the list this year. This recognition is well deserved and reflects the hard work and determination of the administration, the teachers, and especially the students of Highland Hills and the entire New Albany Floyd County Consolidated School Corporation.

As policy makers at every level of government continue to look for ways to improve our educational systems, we would all do well to look to models like Highland Hills Middle School for guidance.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 2015

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to be present for the following Roll Call vote on February 10, 2015 and would like to reflect that I would have voted as follows:

Roll Call #69: YES.

Roll Call #70: YES.

HONORING DOROTHY BARNES PELOTE

HON. EARL L. "BUDDY" CARTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 2015

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and celebrate the life of the late Mrs. Dorothy Barnes Pelote who entered into eternal rest Sunday, January 18, 2015. Mrs. Pelote, often described as a "people's lawmaker", dedicated her life to public service and to her community.

As a native of Lancaster, South Carolina and graduate of Allen University, Mrs. Pelote moved to Savannah, Georgia over 50 years ago where she furthered her education at Savannah State University. In her early career, Mrs. Pelote dedicated more than 30 years of service to teaching in the Savannah Chatham County Public School System.

Mrs. Pelote served in the Georgia General Assembly as a State Representative for the 149th District from 1992 until she retired in 2002. Mrs. Pelote also served as the Eighth District Representative on the Chatham County Board of Commissioners to which she became the first of two women to ever serve on this panel.

Today, it is my privilege to recognize the life of Mrs. Dorothy Pelote. As a teacher, an instrumental leader, and a friend, Mrs. Pelote will forever be remembered.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,128,511,342,681.14. We've added \$7,501,634,293,768.06 to our debt in 6 years. This is over \$7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

ROSIE THE RIVETER

HON. RICHARD M. NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 2015

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize LaVonne Feichtinger Ostergaard of Hoyt Lakes, Minnesota. She was one of the thousands of women throughout America who served as a "Rosie the Riveter" during World War II when she went to work for 50 cents an hour at the Char-Gale plant in St. Cloud. She operated as a riveter building planes. Her job was riveting the fuselage and wings on the outside of the aircraft for planes designed to

carry cargo, personnel, patients and mechanized equipment and to drop cargo and troops by parachute. It was by no means a clean or quiet working environment. Mrs. Ostergaard never won any medals for her service, but I call upon all Members to remember how so many women—from small towns and big cities alike—stepped forward when they heard the call for workers to serve as riveters, buckers, sanders, welders, crane operators, bus drivers, uniform makers, bullet makers, parachute folders, clerical workers, shipyard workers, assembly line workers, Red Cross workers and more.

These women probably never imagined they would answer the call to do this kind of work, but it was a time in our nation's history when everyone needed to pull together with their motto of "We pull better if we pull together." Those who served on the home front are often unrecognized, as after the war, they quietly returned to the routine of raising children, helping on the home farm or the family business.

According to the American Rosie the Riveter Association, of which Mrs. Ostergaard is a member, they came together for one purpose—to help win the war. They built 80,000 landing craft, 100,000 tanks, 300,000 aircraft, 15,000 guns and 41,000,000,000 rounds of ammunition. It was a massive accomplishment and our nation owes these outstanding women our deepest gratitude.

IN RECOGNITION OF HOLLY SCHLESSER OF STREAMWOOD, ILLINOIS

HON. TAMMY DUCKWORTH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 2015

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to recognize one of my constituents, Holly Schlessler, and her selfless act for a child in need. This past fall Holly donated a piece of her liver to a friend's 8 month old baby, Madison Casey. Holly and Madison's mom, Tanya, are the wives of firefighters in Streamwood, Illinois. Service and sacrifice is a part of their daily lives. Madison was born with a rare genetic disorder that led to liver failure. Thanks to Holly Schlessler's selfless gift she now has real hope of growing up healthy and strong alongside her twin brother. The Schlessler and Casey families show us the importance of living through our actions.

Their story is also an important reminder about the incredible difference that organ and tissue donors can make. There is a large and heartbreaking gap between the supply and demand for lifesaving organs and tissue. Each day an average of 18 people in the United States in need of transplants die waiting. And without angels like Holly Schlessler, every 10 minutes a new person joins the national transplant waitlist.

In my home state of Illinois, Gift of Hope, which is part of the national organ and tissue donation system, is working hard to address this challenge by educating the public about the need for donors. They're making progress and experienced their second record-setting year in a row in 2014, helping make 1,024 lifesaving donations happen through the generosity of 336 organ donors and 1,912 tissue donors. I applaud the more than 5 million Illinoisans who have decided to become organ

and tissue donors and encourage other Americans to follow the example set by my neighbors.

RECOGNIZING ROBERT HYATT

HON. TODD C. YOUNG

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, our nation has a long history of honoring our veterans. Even today, we reserve the highest levels of respect for our fellow Americans who served our country bravely in battle. And while many of us personally know some who served in one, or perhaps, two wars, it's exceedingly rare to find an individual who wore the uniform in three separate wars. In fact, in my home state of Indiana, there are only two such veterans alive.

One of them, Robert Hyatt of Franklin, Indiana, will soon celebrate his 90th birthday. A veteran who served as a medic in World War II, Korea, and Vietnam, he recently told a local news station that he'd still be serving in the military today if his health permitted. It's worth noting that along the way, his military service put his health at risk: He was shot in the leg during World War II and stabbed in Korea.

So as he and his family prepare to celebrate his 90th birthday, I wanted to take some time today to wish him well and honor his service to our country. Each of us owes a debt of gratitude to all our veterans, but especially to veterans like Robert Hyatt who answered the call of duty every chance they got.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 2 and during the first series of votes on Tuesday, February 3, 2015, I was unable to be present for recorded votes. Had I been present, I would have voted:

“YES” on roll call vote No. 51, on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 361;

“YES” on roll call vote No. 52, on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 615;

“YES” on roll call vote No. 53, on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 623;

“NO” on roll call vote No. 54, on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 70;

“NO” on roll call vote No. 55, on agreeing to the resolution H. Res. 70; and

“YES” on roll call vote No. 56, on approving the Journal.

HONORING COLONEL BYRON L. DIAMOND

HON. BRAD ASHFORD

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 2015

Mr. ASHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Colonel Byron L. Diamond for his nearly 29 years of military service in the Ne-

braska Army National Guard and United States Army Reserve. Colonel Diamond was born March 30, 1967 in Belleville, Kansas. He graduated from Columbus High School in Columbus, Nebraska in 1985. Colonel Diamond enlisted as a Private on July 17, 1986 into the Nebraska Army National Guard as a member of Company C, 1/195 Armor Battalion in Fairbury, Nebraska. In order to become a commissioned officer, Colonel Diamond attended Southeast Community College in Lincoln where he received an Associate Degree of Applied Science—Finance in 1989. Colonel Diamond was then commissioned a Second Lieutenant on July 22, 1989 at the Nebraska National Guard Military Academy.

From there, he continued his education to obtain a Bachelor of Professional Studies—Business Administration/Technical Services from Bellevue University at Bellevue, Nebraska in 1992. Later on Colonel Diamond would earn a Master of Strategic Studies from the United States Army War College in 2011. Colonel Diamond and his wife, Denise, have two daughters, Emma and Olivia and son, Alexander.

His career included traditional and full-time positions of ever increasing responsibility. Colonel Diamond's career culminated as the G4—Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics in the Nebraska Army National Guard. Colonel Diamond's significant service contributions include key assignments within the 267th (Direct Support) Maintenance Company (command), the 67th Infantry Brigade Forward Support Battalion, the 19th Theater Support Command, the 67th Area Support Group, commander 402nd Military Police Battalion, and Joint Force Headquarters—Nebraska. His key achievements include: serving as the Directorate of Installation Management for the 67th Area Support Group while deployed to Al Asad Air Base; developing plans with the 19th TSC for the defense of South Korea; and the establishment of communications infrastructure to relocate the Nebraska National Guard Headquarters to a new facility.

Colonel Diamond was promoted to his current rank December 13, 2011. Colonel Diamond distinguished himself through his extensive knowledge of logistics and mobilization operations where his mentoring and championing of logistics personnel and processes resulted in Nebraska's numerous regional and national Chief of Staff of the Army, Combined Logistics Excellence Awards. His accomplishments are in keeping with the highest traditions of military service and patriotism and have brought great credit upon himself and the country. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I recognize Colonel Byron Diamond for his years of service and sacrifice to our country.

HONORING MR. ROBERT “BOBBY” HICKMAN

HON. KEITH ELLISON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 2015

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Robert “Bobby” Hickman, to recognize his lifetime of persistently fighting for social change and mentoring the youth of our community over many decades.

Born in St. Paul, Minnesota, Robert was a fourth-generation St. Paulite. His father was a descendant of the founders of Pilgrim Baptist Church and his mother came from a family of educators. Robert recognized the importance of his heritage and the deep rooted community ties that were instilled in him at an early age. Hickman served as a mechanical engineer in the Air Force and returned to St. Paul in the 1960's. It was during this tumultuous time of the civil rights movement that Robert became an activist within his community. In 1968 he founded the Inner City Youth League and served as the Executive Director for the next 20 years.

Robert believed in the importance of empowering and educating youth. The Inner City Youth League taught teenagers art, black history, music, and theater. He would sponsor forums to allow African-American youth to question city officials. He even ran a public television show called “Black Voices” and trained community members in video production.

Robert often came up with creative ways to protest the powers that be in his community. When the city of St. Paul razed houses for urban renewal he created community gardens out of the vacant plots. He advocated employment programs for young African-Americans, pushed for stronger schools, and protested profiling by police. After his work with Inner City Youth he teamed up with the advocacy and social services group The City Inc. in Minneapolis which opened one of the very first alternative schools in Minnesota.

Robert was more than just an activist; he was truly a community leader. He wore many hats throughout his personal and professional life. He was a small business owner and even an occasional actor playing the role of Frederick Douglas in Minnesota's Juneteenth celebrations. He discovered Buddhism and made trips to Kenya and Ghana. Most recently he worked with the Cultural Wellness Center in Minneapolis with young men, many of whom were referred there by the criminal justice system.

Throughout Robert's life he always continued to overcome divisions between city officials and community members. He was able to overcome cultural, racial, and generational divides to unite people in finding common ground while consistently and persistently supporting the community's black youth.

Robert “Bobby” Hickman passed away on January 28, 2015 at the age of 79. His work to improve and inspire the lives of African-American youth will resonate in the hearts and minds of the community for generations to come. He viewed his life's work as a calling and there is no nobler calling than mentoring and empowering our nation's future.

H.R. 596

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 2015

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 596, the latest in a series of seemingly never ending attempts by House Republicans to destroy and dismantle the Affordable Care Act. This legislation, which has no chance of becoming law, would be nothing short of catastrophic for the

millions of Americans who receive critical benefits and health care coverage under the ACA.

The Affordable Care Act is working. Individuals with pre-existing conditions are no longer unfairly kept out of the insurance marketplace. Health care premiums are growing at the slowest rate in nearly a half century. Young adults are able to remain on their parents' health coverage; families can purchase affordable health coverage on the health insurance exchanges; and seniors are receiving real help with their prescription drug costs as we eliminate the Part D donut hole.

Despite these successes, House Republicans are continuing their quixotic pursuit to undermine this law using the same old and discredited arguments they have tried in the past. Instead of outlining a replacement to the ACA, Republicans want to take away comprehensive health coverage from millions of Americans and repeal critical patient protections.

In the last year, I've had many constituents share deeply personal stories of the positive impact the ACA has had on their lives. Below is one such story from Amy and Mark Adams-Westin of St. Paul, Minnesota.

THE ACA IS WORKING FOR US
(By The Westins)

We've been married since 1995. In the spring of 1997 Amy was diagnosed with stage-two breast cancer. A month earlier, Mark had just gotten group health insurance through his employer. A year, two surgeries, 6 chemo treatments, and a full course of radiation later, Amy was finished with her treatments. It was now time to rebuild; fortunately our finances were spared the catastrophe.

We both have been musicians/composers/performers for all of our lives, with dreams of making our love our profession. After going through this life and death struggle, we decided to honor our gifts and talent and go for it. Of course this meant winding down, then giving up, Mark's day job. When we felt we had enough cushion in the bank, we made the leap.

We applied to our health insurance provider to change our group policy to a private family policy. By this time over 11 years had passed since Amy's breast cancer treatments. Our provider had no problem accepting Mark, but they refused Amy's coverage due to the previous conditions of her breast cancer (which shocked her oncologist), and fall allergies (which shocked us).

Fortunately, Amy got coverage from a Minnesota state mandated program that covered folks refused by private companies. Unfortunately, both our monthly premiums (from \$300 to \$650) and our yearly deductible (from \$300 to \$17,500) skyrocketed. And many of the preventative measures (mammograms, colonoscopies, even flu shots...) became part of our deductibles, which we had to pay out of pocket. Somehow we managed to scrape by, but it meant that we often had to choose between seeing our doctors or paying our premiums. Now let me say that we are both non-smokers. Mark does not drink and Amy has an occasional glass of wine. We are mostly vegetarian (Mark is total veg since 1973), and exercise regularly.

As musicians, a great percentage of our work is in independent, assisted living, transitional, and nursing Elder Care facilities. It is an absolute joy to see how important and healing our music can be to so many. We help turn lights on every day. For several years, we struggled from paycheck to paycheck to keep turning those lights on.

On May 1, 2013 Mark turned 62 and began to collect Social Security, which he'd been paying into for almost 50 years. That check covers our housing. In March of 2014 when the ACA took effect, our premiums and deductible were reduced into the affordable range. Also our coverage for preventative measures are now included.

Our response to Social Security and the ACA was "WHEW!" These two programs have changed our lives, along with the lives of millions of others. We can now continue to live our American dream, while bringing our music to those precious folks who need it the most.

Our health care system was broken and breaking this nation until passage of the ACA. While we weren't among the 40,000,000 plus uncovered men, women, and children, our coverage was strangling our finances.

The ACA, contrary to oft repeated myth, is in fact working and making millions of lives better. We must continue to refine the ACA and health care in America until all of the cracks that hard working folks and their children have been allowed to fall into are filled and the basic cost of healthcare is reduced to sane sustainable levels. To repeal the ACA, which has been the constant threat and "promise" of the opposition, would be to turn back the clock and recreate the void that endangered far too many lives.

Mark and Amy's story is just one of many that I have heard about how the Affordable Care Act is helping to improve Minnesotans' health and economic security. It is time for Congressional Republicans to stop refighting the battles of the past and focus on the challenges facing our communities. I'm looking forward to working with my colleagues—Republicans and Democrats—to enact policies that will benefit middle class families and strengthen our economy.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, February 12, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

FEBRUARY 24

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of the Interior.

SD-366

FEBRUARY 25

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) reauthorization, focusing on perspectives from owners, operators, and users of the system.

SD-406

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine regional nuclear dynamics.

SR-222

FEBRUARY 26

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2016 for the Forest Service.

SD-366

MARCH 4

3:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces

To hold hearings to examine United States nuclear weapons policy, programs, and strategy in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR-222

MARCH 12

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces

To receive a closed briefing on missile defense programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SVC-217

MARCH 25

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces

To hold hearings to examine ballistic missile defense programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR-222

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed S. 295, Amy and Vicky Child Pornography Victim Restitution Improvement Act, as amended.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S907–S946

Measures Introduced: Twenty-four bills were introduced, as follows: S. 446–469. **Page S926**

Measures Passed:

Amy and Vicky Child Pornography Victim Restitution Improvement Act: By a unanimous vote of 98 yeas (Vote No. 55), Senate passed S. 295, to amend section 2259 of title 18, United States Code, after taking action on the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S916–20**

Adopted:

Hatch Amendment No. 250, of a perfecting nature. **Page S919**

Measures Considered:

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act: Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 240, making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015. **Pages S907–10, S920–21**

Appointments:

United States Holocaust Memorial Council: The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to Public Law 96–388, as amended by Public Law 97–84, and Public Law 106–292, reappointed the following Senators to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council: Senators Sanders and Franken. **Page S946**

National Council on the Arts: The Chair announced, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, pursuant to Public Law 105–83, the reappointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the National Council on the Arts: Senator Baldwin. **Page S946**

United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control: The Chair, on behalf of the

Democratic Leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 99–93, as amended by Public Law 99–151, appointed the following Senators as members of the United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control: Senators Feinstein, Schumer, and Whitehouse. **Page S946**

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki): The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 94–304, as amended by Public Law 99–7, appointed the following Senators as members of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki) during the 114th Congress: Senators Cardin, Whitehouse, Udall, and Shaheen. **Page S946**

Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China: The Chair, on behalf of the President of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 106–286, appointed the following Members to serve on the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China: Senators Feinstein (re-appointment), Brown (re-appointment), Merkley (re-appointment), and Peters. **Page S946**

President's Export Council: The Chair, pursuant to Executive Order 12131, as amended and extended, appointed the following Senators to the President's Export Council: Senators Klobuchar and Gillibrand. **Page S946**

Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts: The Chair, on behalf of the President of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 85–874, as amended, reappointed the following Senator to the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts: Senator Warner. **Page S946**

Message from the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting a legislative proposal to authorize the limited use of the United States Armed Forces

against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL); which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. (PM–5) **Page S925**

Carter Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 10:30 a.m., on Thursday, February 12, 2015, Senate begin consideration of the nomination of Ashton B. Carter, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Defense; that the time until 2 p.m., be equally divided between the two Leaders, or their designees, and that at 2 p.m., Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination. **Page S946**

Messages from the House: **Pages S925–26**

Measures Referred: **Page S926**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S926–27**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S927–45**

Amendments Submitted: **Page S945**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S945–46**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—55) **Page S920**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 5:10 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, February 12, 2015. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S946.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS AND THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the United States Army Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior, after receiving testimony from Jennifer Gimbel, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Water and Science, and Estevan Lopez, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, both of the Department of the Interior; and Jo-Ellen Darcy, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, and Lieutenant General Thomas P. Bostick, Chief of Engineers, United States Army Corps of Engineers, both of the Department of Defense.

SITUATION IN AFGHANISTAN

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the situation in Afghanistan,

after receiving testimony from James B. Cunningham, Mineville, New York, and Ryan C. Crocker, Texas A&M University George Bush School of Government and Public Service, College Station, both a former Ambassador to Afghanistan, Department of State; Admiral Eric T. Olson, USN (Ret.), former Commander, United States Special Operations Command, Department of Defense, Baltimore, Maryland; and Michael E. Leiter, former Director, United States National Counterterrorism Center, Reston, Virginia.

WORLD-WIDE NUCLEAR CAPABILITIES

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces received a closed briefing on world-wide nuclear capabilities from Douglas S. Wade, Senior Defense Intelligence Analyst for Korea and North East Asia, Dionisio Aquino de Leon III, Senior Defense Intelligence Analyst for Russia and Eurasia, Daniel K. Taylor, Acting Senior Defense Intelligence Analyst for China, Kent A. Breedlove, Senior Defense Intelligence Analyst for South Asia, Richard A. Williams, Senior Intelligence Officer for Levant Branch, and Roy E. Boone, Acting Senior Defense Intelligence Analyst for Weapons of Mass Destruction and Nuclear, all of the Defense Intelligence Agency, Department of Defense.

MILITARY COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT MODERNIZATION COMMISSION

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Personnel concluded a hearing to examine the retirement and compensation proposals of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission, after receiving testimony from Alphonso Maldon, Jr., Chairman, and former Senator Larry L. Pressler, Dov S. Zakheim, Michael R. Higgins, General Peter W. Chiarelli, USA (Ret.), and Admiral Edmund P. Giambastiani, Jr., USN (Ret.), each a Commissioner, all of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission; Robert L. Frank, Air Force Sergeants Association, Suitland, Maryland; Richard A. Jones, National Association for Uniformed Services, Springfield, Virginia; Deirdre Parke Holleman, The Retired Enlisted Association, Alexandria, Virginia; and Alexander Nicholson, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, Washington, DC.

SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY TRUST FUND INSOLVENCY

Committee on the Budget: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Social Security disability trust fund insolvency, after receiving testimony from Carolyn W. Colvin, Acting Commissioner, Social Security

Administration; Mark G. Duggan, Stanford University, Stanford, California; Philip R. de Jong, University of Amsterdam, The Hague, Netherlands; and Kate Lang, National Senior Citizens Law Center, Washington, DC.

INTERNET OF THINGS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Internet of things, after receiving testimony from Mike Abbott, Kleiner Perkins Caufield and Byers, Menlo Park, California; Doug Davis, Intel Corporation, Chandler, Arizona; Lance Donny, OnFarm, Fresno, California; Adam D. Thierer, George Mason University Mercatus Center, Arlington, Virginia; and Justin Brookman, Center for Democracy and Technology, Washington, DC.

PROPOSED CARBON DIOXIDE EMISSIONS RULES

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) proposed carbon dioxide emissions rules from new, modified, and existing power plants, after receiving testimony from Janet McCabe, Acting Assistant Administrator, Office of Air and Radiation, Environmental Protection Agency.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Finance: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

An original bill relating to access and administration of the U.S. Tax Court;

An original bill to remove alcohol bonding requirements for certain taxpayers;

An original bill relating to modifications to alternative tax for certain small insurance companies;

An original bill to modify the excise tax on cider;

An original bill to truncate the collection period for taxpayers hospitalized for combat zone injuries;

An original bill to provide special rules concerning charitable contributions to, and public charity status of, agricultural research organizations;

An original bill to provide an exception to the private foundation excess business holdings rules for certain philanthropic business holdings;

An original bill to clarify a special rules for certain governmental plans;

An original bill to modify the treatment of income received under student work-learning-service programs;

An original bill for a waste-heat-to-power investment tax credit;

An original bill to allow enrolled agents who meet certain requirements to use specified designations;

An original bill relating to real estate investment trusts (REITs), regulated investment companies (RICs) and the Foreign Investment in Real Property Tax Act (FIRPTA);

An original bill to exclude from gross income certain compensation received by public safety officers and their dependents;

An original bill to convert the tax on liquefied natural gas and liquefied petroleum gas to an energy equivalent basis;

An original bill to require the Internal Revenue Service to notify exempt organizations before revoking exempt status for failing to file information returns;

An original bill to exclude from gross income certain clean coal power grants; and

An original bill to create a military spouse job continuity credit.

ENDING MODERN DAY SLAVERY

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine ending modern day slavery, focusing on the role of United States leadership, after receiving testimony from Sarah Sewall, Under Secretary of State for Civilian Security, Democracy, and Human Rights.

GAO 2015 LIST OF HIGH-RISK GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Government Accountability Office's (GAO) 2015 list of high-risk government programs, including solutions to high-risk problems which offer the potential to save billions of dollars, improve service to the public, and strengthen government performance and accountability, after receiving testimony from Gene L. Dodaro, Comptroller General of the United States, Cynthia Bascetta, Managing Director, and Deborah Draper, Director, both of Health Care, Phillip Herr, Director, Physical Infrastructure Issues, Dave Maurer, Director, Homeland Security and Justice, J. Chris Mihm, Managing Director, and James White, Director, both of Strategic Issues, Dave Powner, Director, and Gregory Wilshusen, Director, both of Information Technology, all of the Government Accountability Office.

NLRB NEW ELECTION RULE

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the National Labor Relations Board's (NLRB) new election rule, focusing on employers and employees, after receiving testimony from Charles I. Cohen, Morgan, Lewis and Bockius LLP, and Elizabeth Milito, NFIB Small Business Legal Center, both of Washington, DC; Mark A. Carter, Dinsmore and Shohl LLP,

Charleston, West Virginia, on behalf of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; and Caren P. Sencer,

Weinberg, Roger and Rosenfeld, Alameda, California.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 47 public bills, H.R. 860–906; and 5 resolutions, H.J. Res. 31; and H. Res. 104–107, were introduced.

Pages H980–82

Additional Cosponsors:

Page H984

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Jolly to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Page H921

Recess: The House recessed at 10:40 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon.

Page H926

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by a ye-a-and-nay vote of 263 yeas to 156 nays with one answering "present", Roll No. 73.

Pages H926, H946–47

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

Awarding a Congressional Gold Medal to the Foot Soldiers who participated in Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, or the final Selma to Montgomery Voting Rights March: H.R. 431, to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Foot Soldiers who participated in Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, or the final Selma to Montgomery Voting Rights March in March of 1965, which served as a catalyst for the Voting Rights Act of 1965, by a 2/3 ye-a-and-nay vote of 420 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 76.

Pages H930–37, H960–61

Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act: The House passed S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline, by a ye-a-and-nay vote of 270 yeas to 152 nays, Roll No. 75.

Pages H947–60

Rejected the Capps motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 181 yeas to 241 noes, Roll No. 74.

Pages H958–60

H. Res. 100, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (S. 1), was agreed to by a recorded vote of 248 yeas to 177 noes, Roll No. 72, after the previous question was ordered by a ye-a-and-nay vote of 242 yeas to 183 nays, Roll No. 71.

Pages H937–46

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he authorized the use of military force with respect to the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL)—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 114–9).

Page H926

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four ye-a-and-nay votes and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H945, H945–46, H946–47, H959–60, H960, and H960–61. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:58 p.m.

Committee Meetings

STATE OF THE RURAL ECONOMY

Committee on Agriculture: Full Committee held a hearing to review the state of the rural economy. Testimony was heard from Tom Vilsack, Secretary, Department of Agriculture.

APPROPRIATIONS—INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing on the Indian Health Service budget. Testimony was heard from Yvette Roubideaux, Senior Advisor to the Secretary for American Indians and Alaska Natives; and Robert McSwain, Acting Director, Indian Health Service.

APPROPRIATIONS—COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies held a hearing on the Commodity Futures Trading Commission budget. Testimony was heard from Timothy Massad, Chairman, Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

APPROPRIATIONS—ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, CIVIL WORKS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development held a hearing on Army Corps of Engineers, Civil Works budget. Testimony was heard from Jo-Ellen Darcy, Assistant Secretary,

Army for Civil Works; and Lieutenant General Thomas P. Bostick, Commanding General and Chief of Engineers, Army Corps of Engineers.

FUNDING TO PREVENT, PREPARE FOR, AND RESPOND TO THE EBOLA VIRUS DISEASE OUTBREAK

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs held a hearing on oversight of funding to prevent, prepare for, and respond to the Ebola virus disease outbreak. Testimony was heard from Steve Browning, Special Coordinator for Ebola, Department of State; Dirk Dijkerman, Executive Coordinator, Ebola Task Force, U.S. Agency for International Development; and Jeremy M. Konyndyk, Director, Office of United States Foreign Disaster Assistance, U.S. Agency for International Development.

THE FY16 BUDGET REQUEST: A VIEW FROM OUTSIDE EXPERTS: "ALTERNATIVE BUDGETS AND STRATEGIC CHOICES"

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "The FY16 Budget Request: A View from Outside Experts: 'Alternative Budgets and Strategic Choices'". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE MILITARY COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT MODERNIZATION COMMISSION

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing entitled "Final Recommendations from the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission". Testimony was heard from Alphonso Maldon, Jr., Chairman, Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission; Stephen E. Buyer, Commissioner, Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission; Michael R. Higgins, Commissioner, Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission; General Peter W. Chiarelli, USA (Retired), Commissioner, Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission; and Admiral Edmund P. Giambastiani, Jr., USN (Retired), Commissioner, Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 5, the "Student Success Act". H.R. 5 was ordered reported, as amended.

FEDERAL EFFORTS ON MENTAL HEALTH: WHY GREATER HHS LEADERSHIP IS NEEDED

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled "Federal Efforts on Mental Health: Why Greater HHS Leadership Is Needed". Testimony was heard from Linda T. Kohn, Director, Health Care, Government Accountability Office; and Richard G. Frank, Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, Department of Health and Human Services.

EXAMINING ICD-10 IMPLEMENTATION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled "Examining ICD-10 Implementation". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE FISCAL YEAR 2016 DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY BUDGET

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power held a hearing entitled "The Fiscal Year 2016 Department of Energy Budget". Testimony was heard from Ernest J. Moniz, Secretary, Department of Energy.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee began a markup on H.R. 734, the "Federal Communications Commission Consolidated Reporting Act of 2015"; H.R. 639, the "Improving Regulatory Transparency for New Medical Therapies Act"; H.R. 471, the "Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act of 2015"; H.R. 647, the "Access to Life-Saving Trauma Care for All Americans Act"; H.R. 648, the "Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act"; and H.R. 212, the "Drinking Water Protection Act".

THE FUTURE OF HOUSING IN AMERICA: OVERSIGHT OF THE FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "The Future of Housing in America: Oversight of the Federal Housing Administration". Testimony was heard from Julian Castro, Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

STATE SPONSOR OF TERROR: THE GLOBAL THREAT OF IRAN

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade held a hearing entitled "State Sponsor of Terror: The Global Threat of Iran". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

COUNTERING VIOLENT ISLAMIST EXTREMISM: THE URGENT THREAT OF FOREIGN FIGHTERS AND HOMEGROWN TERROR

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Countering Violent Islamist Extremism: The Urgent Threat of Foreign Fighters and Homegrown Terror”. Testimony was heard from Francis X. Taylor, Under Secretary, Intelligence and Analysis, Department of Homeland Security; Nicholas J. Rasmussen, Director, National Counterterrorism Center, Office of the Director of National Intelligence; and Michael B. Steinbach, Assistant Director, Counterterrorism Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.

COMMITTEE FUNDING FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

Committee on House Administration: Full Committee held a hearing on committee funding for the 114th Congress. Testimony was heard from Chairman Bishop of Utah, Chairman Royce, Chairman Upton, Chairman Chaffetz, Chairman Thornberry, Chairman McCaul, Chairman Hensarling, Chairman Dent, and Representatives Grijalva, Engel, Pallone, Cummings, Smith of Washington, Thompson of Mississippi, Maxine Waters of California, and Linda T. Sánchez of California.

FEDERAL ASSET FORFEITURE: USES AND REFORMS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations held a hearing entitled “Federal Asset Forfeiture: Uses and Reforms”. Testimony was heard from Kenneth A. Blanco, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, Department of Justice; Keith Henderson, Prosecuting Attorney, Floyd County, Indiana; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE HEARING

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security held a hearing on a bill to improve immigration law enforcement within the interior of the United States, and for other purposes; a bill to modify the treatment of unaccompanied alien children who are in Federal custody by reason of their immigration status, and for other purposes; and a bill to amend the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 to provide for the expedited removal of unaccompanied alien children who are not victims of a severe form of trafficking in persons and who do not have a fear of returning to their country of nationality or last habitual residence, and for other purposes. Testimony was heard from Sam S. Page, Sher-

iff, Rockingham County, North Carolina; and public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT PLAN FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS; GAO'S HIGH RISK REPORT: 25 YEARS OF PROBLEMATIC PRACTICES

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a markup on the committee's oversight plan for the 114th Congress and a hearing entitled “GAO's High Risk Report: 25 Years of Problematic Practices”. The committee's oversight plan for the 114th Congress was adopted. Testimony was heard from John J. MacWilliams, Senior Advisor to the Secretary, Department of Energy; Gene L. Dodaro, Comptroller General, Government Accountability Office; Robert M. Lightfoot, Jr., Associate Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Shantanu Agrawal, M.D., Deputy Administrator and Director, Center for Program Integrity, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services; Alan F. Estevez, Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense; and John Koskinen, Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION REAUTHORIZATION BILL: LAYING THE FOUNDATION FOR U.S. ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION PART I

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Surface Transportation Reauthorization Bill: Laying the Foundation for U.S. Economic Growth and Job Creation Part I”. Testimony was heard from Anthony Foxx, Secretary of Transportation, Department of Transportation.

BUSINESS MEETING; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS BUDGET REQUEST FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Full Committee held a business meeting to designate Rep. Jerry McNerney and Rep. Tim Walz to subcommittees and a hearing entitled “U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs Budget Request for Fiscal Year 2016”. Representative Jerry McNerney and Representative Tim Walz were designated to subcommittees. Testimony was heard from Robert A. McDonald, Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING; IRS'S USE OF CIVIL ASSET FORFEITURE LAWS TO SEIZE THE BANK ACCOUNTS OF LAW ABIDING SMALL BUSINESSES, AND THE SETTLEMENT TACTICS EMPLOYED BY THE AGENCY

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Oversight held an organizational meeting for the 114th Congress and a hearing on the IRS's use of civil asset forfeiture laws to seize the bank accounts of law abiding small businesses, and the settlement tactics employed by the agency. The subcommittee successfully organized. Testimony was heard from John Koskinen, Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service; and public witnesses.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING; CHALLENGES FACING LOW-INCOME INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES IN TODAY'S ECONOMY

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Human Resources held an organizational meeting for the 114th Congress and a hearing on challenges facing low-income individuals and families in today's economy. The subcommittee successfully organized. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2015

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the situation in Afghanistan; to be immediately followed by a closed hearing in SVC-217, 9:30 a.m., SD-G50.

Full Committee, closed business meeting to markup S. 165, to extend and enhance prohibitions and limitations with respect to the transfer or release of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, 2:30 p.m., SVC-217.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to resume hearings to examine regulatory relief for community banks and credit unions, 10 a.m., SD-538.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Energy; to be immediately followed by an organizational business meeting to consider committee rules of procedure and subcommittee assignments for the 114th Congress, 10 a.m., SD-366.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider the nominations of Loretta E. Lynch, of New York, to be Attorney General, Daniel Henry Marti, of Virginia, to be Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator, Executive

Office of the President, Michelle K. Lee, of California, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Alfred H. Bennett, George C. Hanks, Jr., and Jose Rolando Olvera, Jr., each to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, Jill N. Parrish, to be United States District Judge for the District of Utah, and Nancy B. Firestone, of Virginia, Thomas L. Halkowski, of Pennsylvania, Patricia M. McCarthy, of Maryland, Jeri Kaylene Somers, of Virginia, and Armando Omar Bonilla, of the District of Columbia, each to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, 10 a.m., SD-226.

Committee on Rules and Administration: business meeting to markup an original resolution authorizing the expenditures by committees of the Senate for March 1, 2015 through February 28, 2017, 9:45 a.m., SR-301.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH-216.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Full Committee, business meeting to consider the Budget Views and Estimates Letter of the Committee on Agriculture for the agencies and programs under jurisdiction of the Committee for FY 2016 and other organizational matters, 9:30 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Full Committee, hearing to review the 2015 Agenda for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, hearing on Bureau of Reclamation budget, 10:30 a.m., 2362-B Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled "Update on Detainee Transfers from GTMO", 3 p.m., 2212 Rayburn. This hearing will close.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, hearing entitled "How Emerging Technology Affects Student Privacy", 11:15 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 734, the "Federal Communications Commission Consolidated Reporting Act of 2015"; H.R. 639, the "Improving Regulatory Transparency for New Medical Therapies Act"; H.R. 471, the "Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act of 2015"; H.R. 647, the "Access to Life-Saving Trauma Care for All Americans Act"; H.R. 648, the "Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act"; and H.R. 212, the "Drinking Water Protection Act", 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Ethics, Full Committee, organizational meeting for the 114th Congress, 10 a.m., 1015 Longworth.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, meeting to adopt the committee's views and estimates on the budget for fiscal year 2016, 10 a.m., HVC-210.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled "The Growing Strategic Threat of ISIS", 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats, hearing entitled “Azerbaijan: U.S. Energy, Security, and Human Rights Interests”, 1 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa; Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, joint hearing entitled “The Syrian Humanitarian Crisis: Four Years Later and No End in Sight”, 1:30 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies, hearing entitled “Emerging Threats and Technologies to Protect the Homeland”, 2 p.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, meeting to adopt the committee’s oversight plan for the 114th Congress, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law, hearing entitled “Consumers Short-changed? Oversight of the Justice Department’s Mortgage Lending Settlements”, 10:30 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet, hearing entitled “Examining Recent Supreme Court Cases in the Patent Arena”, 1 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled “U.S. Secret Service: Identifying Steps to Restore the Protective Agency”, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on National Security; and Subcommittee on Health Care, Benefits and Administrative Rules, joint hearing entitled, “The President’s Executive Actions on Immigration and Their Impact on Federal and State Elections”, 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Environment; and Subcommittee on Oversight, joint hearing entitled “Bridging the Gap: America’s Weather Satellites and Weather Forecasting”, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Research and Technology; and Subcommittee on Oversight, joint hearing entitled “Can

Americans Trust the Privacy and Security of their Information on HealthCare.gov?”, 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Full Committee, organizational meeting for the 114th Congress; hearing entitled “Contracting and the Industrial Base”, 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 749, the “Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act of 2015”; the committee’s Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Views and Estimates; General Services Administration Capital Investment and Leasing Program Resolutions; and possible other matters cleared for consideration, 10:30 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 280, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recoup bonuses and awards paid to employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs; H.R. 294, the “Long-Term Care Veterans Choice Act”; H.R. 216, the “Department of Veterans Affairs Budget Planning Reform Act of 2015”; and H.R. 189, the “Servicemember Foreclosure Protections Extension Act of 2015”, 10:30 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, hearing entitled “A Review of the President’s Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request for the Department of Labor’s Veteran Employment and Training Service”, 2 p.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, Full Committee, markup on the committee’s Views and Estimates on the Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Budget; H.R. 529, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve 529 plans; H.R. 622, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the deduction of State and local general sales taxes; H.R. 880, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify and make permanent the research credit, 9:30 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, business meeting to consider member access requests and views and estimates, 9 a.m., HVC-304. This meeting will be closed.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, February 12

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, February 12

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond one hour), Senate will begin consideration of the nomination of Ashton B. Carter, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Defense, with a vote on confirmation of the nomination at 2 p.m.

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 644—Fighting Hunger Incentive Act of 2015 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Ashford, Brad, Nebr., E197
Capps, Lois, Calif., E196
Carter, Earl L. "Buddy", Ga., E196

Coffman, Mike, Colo., E196
Duckworth, Tammy, Ill., E196
Ellison, Keith, Minn., E197
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E195
Gohmert, Louie, Tex., E195

McCollum, Betty, Minn., E197
Nolan, Richard M., Minn. E195, E196
Roe, David P., Tenn., E196
Smith, Adam, Wash., E197
Young, Todd C., Ind., E196, E197



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.fdsys.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.