the incentives more accessible an providing parity with other forms of renewable energy. The upfront costs of CHP and WHP can be expensive, and facilities seeking to lower their energy bills often lack access to the capital needed for purchasing the equipment. The POWER Act aims to spur investment in these efficient technologies that capture wasted heat from electricity generation and industrial processes and use it to heat or cool buildings or to generate additional electricity. Capturing this otherwise wasted resource has the potential to increase electrical generation efficiency by nearly 80 percent and reduce electricity costs for industrial users.

While technologies such as solar energy and fuel cells currently benefit from a 30 percent investment tax credit, ITC, the incentives for CHP are more limited. CHP systems are only eligible for a 10 percent ITC for the first 15 megawatts, MW, of projects that are smaller than 50 MW in capacity. Moreover, while WHP has the potential to produce 15 gigawatts of emissions-free electricity nationwide, it currently does not qualify for the ITC. The limits on the size and scope of the ITC have hampered companies from making important investments to increase their efficiency. The POWER Act would increase the ITC for CHP to 30 percent, allow WHP to qualify for the credit, remove the limit on project size to ensure large industrial systems are eligible, and extend the credit through December 2018 to allow time for equipment purchase, installation, and permitting.

By making our industrial sector more efficient, we would be reducing costs for manufacturers and helping them to better compete in the global marketplace. CHP can also help us be a more resilient nation. Critical institutions that have combined heat and power can keep the power on even when the lights go out. That is why some hospitals, wastewater treatment plants, and military bases are installing CHP—they have to keep operating even in extreme weather or during blackouts. The POWER Act can save energy, reduce costs, build resilience, and reduce emissions.

Woodard & Curran, headquartered in Portland, Maine, noted in its support for the bill that the POWER Act: ''. . . will allow more companies to reduce energy use and costs by installing combined heat and power, CHP, systems. As a developer of such projects, we know that this technology poses a significant opportunity to generate new businesses, create jobs, and reduce our Nation's energy consumption. CHP is still largely an untapped resource, and we could double its installed capacity over the next decade with the right policies in place.'' Another company in Scarborough, ME, Self-Gen, Inc., stated: ''Every year, the United States sends enough wasted heat from electricity generation up our chimneys to power Japan. Combined heat and power can harness this heat as a resource to create more electricity, nearly doubling efficiency. Senator Collins' POWER Act will help us use this technology throughout Maine and across the nation, moving the United States towards increased energy independence.''

The POWER Act would allow more U.S. companies to install CHP and WHP systems, which would help improve the energy efficiency and lower costs for some of the largest energy users. The legislation has the support of a broad coalition of businesses from across the country, several environmental organizations, and a number of trade associations. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 192—REQUIRING THAT LEGISLATION CONSIDERED BY THE SENATE BE CONFINED TO A SINGLE ISSUE

Mr. ENZI submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 192

Resolved,

SECTION 1. SINGLE-ISSUE REQUIREMENT.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a bill or resolution that is not confined to a single subject.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

(1) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or resolution. An affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

SENATE RESOLUTION 193—CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HISTORIC GRISWOLD V. CONNECTICUT DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES AND EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE CASE WAS AN IMPORTANT STEP FORWARD IN HELPING ENSURE THAT ALL PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES ARE ABLE TO USE CONTRACEPTIVES TO PLAN PREGNANCIES AND HAVE HEALTHIER BABIES

Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. COONS, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. KAINE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 193

Whereas, prior to the landmark decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in Griswold v. Connecticut, 381 U.S. 479 (1965), married women in many States were lawfully forbidden from using family planning tools such as contraceptives and condoms;

Whereas the historic Griswold case provided precedent for future cases in the Supreme Court that extended the right to use contraceptives to all women, regardless of marital status;

Whereas, since Griswold, millions of women have used contraceptives to plan pregnancies, resulting in healthier women, healthier pregnancies, healthier families, and greater financial security for families;

Whereas, despite having the legal right to use contraceptives, many women who need family planning and sexual health services still face financial and other barriers to getting the necessary care;

Whereas, because of limited access to affordable family planning services, low-income women are 5 times more likely to have an unintended pregnancy compared to women with higher incomes, and unintended pregnancy rates are increasing for poor and low-income women while decreasing for women with higher incomes;

Whereas black and Latino women are disproportionately affected by the lack of access to contraceptives and reproductive health care;

Whereas programs such as the population research and voluntary family planning programs under title X of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300 et seq.) and the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) help low-income women access high-quality, affordable family planning care, including contraceptives, that helps women plan pregnancies and stay healthy;

Whereas the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148) is helping realize the promise of Griswold by removing barriers to care by requiring that all insurance providers offer contraceptives and reproductive preventive health care services at no cost to women, and, as of 2014, more than 55,000,0000 women were benefitting from coverage without cost-sharing for preventive services, including birth control, according to the Department of Health and Human Services;

Whereas, each year, publicly funded contraceptives and family planning services help prevent approximately 2,000,000 unplanned pregnancies, 800,000 abortions, 400,000 miscarriages, and 200,000 pre-term and low birth rate births;

Whereas, in 2015, the Institute of Medicine listed using birth control to reduce unintended pregnancies as 1 of 15 core measures for furthering health progress and improving health;

Whereas, as the number of contraceptive methods expands, it is more important than ever that all women have access to the full range of contraceptive methods, including the most effective methods, so that each woman can choose the method that works best for her; and

Whereas every dollar invested in publicly funded contraceptive saves taxpayers $7.09: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) celebrates the 50th anniversary of the 1965 Griswold v. Connecticut decision of the Supreme Court of the United States;

(2) recognizes that birth control constitutes basic health care for women;

(3) recognizes that, despite the monumental Griswold decision, affordable contraceptives unfortunately remain inaccessible to many poor and low-income women;

(4) encourages robust investment in publicly funded family planning services as a means to help women plan pregnancies and have healthier babies;

(5) recognizes that investments in publicly funded family planning services help prevent unplanned pregnancies and abortions and help save taxpayer dollars;

(6) acknowledges that all women, regardless of income or zip code, should have affordable access to the tools that help women plan and space their pregnancies; and

(7) recognizes the value of the publicly funded family planning safety net in helping to realize the promise of the Griswold decision.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1614. Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1615. Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1616. Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1617. Mr. DONNELLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1618. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra.

SA 1619. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1620. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1621. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1622. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1623. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1624. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1625. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1626. Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1627. Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. DAINES, Mr. BROWN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1628. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1629. Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1630. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1631. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1632. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1633. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1634. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1635. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1636. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1637. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1638. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1639. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1640. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1641. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1642. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1643. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1644. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1645. Mr. MARKEY proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra.

SA 1646. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1647. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1648. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1649. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1650. Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1651. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1652. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1653. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1654. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1655. Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1656. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1657. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1658. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1659. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN