United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2015 No. 134

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 17, 2015.

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

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

IN MEMORY OF CAMERON PONDER

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

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Kentucky State Trooper Cameron Ponder of Rineyville, Kentucky.

I believe many people watched or saw with horror the news that spread across this country that another one of our public service officers was killed this week. Only 31 years old, Cameron was shot and killed during an on-duty traffic stop earlier this week.

Known by his peers and in the community as an athlete, Cameron was an all-State performer in track and was the kicker on the football team in high school. After graduating from North Hardin High School near Fort Knox, Cameron joined the U.S. Navy, turning down a track scholarship.

More personally, Cameron was a son, an uncle, and a fiance. Cameron graduated from the Kentucky State Police Academy in January and had been a trooper for less than 9 months.

Among the many condolences that have been shared are those of his former Navy colleagues, who talked about his devotion to our country.

While Cameron was taken far too soon, his commitment to service and community has not gone unnoticed. I join with all of Kentucky's Second District in sending prayers to Cameron's family, friends, and his Kentucky State Police brethren. We will miss him and are thankful for his service.

CLIMATE CHANGE AND PUBLIC HEALTH

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, there was a time when climate change was a concern for future generations, a time when we focused on predicting the possible problems and brainstorming the possible solutions, a time when the threat was real, but we still had time to act. We had not come face-to-face with our tipping point.

That time has passed. President Obama put it best when he said: ''We are the first generation to feel the impacts of climate change, and the last generation that can still do something about it.''

The time to act is now, and the call to action cannot be any clearer. Despite the fact that more than 12,000 peer-reviewed scientific studies are in agreement that climate change is real and humans are significantly to blame, my colleagues continue to debate its validity. Well, if the devastating global and environmental threats aren't proof enough, let me share some of the negative impacts climate change is having on our air quality and public health now.

Simply put, climate change and air pollution make a dangerous pair. In fact, air pollution is among the most serious, indirect health effects of global climate change. The same power plants that release harmful carbon dioxide into our atmosphere also create dangerous levels of soot, smog, and ground-level ozone. The result is a combination of ozone and fine particles that can have devastating health impacts. In all, 147 million people in the U.S., nearly half of this Nation—our Nation—are breathing unhealthy air. And the news is far worse in Beijing, where a new study claims that the air in Beijing is so polluted, breathing it does as much damage to the lungs as smoking 40 cigarettes a day. That is simply unacceptable.

To make matters worse, the warmer temperatures from climate change are only increasing the frequency of days with unhealthy levels of ground-level ozone. If emissions of air pollutants remain fixed at today's levels until 2050, warming from climate change alone could increase the number of red ozone alert days by 68 percent in the 50 largest Eastern U.S. cities.

Studies have also linked breathing and ozone pollution to an increased risk of premature deaths and difficulty breathing. If there are no changes in regulatory controls, the CDC predicts up to 4,300 additional premature deaths in the United States by the year 2050 from combined ozone and particle health effects.

The good news is that air quality has improved dramatically in many American cities over the past 40 years due to the Clean Air Act. The Clean Air Act has a track record of cutting dangerous

pollution and has prevented more than 400,000 premature deaths. In fact, it has helped to cut ground-level ozone by more than 25 percent since 1980 and reduced mercury emissions by 45 percent since 1990. If that isn't enough, the economic value of these improvements is estimated to reach almost $2 trillion by the year 2020.

The recently announced Clean Power Plan offers us the opportunity we need to continue to better protect public health. It is projected to contribute to significant ozone pollution reductions, resulting in important benefits including avoiding up to 3,600 premature deaths, 90,000 asthma attacks in children, and 1,700 heart attacks.

However, the continued effects of climate change and our inability to act are impairing our continued progress. Climate change is creating conditions that make it harder for us to clean up our air and reduce pollution. Without addressing one problem, we eliminate our progress on another.

Unfortunately, Members of this body use every opportunity possible to attack the Clean Air Act and now the Clean Power Plan. These unprecedented assaults block, weaken, or delay a host of long overdue clean air safeguards. As my colleagues continue to stand in our own way, we are harming the environment and ultimately hurting ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, climate change is a direct threat to humanity, and it is time we reexamine how we can think about it, talk about it, and respond to this growing problem. We may be part of the problem, but we also have the unique opportunity to become part of the solution.

I think Pope Francis put it best when he said: ''Yet all is not lost. Human beings, while capable of the worst, are also capable of rising above themselves, choosing again what is good, and making a new start.''

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to heed these wise words and make a choice to act on climate change to protect our health. We cannot afford to wait any longer.

FEDERAL CONTRACTORS

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

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to express my deep concern and disapproval of how the Obama administration has continued their assault on Federal and private contractors.

Since taking office, the President has signed a total of 13 executive orders that directly focus on Federal contracting, all of which establish new labor requirements and impose additional financial burdens on contractors. When you also include the 16 new regulations that have been created from these orders, a large portion of contractors who were once able to compete for Federal contracts are now being forced out due to these new hurdles.

In fact, the number of small contractors who submit bids for Federal contracts have declined by more than 100,000 since 2013. This is unacceptable. While these mandates range from forcing contractors to provide additional employee benefits to being required to report additional information during the bidding process, the one thing that each of these new directives has in common is that it will make it more difficult for small contractors to compete for Federal contracts. A prime example is the executive order known as the Fair Pay and Safe Workplaces, which the President signed in July 2014. While intended to award Federal contracts only to responsible contractors who have not committed recent labor violations, the actual outcome will lead to additional reporting requirements, increased administrative costs, and the potential for a contractor to be blacklisted from bidding on Federal contracts while they prove that they are innocent from the accused infraction.

Mr. Speaker, by using executive orders to bypass congressional authority, this is nothing more than an attempt by this administration to implement their agenda without regard for the negative impact it will have on businesses and industries. But, unfortunately, this agenda extends beyond Federal contractors. The recent National Labor Relations Board ruling in the Browning-Ferris Industries case, which is more widely known as the joint employer decision, will have a massive impact on the business relationships between contractors and their subcontractors, franchisors and franchisees, and other contract labor relations.

In one politically motivated decision, the NLRB completely redefined the definition of ''joint employer'' when they determined that a company could be held liable for a labor violation committed by a subcontractor or a staffing agency that they hired, even if this company doesn't have direct supervision over those workers.

This sharing of responsibility is nothing more than an attempt to force both parties into collective bargaining, but the result will be much worse. Franchisors may decide that it is in their best interest to assert more authority over their franchisees to make sure that labor violations are less likely to occur, but then other franchisors may decide it is more cost effective to end their relationship as a way to avoid potential issues. Essentially, the same results could occur with companies who hire staffing agencies or independent contractors to provide them with temporary employees or contractors who hire subcontractors to perform skilled labor.

As a small business contractor for more than two decades, I understand the unique relationship between a contractor and a subcontractor. In the end, the joint employer decision will disrupt this relationship and potentially discourage future contract arrangements.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for my colleagues to join with me in demanding this administration to stop continually adding burdens to our Federal and private contractors.

RACISM AND VOTING RIGHTS

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rewatched recently one of my favorite movies. ''Selma'' tells the story of the fight to register voters in Selma, Alabama, culminating in the march from Selma to Montgomery, led by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in 1965. Spoiler alert: After being turned around, threatened, beaten, tear-gassed, and killed, Black people got to vote in America.

A young and handsome JOHN LEWIS is depicted in the pivotal role of the community organizer who helps lead the movement. Another spoiler alert: JOHN is a Member of this body and serves with distinction from the State of Georgia.

It is among the highest honors of my life to know JOHN LEWIS and to work with him. In fact, I have marched with him and gotten arrested with JOHN LEWIS outside this Capitol Building in our fight for immigration reform.

I highly recommend the movie, and I want every citizen—and every person who lives here and hopes to become a citizen one day—to watch and learn from the movie ''Selma.'' It is a moment in history when voting and citizenship were literally life-and-death struggles—and it was only 50 years ago.

And just yesterday, the NAACP completed a historic 1,000-mile march from Selma to Washington to remind us how we must always stand up to bullies and official inaction using nonviolence and community organizing and empowerment techniques.

The way to respond to racism is to vote. I have been thinking a lot about that recently as the Republican Presidential field of candidates has fallen in line with a bully who spews racism and is leading among his party's primary voters.

What can Americans do when the tail wagging the dog of the Republican Party is saying that most Mexicans are murderers and rapists?

What can we do as a nation when candidates blame unrest in reaction to police violence in Baltimore and Ferguson on Mexican and Central American immigrants.

What can we do when thousands of people cheer when a candidate proposes building a great wall of America on our southern border, and the response from other candidates is to say that we should build another wall opposite Canada as well?

Well, in the movie ''Selma,'' Oprah Winfrey didn't just get mad; she fought

back by making sure she could register to vote. We have all learned what the Republican Party seems to be forgetting: Appeals to a narrow Republican electorate with over-the-top racism and below-the-belt immigrant bashing will not get you to the White House.

□ 1015

President Romney—oh, I'm sorry. Governor Romney got more White votes than any candidate in the history of the United States, but he couldn't overcome the demographic reality that the country is more diverse and so are its voters.

Appeals to racism and immigrant bashing are creating a predictable backlash in the neighborhoods of my district in Chicago. People are calling and coming into my office, asking what they can do to push back.

Very specifically, those who are not yet citizens are asking: How do I become a citizen? Those who have not registered to vote are asking how to get that done.

In Latino and Asian communities and in every community that thinks that calling most Mexicans ''rapists'' is not the kind of political rhetoric that should go unchallenged, people are becoming citizens.

My office in Chicago is known as a place to go if you want information on the citizenship process. In total, more than 50,000 American citizens have come to our office for help in figuring out the process.

The demand for information on citizenship has grown so much in my district that, this Saturday, from 9:00 to noon, at the Instituto Del Progreso Latino, I will join my staff and local advocates and the local office of the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services for a free workshop on applying to become a citizen.

Not only will people get help in understanding the process, but we will also help them figure out if they qualify for a fee waiver so that the $680 application fee that people have to pay is not a barrier.

Think about it. There are roughly 8.8 million immigrants with green cards who have lived in the U.S. for 5 years or more or who have been married to a U.S. citizen for 3 years or more, and they can pass a background check and qualify for citizenship today.

So what I am proposing is that, instead of renewing your green card, if you are one of those 8.8 million people, and you get it for $450 for 10 years, you apply for permanent citizenship, with a fee waiver, and become a citizen for free. That is right.

Apply for citizenship, and you can vote for whomever you want to vote for. You can even vote against the guy who called your whole ethnic group ''rapists,'' ''murderers,'' and ''drug dealers.'' That kind of ugly, un-American attack is moving people to apply for citizenship and moving citizens to become voters.

Mr. Speaker, today is Citizenship Day, and there are hundreds of citizenship workshops and activities across the country. I am looking forward to meeting with the hundreds of people who will be working towards their citizenship this Saturday in Chicago.

The way to respond to racism is by voting, and in Latino and immigrant communities, we are getting that message loud and clear.

OZONE REGULATIONS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reject a proposal from the Environmental Protection Agency that would increase compliance measures in dealing with ozone. This proposal has been met with bipartisan opposition in Pennsylvania from local, State, and, yes, Federal elected officials.

As a result of these regulations, three counties in my district—Erie, Centre, and Clearfield—would fall out of compliance with Federal law. This comes at a time when Pennsylvania's ozone emissions have declined for decades.

Let me repeat that. This comes at a time when the ozone emission levels in Pennsylvania have been in decline for decades. This is an EPA-Obama administration political solution in search of a problem.

The new regulations would trigger an implementation procedure for counties which would make State and local officials answer to the EPA for basic permitting and planning decisions.

The regulations would threaten the State's ability to open new manufacturing facilities and, by the way, the jobs that would go with that. They would threaten the State's ability to expand current businesses and invest in new roadways.

They would also threaten agriculture through restrictions on animal feeding operations due to emissions from animal waste, along with limits on pesticide use.

This proposal comes at a time when ozone emissions across Pennsylvania have been in decline, again, for decades. With the State's economy still on the rebound from the Great Recession, now is the wrong time for new, stringent, and, I would argue, unnecessary rules from the EPA that could kill jobs.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, this proposal is the latest in a series of overreaches by the EPA, including the Clean Power Plan, which was announced earlier this summer by President Obama.

That plan will work hand in hand with these proposed ozone limits to kill good-paying jobs and to stifle economic development in Pennsylvania and across the Nation.

Furthermore, recent studies have called into question the claim that ozone levels lead to health issues, including asthma, especially among children.

With that in mind, these proposed regulations, which could be the costliest in the history of this Nation, may not have any impact on the health of our citizens.

There is still time for the EPA to reconsider the stringent regulation proposals for ozone and coal power plants.

As the Representative of a largely rural district which depends on agriculture, I understand how important it is that we be good stewards of the environment.

However, that stewardship must be balanced with the protection of industries and jobs, which have powered our communities for generations.

DROUGHT AND WILDFIRES IN CALIFORNIA

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the devastating wildfires that are sweeping throughout the Western States and, particularly, in much of California.

Last week, we had over 22 wildfires at one time that were in various parts of California. Because of the incredible 4 consecutive dry years, what once was a seasonal issue now seems to be year round.

Obviously, the drought conditions facing California played a big role in the ability to manage these wildfires, and the devastation that has occurred as a result of that has been great.

These last 4 years have been among the driest 4 years we have had, climatologists say, in 1,200 years in California and in the Western States.

Over 70 percent of California is facing what is considered to be extreme and exceptional drought conditions, which are among the highest categories that you can face under drought conditions.

California is not new to managing wildfires. It is part of living in that State as well as in other Western States, but these dry conditions over the last 4 years have made it worse; therefore, we need to try to figure out different ways to address this.

The Rough fire in Fresno County, which is part of the county I represent, has burned over 140,000 acres. Yesterday, finally, we got up to 67 percent contained.

This fire has lasted over a month, and it has closed one of our great national parks, Kings Canyon National Park. Last week, when I was home, literally, ashes were raining on our communities. Governor Jerry Brown has announced a state of emergency for northern California.

The Valley and Butte fires have been significant, affecting both Congressman MCCLINTOCK's and Congressman THOMPSON's districts.

Congressman THOMPSON has lost over 600 homes, and the fires are threatening thousands more. He has stayed

there to protect his district and assist with the fires. At this point, the Valley fire is only 30 percent contained. The Butte fire has taken 233 homes.

As a result of these devastating fires, sadly, two firefighters have lost their lives, three civilians have been killed, and four firefighters have been hospitalized due to receiving severe burns. Literally, we have thousands and thousands of men and women who are out there manning these fires.

So the question is: What should we do about it as these numbers, sadly, continue to rise?

We need to better manage our forests. We need to help alleviate and cut down on the fuel that is there through the brush that has made these fires spread incredibly fast in conditions that were never foretold. Wildfire suppression and better managing our forests is a key to doing this.

The funding that we provide for natural disasters, like to FEMA for hurricanes and for earthquakes, ought to go toward putting out these fires.

We have exceeded over $1 billion in the U.S. Forestry Department's budget, and we have completely overrun our ability to provide funding.

Currently, money the U.S. Forest Service has allocated for forest cleanup in order to prevent fires is being used to put the fires out.

We must put our political differences aside and pass legislation that will alleviate this crisis in Western States and in California.

In addition to getting legislation passed that will provide funding for putting fires out, we need to put legislation together that would, in fact, in the future, manage our forests better.

In July, I, along with Congressman VALADAO, introduced legislation, the Western Water and American Food Security Act.

This is part of a larger effort to deal with this issue. This legislation is the first step toward passing a bill that will provide additional tools for California to manage drought. This bill addresses a number of solutions to fix California's broken water system.

They include improved operations that are governed by the latest science, which will allow us to move more water when water is available in the system; additional water storage capacity; increased water recycling and reuse; improved water efficiency; and a conveyance solution that minimizes the use of an ecosystem as infrastructure and that balances the water needs for all of California.

This is but one of the tools that we need to address. We have legislation in the House, and we have legislation in the Senate. This fall, I hope we will be able to work together in a bipartisan fashion to pass this important legislation.

Certainly, these wildfires tell the public—and the public tells us—that we must do something about this. It must be a priority that we get something signed into law this year, before the rainy and snowy seasons begin. Lord knows, we hope it rains and snows this winter.

People in California, people in our valley, which has been ground zero for the drought impacts, and people in the West want Congress to act.

I urge my colleagues to take the appropriate action and pass much necessary legislation affecting the drought conditions in California and in the Western States.

DAVID C. HYDE, JR.

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

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, throughout our lives here on Earth, God places in our path certain people who influence our lives, who help shape who we are, and who ultimately help us to understand our purpose.

A couple of years ago, I met someone whose optimism, faith, and valor in the face of difficulty has had a great influence on me, on my family, and on our entire community.

I met Mr. David Hyde in 2013, who at that time was a small business owner in Cartersville, Georgia. At that time, I was a relatively unknown candidate for Congress, who was promoting the idea that America's days are still ahead of us if we define where we are going and aggressively set a course to get there. David quickly became a supporter and a friend.

Although many had lost hope in restoring America's greatness, David was a breath of fresh air. His patriotism was inspiring; his optimism was infectious; and his energy invigorated me with a willingness to fight on.

David and I share a vision: to restore our struggling Nation to one that is free, safe, and full of opportunity. We both believe that we can turn the tide and give our grandchildren a nation better than the one we inherited, but, of course, it will take a lot of hard work.

Within 2 weeks of our introduction, David was given the news that he had esophageal cancer and that it was rapidly spreading. Now, after nearly 2 years of, quite literally, putting up the fight of his life, the cancer is quickly taking David's life. The time my friend has left with his wife and children is no longer measured in months or weeks, but in days.

In realizing that any day could be David's last, I recently asked: David, if you had the ability to speak to the American people, what would you say?

Mr. Speaker, in response to that question, David sent me the following words of encouragement to give to the people of this great Nation. David wrote:

I recently had the honor of going to lunch with a friend just days before he shipped off to join the Navy.

As we sat enjoying our meal, I saw in the eyes of my friend a young man who was proud to be given the opportunity to serve his country.

The more we talked, the more he reminded me of another young man who, 35 years earlier, had also left home and family to join the Navy. The similarities between the two of us were not lost on me, and it reminded me of all that America held for a young man like me back then.

While my vision of sailing the high seas and protecting the land of the free may have been somewhat jaded by the old black and white movies I grew up watching, the dream of doing something that really mattered was alive and real to me. While America may have gotten off course, the goal of why we served has never changed.

We have lost many of the freedoms we once held, but I believe we are not so far from those days that, with hard work, sacrifice, and turning our eyes back to God, they cannot be restored.

My life is a living example of God's restoration powers.

It doesn't appear God will heal my sick body, but I know that, in the land I am soon going to enter, I have already been granted a new body—a perfect one—which I will have for eternity. That, my friends, is restoration.

Just as He will restore me, I believe He can restore our Nation to the greatness it once saw, but it will only be possible if we turn our affections back to Him. The road to restoration is not easy, as I can personally attest. It is hard, painful, and discomforting. But when your eyes are upon God, not your problems, the path is much easier to endure.

□ 1030

He has set out a clear plan with guidelines that aren't hard to follow. As our Founders understood, we may have some battles to overcome and a wilderness to cross, but we must not be paralyzed by fear of the unknown, for it is ''In God We Trust.''

When leading the Israelites from bondage, Moses had to lift his rod over the Red Sea in complete trust before God parted the waters for safe passage. He trusted God and forged on.

Although he faced insurmountable odds, the fear of the unknown didn't stop Joshua from forging on.

During the darkest hours of the American Revolution at Valley Forge, Washington didn't give up, but dug in and put his faith in the providence of God.

Leaders who are willing to do what is difficult or even what seems to be impossible are the ones who carry the team forward.

We must honor God and know that his plans for us include only one thing, His glory. If we are in it for Him, we win. If we are in it for ourselves, we lose.

Just as my young friend went out to serve in the U.S. Navy without a clearly defined path or step-by-step guidelines, but fully relying on his authorities to lead him, we must know that, if we are to return to our country's traditional values, we need to study our history, find men and women willing to adhere to those founding principles, and tighten ourselves for a brighter future led by our intelligently chosen authorities.

Who is your leader?

My best advice, as a man looking backwards with 20/20 vision, is to decide now whom you will serve and proceed in a manner worthy of your calling.

David C. Hyde, Jr.

Thank you, David, for these words of inspiration and hope. God bless you, my friend, as you forge ahead in faith and trust in God almighty.

NO SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we have 6 legislative days until the Government of the United States shuts down for lack of funding.

Why? It is because the Republican leadership here in the House has failed to bring forth critical appropriations bills to fund the government. As a result of that, we are faced with the need to pass a continuing resolution to fund the government; yet we have leading Members of the Congress here threatening to shut down the government rather than to put forth on the House of Representatives here a bipartisan bill for a continuing resolution to fund the government.

Instead, we have partisan after partisan after partisan legislative measures brought before the House here under closed rules that the leadership knows isn't going to go anywhere, but it is introduced for the perceived notion of partisan gain.

The hard simple truth is that the American people want the Congress to put their partisanship aside and to go to work, start fixing things, finding common ground, rebuilding the middle class, creating jobs, and restoring the American Dream. They surely don't want another government shutdown that puts people's jobs, families, our government, and our national security at risk.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Congress of the United States needs to come to Washington and to go to work. If the Congress doesn't do its job and get its work done, then Congress shouldn't get paid. The working men and women of America don't get paid when they don't come to work, why should the Congress get paid?

That is why I have introduced the No Government No Pay Act to prohibit Members of Congress from getting paid during a shutdown of the Congress' own creation—because people in this country, they don't want a shutdown.

They want to see the Congress go to work, find common ground, fix things, get things done, rebuild America with a transportation bill, not another kick-the-can-down-the-road, short-term fix. They want jobs with good-paying benefits, not a Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement that sends their good-paying jobs overseas.

The American people want accessible health care for our veterans, as indeed they should be receiving, not a trip to ''kingdom come'' every time a veteran needs some medical care.

The American people, they want to see protection from Social Security and for Medicare and the recognition these are not entitlements, that these are benefits that people worked hard for and started paying for the first day that they ever went to work. They surely don't want to see those benefits turned over to Wall Street and to the big insurance companies.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, if the Congress doesn't go to work, it shouldn't get paid.

More importantly, the Congress needs to go to work and bring these measures under open rules before the full House of Congress because that is how you find common ground, that is how you get things done, that is how you fix things in America.

The American people want it; they deserve it, and they have every right to expect it.

PROTECTING LIFE BY DEFUNDING PLANNED PARENTHOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, like the majority of the American people, I was disgusted and angered by the recent videos showing Planned Parenthood officials apparently willing to sell the tissues and organs of aborted babies. That is right; I said ''babies,'' not a glob of tissue as some would suggest.

I have always been unapologetically pro-life, and the mere thought of such horrific actions is beyond words. That is why I come to the floor today to urge my colleagues to support the Defund Planned Parenthood Act, which will cut all Federal funding for Planned Parenthood until the House conducts a complete and full investigation into the organization's abortion practices.

I am also pleased that this legislation will reallocate Federal funds currently being used to fund Planned Parenthood's abortion services to community health centers and other clinics that help provide preventative care to women without performing abortions.

Women's health is extremely important, and it is my belief that the funding currently being used to fund Planned Parenthood's abortion agenda will be better used by helping our local clinics provide vital women's health services without promoting the malicious practice of abortion.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the majority of my constituents in the Third Congressional District of West Virginia want to see a culture of life promoted in Washington, not a culture of barbarity and lack of respect of life.

My constituents deserve to know that their taxpayer dollars are going to organizations that represent their values and beliefs, not to organizations that are determined to push their own agenda that goes against the will of the American people.

I urge my colleagues to support the passage of Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015 and to promote the sanctity of life and listen to the American people and my constituents when they say they have had enough of their hard-earned tax dollars being spent to promote Planned Parenthood's pro-abortion agenda.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address a very important issue that continues to trouble the American people, and that is the Republican obsession of denying a woman and families' access to certain healthcare services like birth control.

Republicans' outdated views on family planning do nothing to empower women and nothing for families in their success in the 21st century. The latest round in the Republicans' battle against women's access to health care is, yet again, an attempt to eliminate Federal funding for Planned Parenthood.

This debate has been riddled with lies and deliberate misinformation designed to shock the American people, while needlessly demonizing one of the Nation's leading women's healthcare providers.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that we talk about a few things and clear up some issues and talk about the facts in this. Since its inception, Planned Parenthood has empowered millions of women nationwide by providing affordable access to contraception. Cutting off funding would cripple Planned Parenthood's ability to provide this crucial service for our Nation's women.

The two primary sources of Federal funding for Planned Parenthood come from two programs, Medicaid and Title X Family Planning. These programs were created as a safety net to provide low-income individuals with access to critical medical services that they would otherwise be forced to forego due to their high cost, such as birth control.

Together, these programs account for over 40 percent of Planned Parenthood's operating budget. Stripping these dollars would severely decrease Planned Parenthood's ability to provide care for 2.7 million people that they serve every year.

Let me tell you what this means. This means millions of the Nation's poor women would not only be at risk of losing affordable contraceptive services and counseling, but also their access to breast and cervical cancer screenings, as well as testing and treatment for STDs.

It is important to understand that, for those who are uninsured, this is the only way to get this lifesaving care. This would mean 400,000 fewer pap smears for women, 500,000 fewer breast exams, and 4.5 million fewer STD tests and treatments nationwide.

Let me be clear. It is not just Democrats' districts that will be affected. If you go outside of the Dallas/Fort Worth metroplex, these smaller cities and suburban areas and rural areas, those are Republican districts; they

have low-income women, and they will be cut off from this funding and this treatment.

All this is at risk because of Republicans' objections to Planned Parenthood providing safe and legal access to abortions. This is less than 3 percent of what this organization does. In accordance with Federal law, no Federal funds go to cover abortion services.

Another faulty argument made by Republicans is that the Nation's community healthcare centers could absorb the work that Planned Parenthood currently does.

I love community health centers, and I appreciate the work that they do because they really do serve the underserved, but the idea that these facilities would be able to provide adequate services to nearly 3 million additional people who would suddenly be without care is simply unimaginable.

Community health centers rely on other sources for affordable care to alleviate the strains of residents' needs, sources like Planned Parenthood. This is not imagined. I have seen it in the State of Texas.

I have visited community healthcare centers in the district that I serve, and they are very overwhelmed as a result of the void for healthcare services purposely created by the Republican State legislature. One of the things you always hear Republicans hollering about is how much they want to save taxpayers money.

Let me tell you something. What happened in my State of Texas in 2012, Governor Rick Perry and the Republican State legislature banned Planned Parenthood from participating in the Medicaid Women's Health Program, a joint initiative that saved Texas millions of dollars in Medicaid prenatal and delivery costs through the prevention of unplanned pregnancies.

Today, 30,000 fewer women are receiving that care, Medicaid claims are down by 26 percent, and Texas taxpayers are now paying the full price to support the State's community health centers. Republicans wasted lots of money.

Where does that leave us today? I will tell you a lot of these antiabortion groups and their political allies have created this partisan debate by releasing a series of deceitfully edited ''undercover'' videos casting Planned Parenthood in a negative light.

Let me tell you that these videos are a sham; they are lies, and they do absolutely nothing to help increase access to the critical services that Planned Parenthood provides for women.

Documents and testimony submitted to the Energy and Commerce Committee during a wasteful and unnecessary investigation show that absolutely no evidence exists to substantiate claims that Planned Parenthood violated the law in any way. In fact, their fetal tissue donation program is not only compliant with Federal law, but goes well beyond the law's requirements.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues to cease their fruitless fight against birth control—because we know that this is really what this is all about—and Planned Parenthood and women's health and get to the job of governing.

We all want women to have access to the health care they need to stay healthy for their family because, let me tell you, in my family and in families around the country, that if mom is not healthy, the rest of the family is not healthy.

That is why I choose to put people before politics and stand with women, families, and all the people of Texas and America in my support of Planned Parenthood.

□ 1045

OUR STRATEGY AGAINST ISIS

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

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago this month, the President of the United States addressed the Nation proposing his strategy for a war against ISIS. He struggled with what the mission was. Were we as a nation engaging to degrade ISIS, to defeat ISIS, to destroy ISIS? And then the question arose in this body, at what level do we engage? Do we consider an Authorization for Use of Military Force, something that is proper under our constitutional authority?

Yet 1 year later, we have not considered an Authorization for Use of Military Force. We have not had the debate over what is the role of this body and our current foreign policy and our current national security strategy against ISIS. The only portion that we were willing to touch was the request to arm and train Syrian rebels; and this body, I believe wrongfully, authorized and appropriated half a billion dollars—$500 million—to train Syrian rebels. Yesterday, we heard from the top commander of our forces in the Middle East that there are either four or five individuals engaged as Syrian rebels confronting ISIS—$500 million, five people.

The President's strategy against ISIS has failed. ISIS continues to grow geographically, continues to be enriched. Russia's hand is strengthened. Iran has increasing leverage every single day. Mr. Speaker, the architects of terror today are emboldened. But they are emboldened not only by the failure of this administration's policy; they are emboldened by the failure of this Congress to do our job.

Where are we in this debate? Where is this Congress on whether or not we are going to consider an Authorization for Use of Military Force? Where are we today on the $500 million that has now trained five people? Do we stand behind that decision as a body? I hope we do not.

The bigger question we have to ask, and it is a hard question: Are we a nation at war today with ISIS or are we not? If we are, are we willing as a nation to accept the human and economic consequences that come with conflict?

The frustration you hear in my voice is the frustration we hear in the voices of the American people across the Nation every single day. It is a frustration about what this body does not do. We should be having a debate over the Authorization for Use of Military Force. I don't know how that debate turns out.

Nobody wants to go into conflict. We don't get to choose the threats that come our way. We only choose our response, and 1 year later we have no response. All this is through the lens of an agenda that we continue to fail to do.

Let's give voice to the American people on issues like border security and immigration reform, on transportation, on a budget that finally balances. The frustration is not that we haven't achieved these things; it is that we haven't even engaged in a legislative fight to begin to advance the agenda that is right for the American people.

We are elected to be custodians of the public trust, and we fail that public trust every day we fail to consider the issues that are of most significance to the American people, to honor the constitutional responsibility we have under article I. We have spent the last 2 years cloaking ourselves in the article I authority of the Congress every time the President overreaches, and we have rightfully done so; but just as we cloak ourselves in the article I authority, we have to recognize article I brings responsibility.

We have failed to honor the responsibility that we have under article I. We have an obligation to have a very hard debate about whether or not we are a nation at war with ISIS and whether or not we are doing anything in the face of the President's failed policy to actually confront the audible threat of terror of a regime that wishes to bring harm and destroy the United States of America. This body has failed to engage in that debate.

Mr. Speaker, I ask with the utmost conviction of this Member but, frankly, the people who give me the honor to represent them in this House. Let's give voice to the American people. Let's give voice to the people that we represent here in this body, and let's finally have that debate.

WE CANNOT STAND IDLY BY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to denounce the unjust sentence of almost 14 years that was handed to human rights activist Leopoldo Lopez in Venezuela. Leopoldo is pictured here in this poster with his slogan, which says, ''Wanting a better

Venezuela is not a crime.'' Liberate Leopoldo.

Sentenced along with Leopoldo as human rights activists were Cristian Holdack, Angel Gonzalez, and Demian Martin, three students whose charge sheets include public instigation, damages to property, and arson—all false charges. Their crimes were nothing more than standing up to the regime—the corrupt, illegitimate regime—of Nicolas Maduro in Venezuela and demanding a better country that would have respect for human rights, that would have freedom of the press, and that would have free and fair elections and other universally recognized rights.

As this says, demanding a better Venezuela is not a crime, except it is in Venezuela. Democracy advocates are harassed; they are abused; they are imprisoned; they are beaten; and some are even killed—yes, killed. We cannot stand idly by while democracy and due process are trampled on in our own hemisphere.

Democracies like Brazil, Mexico, Colombia, and Chile should join the U.S. in advocating for democracy and stability for Venezuela, and freedom for the many political prisoners who are languishing in Maduro's gulags. I urge the Obama administration to immediately sanction the judge, prosecutors, and those who led this politically motivated kangaroo court against Leopoldo Lopez, against these students, and against so many.

The President can use the power granted to the executive branch when we passed here in the U.S. House of Representatives and in the United States Senate the Venezuelan sanctions legislation last year. The President must act. Mr. Speaker, let's hope that he does.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to denounce so many human rights violations that are occurring throughout the hemisphere, whether it is in Venezuela or my native homeland of Cuba. As the Pope prepares for his historic trip to Cuba this weekend, he should meet with those people, like the political prisoners who share common interests of peace and justice with the Catholic Church. The church stands for liberty; it defends the freedoms of oppressed people, the freedoms to pursue one's goals and dreams without having to live in fear.

The Castro regime stands for the complete opposite. It stands for oppression, for violence, for hatred, for injustice, and I would urge His Holiness to meet with those who truly defend the values for which the church stands; people like this young man, a graffiti artist, a young man who has only known Communist Cuba as his government. His name is El Sexto. It means the sixth one, in reference to some other charges.

El Sexto has been behind bars for nearly 9 months. He has been on a hunger strike to protest the brutal Castro regime. What did he do? This is what he did. He had a picture of two farm animals, and he put the names of Fidel and Raul on them. For that, he has been imprisoned with no contact with the outside world.

In January, another young man, a Cuban rapper named El Dkano, was sentenced to a year in prison just because he used music to criticize the Castro regime, a regime which has not unclenched its fist against the Cuban people.

Yesterday, pro-democracy leader Jorge Luis Garcia Perez, also known as Antunez, and 10 of his activists of the organization National Civic Resistance Front announced that they have begun a fast in an attempt to get a meeting with His Holiness to raise the plight of the suffering Cuban people.

These are just a few of the prisoners, Mr. Speaker, who have received harsh sentences after President Obama signed and announced this ill-fated deal with the Castro regime on December 17.

Reports indicate that the Castro regime is planning on releasing more than 3,000 prisoners in advance of the Pope's visit to Cuba, and you will think, hey, that sounds like a good idea, but let's remember this: Many of those prisoners should have never been in jail in the first place. By the way, political prisoners like El Sexto, for doing an artwork, will not be included in that number. No political prisoners will be freed, but that is not anything new, Mr. Speaker.

In 1978, Fidel Castro released almost 3,800 political prisoners ahead of Jimmy Carter's visit; in 1998, Fidel Castro released 300 prisoners ahead of Pope John Paul's visit; in the year 2011, Raul Castro released nearly 3,100 ahead of Pope Benedict's visit; yet the Castro regime has detained an unprecedented number of Cubans this year. With all of these people being freed, this year, there has been an unprecedented number of arrests in Cuba of political activists.

We can be sure that before the Pope's visit, during the Pope's visit, and after the Pope's visit, more innocent Cubans will be detained—like El Sexto—by the regime and thrown into Castro's gulags. This tactic is nothing new, and it is not indicative of a change of policy by the evil, despotic, sadistic Castro regime. It is just a political propaganda farce.

Will the Pope see this cynical move for what it is? We shall soon see, Mr. Speaker.

INVESTIGATIONS INTO PLANNED PARENTHOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am here this morning to speak about the investigations into Planned Parenthood and to the sale of fetal tissues. We are beginning this process in our Committee on Energy and Commerce; and we are approaching this in a thoughtful manner, beginning these investigations as we look at life rights and focus on the lives of these unborn children and the mothers who have gone through this process.

It is so interesting to me, as we have this discussion of fetal tissue sales and what all has transpired in the selling of these tissues, that we look to science. What science has shown us is that these are not blobs of tissue; these are babies.

This weekend, I had the opportunity to go to a baby shower, and a very excited grandmother showed me the sonogram, the picture of her unborn granddaughter already named and being celebrated. As we looked at it, we could distinguish these features of this child yet unborn, but this child fully formed and developing and sleeping in her mother's womb.

There was great excitement to celebrate this arrival, and we know that this is a fight worth having and a process worth ending as we look at the selling of these fetal organs and what has transpired.

Now, everyone is familiar with what happened with Kermit Gosnell in his house of horrors, and we know there was a conviction, but what we have learned is those convictions are very rare. We have moved now to the video footage that The Center for Medical Progress released, and we see that this is absolutely sickening, abhorrent.

□ 1100

These videos have raised a lot of suspicion about what has transpired in these Planned Parenthood affiliates and clinics and questions as to whether they have systematically and repeatedly broken laws.

Obtaining informed consent for fetal tissue donation, how was that approached? Killing infants born alive after an attempted induced abortion, who are the persons entitled to legal protection here?

As you look at a botched abortion and you have a child born alive, all of a sudden you have got two patients there that you are considering.

Dr. Deborah Nucatola, Senior Director of Medical Services for Planned Parenthood Federation of America, describes harvesting human tissues. In one of the videos, she talks about crushing this part or the other part of the baby in order to get a good specimen.

To listen to her callous description and her casual manner is sickening, but it also may violate some of the Federal laws which prohibit alteration of abortion procedures to obtain fetal tissue.

In another video, a technician says:

> I'm sitting here and I'm looking at this fetus, and its heart is beating, and I don't know what to think. I don't know if that constitutes it's technically dead or it's alive.

Imagine that. This baby, if it had arrived in a hospital with a NICU and doctors surrounding it, there would

have been a rush to make certain that life was saved.

And God bless those NICU specialists who work with these preemie babies. We have all spent time with them and are grateful that they are there.

The cheap veneer of the left, the defense of abortion as a matter of reproductive choice, is wearing thin. Reproductive rights?

As I said, let's talk about life rights. Let's discuss life rights. It is Constitution Day, the right to life, liberty, pursuit of happiness.

We have got several bills that our Members are bringing forward, which I will submit for the RECORD, along, Mr. Speaker, with those Democrats that voted for the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002, which was passed in this House by a voice vote.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD BILLS

H.R. 3134, THE DEFUND PLANNED PARENTHOOD ACT OF 2015 (BLACK)

Bill would impose a one-year moratorium on all federal funding to Planned Parenthood or any of its affiliates while investigations are conducted unless they certify they will not perform abortions or provide funds to other entities that perform abortions.

Restriction does not apply in cases of rape, incest or woman's health concerns.

H.R. 3429, THE PROHIBITING THE LIFE-ENDING INDUSTRY OF FETAL ORGAN EXCHANGE ACT OR THE PRO-LIFE ACT (YODER)

This bill amends the Public Health Service Act to prohibit the transfer of fetal tissue in exchange for valuable consideration, including payments associated with the transportation, implantation, processing, preservation, quality control, or storage of human fetal tissue.

H.R. 3494, THE PROTECTING INFANTS BORN ALIVE ACT (BLACKBURN)

Draft legislation I have authored to strengthen and improve the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002.

The Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002 became law on August 5, 2002 and requires that any reference to person, human being, child or individual include every infant born alive.

Both Ellmers and Blackburn bills will ban any provider proven of violating either of these existing laws from participating in Medicare, Medicaid, and CHIP and will allow states that suspect any violation of these existing laws to ban those suspected from the state's Medicaid program.

H.R. 3495, THE WOMEN'S PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT (DUFFY)

The bill amends the Medicaid law to allow states the flexibility and discretion to be able to exclude abortion providers like Planned Parenthood from Medicaid. States that have tried to defund Planned Parenthood have been blocked by the federal Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services assertion that states must fund Planned Parenthood under what is known as the ''free choice of qualified provider'' provision in Medicaid. Since the release of the undercover videos by Center for Medical Progress three states (Louisiana, Alabama and Arkansas) have sought to terminate Planned Parenthood's Medicaid contracts and are now embroiled in lawsuits.

H.R. 3504, THE BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT (FRANKS)

Bill mandates that infants born alive during abortions are legal persons entitled to all the rights and protections allowed to other legal persons, including needed medical care and attention. This legislation requires the same care for a child born alive during an abortion as a naturally premature baby born in a hospital. Any violation to this rule is a federal offense and must immediately be reported to law enforcement.

The bill also provides for criminal penalties for providers who fail to provide care to baby.

H.R. XX, THE PROTECT INFANTS FROM PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION ACT (ELLMERS)

Legislation will bolster the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2003.

The Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2003 amends the Federal Criminal code to ban partial-birth abortions except in the interest of the life of the mother

H.R. 3515, SMITH DISMEMBERMENT ABORTION BAN ACT

The Born Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002 (P.L. 107–207) passed the House by voice vote and the Senate by UC. The following is a list of Democrats who were serving when these votes took place.

DEMOCRATIC SENATORS

Tammy Baldwin*, Barbara Boxer, Sherrod Brown*, Benjamin L. Cardin*, Maria Cantwell, Tom Carper, Dick Durbin, Dianne Feinstein, Patrick Leahy, Edward J. Markey*, Robert Menendez*, Barbara Mikulski, Patty Murray, Bill Nelson (FL), Jack Reed, Harry Reid, Chuck Schumer, Debbie Stabenow, Tom Udall (NM)*, Ron Wyden.

*served in the House during the 107th Congress.

DEMOCRATIC HOUSE MEMBERS

Xavier Becerra, Sanford D. Bishop Jr., Earl Blumenauer, Robert A. Brady, Corrine Brown, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, James E. Clyburn, John Conyers Jr., Joseph Crowley, Elijah E. Cummings, Danny K. Davis, Susan A. Davis, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, Rosa L. DeLauro, Lloyd Doggett, Michael F. Doyle, Eliot L. Engel, Anna G. Eshoo.

Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Gene Green, Luis V. Gutiérrez, Alcee L. Hastings, Rubén Hinojosa, Michael M. Honda, Steny H. Hoyer, Steve Israel, Sheila Jackson-Lee, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Marcy Kaptur, Ron Kind, James R. Langevin, Rick Larsen, Barbara Lee, Sander M. Levin, John Lewis, Nita M. Lowey, Stephen F. Lynch.

Betty McCollum, Jim McDermott, James P. McGovern, Carolyn B. Maloney, Gregory W. Meeks, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Frank Pallone Jr., Bill Pascrell Jr., Donald M. Payne, Nancy Pelosi, Collin C. Peterson, David E. Price, Charles B. Rangel, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Bobby L. Rush, Loretta Sanchez, Janice D. Schakowsky.

Adam B. Schiff, Robert C. Scott, José E. Serrano, Brad Sherman, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Bennie G. Thompson, Mike Thompson, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Maxine Waters.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 2 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

Reverend Brondon Reems, Center of Hope Community Church, Oakland, California, offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the Earth. We honor You. We beseech thee in behalf of these, our United States and Congress.

Heavenly Father, we depend on You for skillful and Godly wisdom, to enter into the hearts and minds of those in authority. Only You know the rightness of their cause, their purpose, and their plans.

To thee, do they now look up, realizing that their help comes from You. They look to You for Your approval and for Your support. They look to You for favor that only You can give.

We thank You, Heavenly Father, for Your mercy as we seek peace in all of these United States and the world. We give thanks for the leaders You have given to us. We thank You for Your love and protection that surrounds them.

We ask that You continue to bless, strengthen, and preserve those they represent. We believe in Your Word that declares blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord.

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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GARRETT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING REVEREND BRONDON REEMS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to welcome Pastor Brondon Reems to the House floor this morning after delivering such a powerful prayer.

Pastor Reems is the senior pastor of the Center of Hope Community Church in Oakland, California, a church founded by his mother—a great woman of faith, who has broken so many glass ceilings for women, especially for African American women—Bishop Ernestine Reems.

His wife, Pastor Maria, who is also here with us today, is his partner in

ministry and has helped to grow the church into a vibrant and strong pillar of faith and community in the East Bay.

Pastor Reems accepted his call to ministry at 10 years old, and he has flourished into a strong spiritual leader.

From ministering youth in juvenile hall to assisting families coping with substance abuse and emotional disabilities, Pastor Reems serves the East Bay community with a genuine heart and compassion.

He is the cofounder of the Oakland's Potters House for Young Men, a 24-hour residential care facility for young teens who have become wards of the State.

I thank Pastor Reems for his spiritual leadership, his wisdom, and his service. He embodies and exemplifies a living faith. He is a wonderful pastor, a great mentor, and a committed and powerful civic leader.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZINKE). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CONSTITUTION DAY

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, as founder of the Congressional Constitution Caucus, today marks the 228th anniversary of the signing of the Constitution.

Unlike other revolutions, the Constitution was not imposed on the people. It was submitted to the people for their approval. If the people were to judge the Constitution, they were expected to understand the Constitution.

The Federalist Papers, a series of essays written by Alexander Hamilton, John Jay, and James Madison, argued for ratification and served as an invaluable guide to the Constitution. Education was integral to the Constitution's success.

Today, I commend all those who follow in the footsteps of our Founders by accepting the duty to educate the public on the ideals of human liberty. It is they we must thank for the preservation of the Constitution today.

NATIONAL CITIZENSHIP DAY

(Ms. JUDY CHU of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate National Citizenship Day.

America would not be the great country that it is without its immigrants. One of our greatest strengths is our Nation's diversity—the ability of this country to absorb and integrate the most entrepreneurial minds that this world has to offer and to make them our own. In fact, immigrants or their children have founded more than 40 percent of Fortune 500 companies.

However, there is a dangerous anti-immigrant sentiment perpetuated by those who fail to recognize the strength derived from our diversity. Even today, laws are being proposed to deny the constitutional right of citizenship to those born in America. Proposals like these are both appalling and un-American.

In Congress, we must continue to fight against these anti-immigrant proposals and to push for comprehensive immigration reform, and we must work to ensure that every person who is eligible for naturalization understands the process that it takes to become a U.S. citizen and has a voice in our great democracy.

CONGRATULATING JEFF HERRALA

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

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Jeff Herrala of Andover for being named the 2015 Cadet of the Year.

Jeff graduated first in his class from Anoka High School, where he excelled in both academics and athletics.

Due to Jeff's stellar accomplishments both inside the classroom and out, my predecessor, Michele Bachmann, awarded Jeff with both the Congressional Certificate of Merit and an appointment to the United States Air Force Academy in 2012.

Jeff currently attends the Air Force Academy in Colorado, where he is studying aeronautical engineering.

It is clear that Jeff truly embodies one of the Air Force's core values: excellence. Throughout Jeff's life and academic career, he has demonstrated nothing short of excellence, and he is beyond deserving of this award.

Jeff, I am proud to recognize you here today, and I look forward to seeing what the future has in store for you.

INCREASE FUNDING FOR THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, thousands of Americans are on Capitol Hill today to attend the Rally for Medical Research and to demand increased funding for the National Institutes of Health.

The NIH supports 400,000 American jobs. In fact, 82 percent of its budget supports research conducted in every State in this Nation, and every dollar of NIH funding generates $2.21 in local economic activity.

The effects are, obviously, not only economic. Thanks in large part to the National Institutes of Health, deaths from heart disease are down 50 percent over the last 40 years, deaths from cancer are down 20 percent since 1991, and the cure rate for childhood cancer is now 80 percent.

From 1997 to 2003, Congress doubled funding for the National Institutes of Health, but, since then, it has fallen by 25 percent when accounting for inflation.

Just yesterday, the National Cancer Institute released a report that identifies research that won't be conducted unless Congress restores its purchasing power with sustained annual funding increases over the next decade. We must not let that happen.

I urge this House to give the NIH the resources it needs to conduct the work our Nation deserves.

SERVING OUR SAVIOR

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, during the August work period, Smith Phillips Building Supply hosted a customer appreciation day and supplier showcase that I attended in Winston-Salem.

While I was there, I had the pleasure of speaking with Jack Shearin, who founded a ministry called Serving our Savior, and Harry Underwood, who chairs the ministry.

Since 2000, this group has been assisting the disabled in Forsyth County by building handicap ramps at their homes. All the work is performed by volunteers, who build 70 to 80 ramps each year.

Since the organization's inception, more than 700 ramps have been built. Serving our Savior does not charge for their ramps. Instead, the organization allows the recipients to pay what they can, and if they are unable to pay, funds are provided by Serving our Savior.

This ministry is a wonderful example of the difference a small group of people can make in its local community, and I applaud their selfless work on behalf of those who need a helping hand.

CONFECTIONERS

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that says you can catch a lot more bees with honey than with vinegar. It turns out that that is true in business, too.

The confectioners industry employs a whopping 55,000 busy worker bees in the United States—that is 55,000 people who are working directly in the confectionery industry—and indirectly supports another 400,000 jobs in other industries from retail to trucking.

Every confectionery job created in the United States supports another seven; but Congress continues to maintain an unbelievably wrongheaded policy that is destroying these jobs.

The Department of Commerce found that protectionist provisions in the 2008 farm bill destroyed three jobs for every job they saved. They have cost consumers and businesses as much as $14 billion since 2008, and they have cost taxpayers over $300 million in subsidies.

We have lost over 125,000 jobs in sugar-related industries since 1997. We cannot continue to hurt our own workers and consumers alike. This is not a sugar high. This is a sugar low.

I urge Congress to pass the bipartisan Sugar Reform Act so we can provide relief to small- and medium-sized businesses.

CHUCK HAUPTMAN

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

Mr. ZINKE. Madam Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to a Billings resident, a World War II veteran, and a fabled member of the Army 10th Mountain Division K Company, Chuck Hauptman.

Seventy years ago, the young lieutenant was crawling on his belly up Mount Belvedere under the cover of darkness. The K Company was charged with leading the allied assault on the Germans through the minefields—set up along the steepest peak—and driving the Germans out of Italy.

On one February night, they battled snow, darkness, vertical climbs, freezing temperatures, and booby traps, all while under the heavy machine gun fire of the Nazis.

The K Company was in combat for 110 days against Nazi forces in the Italian Alps. During this time, Lieutenant Hauptman was shot and wounded in battle while assaulting a machine gun nest. Like many young men, he went back to battle.

It is easy to forget the young men who were sent to the battle in World War II. We look at our veterans and the aging today of our World War II veterans.

Remember, as our young men go to battle, that our Nation asks our youngest men and women to go to battle and fight for this country, and we should never forget the sacrifice.

When we go to war, we send our Nation's best. I am proud to recognize Chuck Hauptman as one of our Nation's best. He represents the best of Montana, the best of our country, and the best of our youth.

□ 1215

5,000 ROLE MODELS OF EXCELLENCE PROJECT

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Madam Speaker, almost a half century ago, while serving as an elementary school principal in Miami, I sensed a void in the lives of the boys who were always being sent to my office because of disruptive behavior.

The one thing they all had in common was the lack of an adult male to love them and guide them along life's often tricky paths. I founded the 5,000 Role Models of Excellence Project to rescue these boys of color from futures fueled by drugs, poverty, or prison.

The 5,000 Role Models of Excellence is recognized by President Obama's My Brother's Keeper initiative. It is an in-school program in Florida's public schools. These boys have earned more than $10 million in college scholarships, and so many have returned and now serve as role models to the 10,000 boys now in the program.

There are 109 chapters in Miami-Dade County schools, the fourth largest school district in the Nation, 30 chapters in Pinellas County/St. Petersburg schools, and 10 chapters in Duvall County, Jacksonville, Florida.

Please welcome the Miami Northwestern Senior High School chapter who are up in the gallery today. I love you, and I am so proud of each and every one of you.

Welcome to Washington.

HONORING VILLAGE OF PINECREST POLICE OFFICER EDISON CRUZ

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Officer Edison Cruz for being named the officer of the second quarter of 2015 of the police department at the Village of Pinecrest, my hometown.

Officer Edison is an invaluable member of the Pinecrest police DUI enforcement program and is highly regarded for his knowledge in this important area of policing and community safety work. Officer Edison's leadership is further exemplified by his role in the coordination of the department's training regarding new DUI blood warrants requirements.

In addition to this most recent honor, Officer Cruz has received two awards from Mothers Against Drunk Driving, MADD, for his successful efforts to protect the public from the terrible crime of drunk driving.

I thank Officer Cruz for his dedication and important work in the service of the people of the place I am so proud to call my home, the Village of Pinecrest.

Congratulations, Officer Edison Cruz.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, if it is September, it must mean another shutdown on the horizon. The same small band within the House majority is demanding another shutdown of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen this movie before. In the mid-1990s, conservatives shut down the Federal Government, demanding cuts to Medicare, threatening the healthcare security of seniors.

Just 2 years ago, the government was shut down as conservatives demanded an end to the Affordable Care Act, threatening the healthcare security of millions of Americans. This time, the demand is to end funding for Planned Parenthood, threatening the healthcare security of millions of women, many of them low income.

A recent poll showed that more than 7 out of 10 Americans want Congress to do its job and reach a budget agreement, but like a bad horror movie franchise, the GOP keeps turning out shutdown sequel after shutdown sequel.

Guess what—the American people don't get to walk out on this sequel. They have to sit and suffer through it.

DON SHAW'S RETIREMENT

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

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a faithful servant of the people of Missouri, Mr. Don Shaw. Don has served the members of Missouri's rural electric cooperatives for 40 years in a variety of capacities, from his start as an electrical engineer to his most recent post as general manager and CEO of Central Electric Power Cooperative.

Don is an outspoken leader in protecting reliable, affordable sources of electricity. His vision and foresight allowed him to take advantage of new technologies, giving high priority to innovative and cost-effective methods to better serve members.

Don has created programs to help alleviate or minimize outage shortage during extreme weather and other natural disasters. In addition, Don helped to build a robust network of fiber optic services to assist the rural membership in staying up to date with an increasingly connected world.

Don has been an active and effective spokesman here at Capitol Hill and back in the Missouri State House. I know this is not the end of service he will provide to his community, State, and country, but merely the end of one more chapter in an extraordinary life.

I would, again, like to thank Don Shaw for his service and wish him the best of luck in his future endeavors.

IMPROVING AIR TRAVEL

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of long-suffering airline passengers. All of us know that air travel is becoming more and more uncomfortable.

At a time when airlines treat passengers so poorly, subjecting us to decreased legroom, cramped planes, more

seats in each row, charging extra fees for luggage or snacks, and many other inconveniences, many people are understandably upset that a CEO of a major airline will receive a golden parachute with up to $20 million in compensation and free first-class airline tickets for life.

The airline industry is expected to double its profits this year as compared to last year, and even though the fuel prices have dropped 50 percent, ticket prices have barely budged, but what has changed is smaller seats and less legroom.

Since 9/11, the traveling public has complied graciously and patiently with all the new regulations, but once they board the airplane, they are squeezed at every side.

I will soon be introducing legislation that improves the flying experience for the flying public. I think Congress needs to look out for the consumer.

CHIWAUKEE PRAIRIE ILLINOIS BEACH LAKE PLAIN

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Chiwaukee Prairie Illinois Beach Lake Plain for being designated as a Ramsar Wetland of International Importance.

As the 38th Ramsar Wetland in the United States, this designation recognizes the Lake Plain for its globally significant contribution to biodiversity and importance to human health and economy.

Mr. Speaker, wetlands are among the Earth's most diverse and productive ecosystems, providing flood control, food, and freshwater. The Lake Plain protects diverse natural communities, including globally rare wetlands, while still being open to the public. This gives our community the chance to experience and enjoy nature, while learning about biodiversity and how to conserve our natural resources.

I specifically want to congratulate the many groups that made this conservation effort possible, including the Lake County Forest Preserve District, the Chiwaukee Prairie Preservation Fund, and the Illinois Department of Natural Resources.

This honor is only the beginning for the Chiwaukee Prairie Illinois Beach Lake Plain. I look forward to seeing what else they will accomplish in the future.

OPPOSING A GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN AND RENEWING THE CALL TO CREATE JOBS

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

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, we have only 6 legislative days left to avoid a reckless and unnecessary government shutdown. I come to the floor to, once again, urge the leadership of this House to focus on jobs.

We need to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, and we need to pass a long-term highway bill and to invest in America's infrastructure, but this House is busy attacking women's health care instead of defending America's economy.

Instead of creating jobs with a highway bill to rebuild America, the majority is fixated on misguided attempts to defund Planned Parenthood. Instead of creating jobs by supporting manufacturers who export to the world, this House is pushing companies to export American jobs.

It is time for this House to focus on rebuilding America and to support American businesses by getting back to the business of the American people.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR'S FIDUCIARY RULE

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

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to express great concern about the Department of Labor's fiduciary rule. This is a rule that is going to have a substantial impact on lower-income and middle-income savers, the men and women and the families that we want to get good advice from advisers so they can save and plan for their retirement. This rule is going to make it harder for American families to save for that eventual day of retirement.

For decades, my constituents in Wisconsin have been served by well-regulated financial institutions, and they include the mutually owned cooperatives and the fraternal membership organizations. These organizations only do well if they serve their customers and their clients well, and if they don't serve them, the clients walk down the street, and they go somewhere else.

This Department of Labor fiduciary rule is going to take the advice away from folks who need the most advice when they are saving. It is an idea that Washington knows best and that people with full disclosure can't make the right decisions for their families.

This rule is a disaster, and my concern is less people are going to save, which means more people are going to be reliant on the Federal Government. That is a wrong approach. Let's not let this rule go through.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, in 6 legislative days, our government will shut down. This is a bad idea.

Last time the government shut down, our economy lost more than $20 billion, $4 billion in tax refunds were delayed, 20,000 veterans disability claims per week were delayed, and $140 million in small business loan applications were not processed. If you look at the analysis, over those 2 weeks, 120,000 fewer jobs were created. This is a bad idea.

In Sacramento County, my home community, thousands of employees of the VA, Department of the Interior, and other agencies were threatened. This hurts American families.

It doesn't have to be this way, Mr. Speaker. We could come together, put together a budget, keep the government open, and get people back to work. That is what we are sent here to do.

Let's work together, Democrats and Republicans. Let's avoid a government shutdown, and let's put America back to work.

DELIGHT BREIDEGAM, JR.

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleague Representative RYAN COSTELLO in celebrating the life of and remembering DeLight Breidegam, Jr.

If you have a Deka battery in your car, your motorcycle, or tractor, it is the offspring of a product manufactured by his company, East Penn Manufacturing, and developed by DeLight and his business partner, Karl Gasche.

DeLight started his business with his father at the age of 20. He and his father, DeLight, Sr., worked tirelessly, both at their small company and at part-time jobs, to help make ends meet. Through their tenacious talent, DeLight grew a business that now employs over 7,000 people in Berks County, Pennsylvania, and beyond.

I just wanted to say it was an honor for me to know this great man. He drove me around his battery empire. He showed me his farmhouse, and I said: ''How did this business begin, DeLight?''

He said: ''Well, my father sent me out in the backyard to fix the battery in the tractor.''

I said: ''DeLight, I am just glad he didn't send you out there to go shovel manure. We would have a fertilizer empire right here in this community.''

Nevertheless, he was an extraordinary man, generous, kind, caring. He supported universities—like Moravian College—Lehigh Valley Hospital, and so many other charities.

I wanted to pay tribute to the life and memory of DeLight Breidegam, Jr.

AIR FORCE CELEBRATES 68TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Ms. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, this week, we are celebrating a very special birthday; the United States Air Force is turning 68.

The anniversary is especially important to me because of the men and women I represent at Tyndall Air Force Base in Panama City.

Since my election to Congress, I have gotten to know a great many of them, from three star generals to newly enlisted airmen, and I could not be prouder of their service to our Nation.

Today, the F–22 Raptor from Tyndall's 95th Fighter Squadron are deployed in Europe, supporting the NATO Baltic air patrol mission.

On this momentous anniversary, our grateful Nation says thank you to the 95th Fighter Squadron and all the men and women serving in the United States Air Force around the world.

Aim high. Fly, fight, win.

□ 1230

HONORING DELIGHT BREIDEGAM, JR.

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

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleague Mr. DENT to thank and honor a Berks County innovator for his leadership and dedication to the community.

Mr. Speaker, DeLight Breidegam, Jr., passed away last week at the age of 88. He was cofounder and chairman emeritus of East Penn Manufacturing. Under his leadership, East Penn grew to be Berks County's second largest employer.

The company is nothing short of an American success story. East Penn began as a dream of the Breidegam family following World War II. DeLight frequently cited the shortage of batteries during the war as the spark to start the business. Along with his father, they soon started their battery business in a small, one-room creamery. Since then, the Breidegam family has been committed to producing batteries.

I had the good fortune to meet with DeLight about a month ago. The value that he placed on his employees was palpable in speaking with him. I must say that it is a very, very special thing when you hear someone speak about their employees in the way that he spoke so lovingly of his, still calling and speaking with them every single day.

He will be missed. He is a tremendous, tremendous asset, as is his company, to the Berks County community; and while we are sad for his passing, Mr. DENT and I wish to recognize him for all his great and positive accomplishments in the community.

LET'S WORK ON KEEPING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OPEN

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, we are 2 weeks away from a shutdown of the Federal Government. What does that mean for communities like the one I represent in Colorado? Our Federal labs funding Federal research, funding for our universities, our national parks.

When you hear about something like our national parks closing, many people think, okay, maybe it means I delay our vacation. What does it mean to the thousands of people who live in Estes Park and our communities in Grand County, supported almost entirely by Rocky Mountain National Park, which millions of Americans enjoy every year? If they curtail their season by several weeks, they can't afford the rent for their store and can't afford to put their kids through college.

I also want to draw attention to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. After 50 years as one of our country's most successful recreation and conservation programs, funding needs to be reauthorized by September 30 or it could be lost forever.

There are so many things we could be discussing with only 14 days until a government shutdown. Instead, this body is about to go into debating two bills which the President will veto which don't fund a single thing with regards to keeping the Federal Government open.

Let's focus on what we need to do. Let's get to work. Let's make sure we can grow our economy and keep the Federal Government open.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 17, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, U.S. Capitol,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 17, 2015 at 9:05 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 70.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 73.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 74.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 348, RESPONSIBLY AND PROFESSIONALLY INVIGORATING DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 758, LAWSUIT ABUSE REDUCTION ACT OF 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 420 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 420

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 348) to provide for improved coordination of agency actions in the preparation and adoption of environmental documents for permitting determinations, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-26. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 758) to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment

thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of September 24, 2015, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on House Resolution 420 currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, where are the jobs? The question resonates throughout our Nation. It is the driving force behind every solution the Republican majority has offered to this body and every solution this administration has rejected.

I am pleased to bring forward this rule on behalf of the Committee on Rules. This rule provides for consideration of H.R. 348, the RAPID Act, and H.R. 758, the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act of 2015.

The Committee on Rules met on this measure yesterday evening and heard testimony from a Republican member of the Committee on the Judiciary and two Democratic members of the Committee on the Judiciary. The Committee on Rules solicited amendments for both these measures, but no amendments were submitted for the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act, making the rule closed. There were 11 amendments submitted for the RAPID Act by both Republican and Democratic Members. This rule makes 10 of those in order. Let me repeat that: 11 amendments submitted, and 10 of those amendments are on the floor. Both the RAPID Act and the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act went through regular order in the Committee on the Judiciary, including robust amendment debate.

This rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary for each piece of legislation.

I appreciate the hard work of the Committee on the Judiciary chairman, Mr. BOB GOODLATTE, and his full committee and subcommittee staffs in bringing forward these key reforms. It would take more than 60 minutes to list all the ways Republicans have worked to encourage economic growth and create jobs in the 114th Congress. We have worked tirelessly to pass litigation reforms that would promote access to court and ensure the cost of litigation isn't being used to force settlements.

I am a proud cosponsor of the RAPID Act because men and women across the Nation are ready to go back to work. Republicans are committed to giving job creators the confidence to take projects off the drawing board and onto the worksite.

A 2012 U.S. Chamber of Commerce study of proposed projects in just one sector of the economy, the energy sector, found that if a modest number of these projects were allowed to move forward and begin construction, the direct and indirect economic benefits would be tremendous—hundreds of thousands of jobs and billions of dollars annually.

Hundreds of thousands of jobs and billions of dollars are in the pipeline, and Republicans believe we should streamline the approval process so that these projects are either approved or denied, not left languishing year after year after year.

Americans need jobs now. They have bills to pay and families to feed. The RAPID Act is one of a number of solutions offered by House Republicans that would break down unnecessary Federal barriers and allow employers to break ground on the projects that offer Americans jobs and economic growth.

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, NEPA, was designed for an important purpose, one that should be preserved. The Committee on the Judiciary has done important work exploring the original goals of NEPA and hearing from experts in the field and academic scholars. The facts are clear: The NEPA process we have today is far removed from what the authors intended. It is normal for the review process to take years and years, and in some cases over a decade. Imagine how the world has changed in the past 10 years. It is absolutely mind-boggling that a review process for any project would take a decade.

We live in a world where technology has made the impossible possible. There is no excuse for relying on old methods or overly complex regulatory frameworks. It is time for Federal regulators to stop tying up capital and prioritizing endless paper pushing over job creation.

We can do better as a nation. Our economy and our families depend on us doing better.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding the customary 30 minutes.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 348, the RAPID Act, is an attempt to limit flexibility and eliminate the public's role in environmental review and decisionmaking processes. H.R. 758 would force judges to impose sanctions against any claim that appears to lack support or involve a novel legal theory.

These are no doubt important issues to debate and discuss, and we will have that time on the floor, but I want to address what this body is failing to address. Though the subject matter of these two bills couldn't be different, neither one of them relates to the fact that we are 6 legislative days before a job-killing, money-wasting shutdown of government.

Now, when we hear 6 legislative days, let me translate that for normal days that Americans have. That is actually 14 days. We are 14 days until we risk the government shutting down. Of the next 14 days, Congress is only scheduled to work 6. Now, by the way, we should thank Pope Francis for that, because before Pope Francis scheduled his visit, Congress was scheduled to work 4 of the next 14 days.

Now, if everything were going wonderfully and this body was a model of keeping the government open and fulfilling its responsibilities, I think the American people would say: ''Well, guess what, Congress. You deserve a vacation.'' But that is not what I hear from my constituents. They are not saying that we should be on vacation 8 out of the next 14 days when we are facing a government shutdown.

Not only are we facing a government shutdown now, but we are 76 days after the expiration of the Export-Import Bank, which already has lost at least 500 jobs here in our country. We are 41 days until authorizing legislation to maintain our Federal highway systems expire. We have already passed that deadline twice and done short-term extensions.

In my August townhall meetings—and I had a number of them across the district—I do not recall any of my constituents telling me their family's top concerns are we start eliminating environmental reviews and public health standards.

While we are wasting unconscionable time on issues when we are only 6 legislative days or 14 real days from a shutdown, we wonder why this body is losing popularity every day among the American public and will continue to.

To my friends across the aisle, I want to work with you. My Democratic colleagues want to work with you. We want to work to avoid a government shutdown. We want to work with you to reauthorize the Federal highway bill.

These are not Democratic or Republican principles. Both parties believe in a Federal Government; both parties believe in highways and investment in infrastructure. So let's do that. I think we should do that all 14 days, or at

least 12 of the next 14 days rather than 6, but at least let's get to work and do it.

I think we share many of the same domestic and foreign policy interests, and hopefully we can agree upon our priorities. The average American family in my district and across our country has no interest in grandstanding on display. They have no desire to send their hard-earned dollars in taxes to a body that continues to govern crisis by crisis, sometimes after the fact.

□ 1245

So I implore my colleagues to use the next 14 days—or, if they want to take 8 of them off, 6 days—to consider the threat we are facing and the hardship a shutdown would cause in districts like mine that rely on two major universities to receive Federal funding; Federal labs; national parks that support countless local businesses that would close if the Federal Government is closed; the Centers for Disease Control, with a strong presence in Fort Collins; and the many other secondary and tertiary effects that a Federal shutdown would have.

Let's find a way to avert it. There is still time. Let's not wait until it is 2 days or 1 day or zero days or negative 1 day or just hours remaining on the countdown clock. Let's pass a bipartisan bill to fund government. Let's reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. Let's make a long-term commitment to our Federal highway system and infrastructure to keep our economy growing.

After we fulfill these basic needs, these self-created crises that Congress is presented, then let's have a discussion about limitation of irregular lawsuits or eradication of environmental reviews on public projects. We can have our disagreements. We can debate them. But let's get our priorities right.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we just got back after spending time in our districts, and I know, in my case, one of the reasons that we are back today dealing with regulatory issues is just a couple of examples that just continue to come up in conversations.

There were always questions about, frankly, what are we doing in Washington, what are we not doing in Washington, but there was a common theme when I went to small business, factories, and when we do roundtables. The common theme was: Why is Washington constantly keeping me from doing what I can do or need to do in my business? Why are we continuing to get regulation after regulation after regulation that keep us from expanding our business?

I had a businessowner tell us in a roundtable that right now there were several businesses he knew that would be willing to hire upwards of 20, 30, 40 folks, but right now they are bound by the caps that they find under the healthcare law. They don't want to go over a certain number—that magic 49. They don't want to get involved in other areas that are keeping them constricted to this point.

So when we look at these packages of bills that we are looking at, frankly, we are looking at everyday moms and dads; we are looking at businessowners; we are looking at the folks who are the economic engines of the United States; and we are saying the government should not be the inhibitor of your company. The government should not be the part that is stopping you from creating jobs, from getting that next big idea, from having that next product that hits the market that takes us to that different level or hiring that next person who has that spark, that creative energy to say: ''Here's the next idea that changes even how we are here today.''

So when we deal with this and we look at it, the question really is: What drives jobs? The House majority, the Republican majority, constantly has looked at what it means to be an entrepreneur and to have people that you employ. What does it mean? It means giving someone a chance.

This summer, I had the awesome fun or joy, if you will, of watching my son get his first job. He started to work at a grocery store, and I can remember at first he was all excited. He went through all the process and he got that job. The best day was when he actually came home after working and he was tired, but yet it was payday. He came in and he looked at me and he said: ''Dad, I got my paycheck.''

And for a moment, regardless of how much that check was—this is not a story about seeing taxes for the first time; my son has lived in my house and he understands the burden of taxes, so it was not any of that—it was just the joy in his eyes that someone had given him a job and that he went to work. It was that pride of having money that he could spend. There is a new person in the economic engine.

That is why we continue to bring these bills forward, so that government can be out of the way and be its proper role, not the roadblock to job creation. When we do that, then the people of the United States can look at this House Republican majority and know our best interests are with those who get up every day looking to make life just a little bit better.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up legislation to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I first would like to thank the gentleman from Colorado for the time to speak on this important issue.

I rise today in opposition to the previous question in order to give House Members an opportunity to vote on reauthorizing the charter of the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. Speaker, it is well past time to end the ideologically driven shutdown of the Export-Import Bank that has prohibited this critical agency from continuing to support United States businesses and their workers.

For almost 2 years, Democrats have been sounding the alarm that a shutdown of the Ex-Im Bank would be devastating for American businesses and their workers. Since Republicans in Congress let the Bank's charter expire in June, companies around the country have been preparing to lay off employees, and many have stopped expansion plans because they now lack the critical financing tools that Ex-Im provides.

In fact, just last week, General Electric announced that, due to the GOP shutdown of the Ex-Im Bank, more than 500 jobs will be shipped to places like France and China. Last month, Boeing told its workers that it expected to cut as many as several hundred jobs at its southern California-based satellite factory after a multimillion-dollar contract was scuttled due to uncertainty about the future of the Export-Import Bank.

Republican obstructionism is also having a direct impact on countless small businesses around this country, many of which are set to lose their Ex-Im-backed insurance policies in the coming weeks.

Mr. Speaker, a majority of this House supports reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank, but if we don't give Members the opportunity to vote up or down on reopening the Bank's doors today, the self-inflicted shutdown of the Ex-Im Bank may continue for months on end.

If that scenario plays out, the damage to our businesses, their workers, and our economy will only get worse. The consequences for average taxpayers would get worse as well. Because the Bank generates income through fees it charges for its services, failure to reauthorize the Bank means throwing away billions of dollars that would otherwise be transferred to hard-working American taxpayers. Accordingly, we should reauthorize the Bank. If we did, we could raise billions of dollars in profit for U.S. taxpayers over the coming years. The House should take a position.

Mr. Speaker and Members, we have too many Republicans, our friends on

the opposite side of the aisle, claim they support small businesses. They want to do everything that they can to get rid of the regulatory obstacles to small businesses being able to grow and expand. They talk about this with community banks. They talk about this with all kinds of businesses. But look what they are doing.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. They have absolutely stood in the way of reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank.

And where does that place this country? It places us in a position where we cannot compete with other countries who fully support the export opportunity. So I would ask my colleagues to please vote on this bill at this time.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK), a leader in the effort to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question so that we might indeed take up legislation to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. Because I think the gentleman from Georgia has it exactly right, the question before this Chamber, before this Congress, before the President, before the American people is: Where are the jobs?

Now we know where the jobs, in part, have come from over the last 8 years. In fact, about 1.5 million of them have come through the activity of the Export-Import Bank, where they supported $200 billion in exports spread out across 7,300 companies. And we know where the jobs have not come from since July 1, when the charter of the Export-Import Bank expired, at which time there were 116 deals frozen, constituting $9.3 billion in activity.

Who were they?

Norwest Ingredients is a company in my home State that sells mint flavoring for the manufacturers of candy and oral care. The company currently employs about a dozen employees. It is a small business.

Without Ex-Im, many small businesses like Norwest aren't going to be able to extend terms to foreign buyers, and they will have to ask for cash in advance. When they do, they will lose their business to other countries who have export credit authorities.

By way of reminder, every single developed nation on the face of the Earth has an export credit authority right now, except the United States of America.

Combustion Associates in California, they spent 3 years closing a deal for a new power project in Nigeria that would generate $39 million in revenue and create 30 new American jobs. The deal is on hold, along with two other projects that would have been worth nearly $50 million in revenue and 100 jobs.

GE, the gentlewoman from California shared the sad news of the 500 jobs that are leaving these shores as a consequence of our failure to reauthorize the Ex-Im.

Digital Check, an Illinois company, sells check scanning equipment to clients in nearly 100 countries. Tom Anderson is the family-run company's chief executive. He says: We're losing now a quarter million in sales in British markets and around $300,000 in India. And that half-million-dollar hit is causing the company to reevaluate whether they will suspend, altogether, their scanner leasing services.

FirmGreen—Steve Wilburn, president of FirmGreen and, I might add, a proud and highly decorated marine—laid off 10 of its 17 employees last year because the company lost $60 million in contracts during our latest period of uncertainty.

They are now, right as we speak, right as we are attempting to answer the question of where are the jobs, competing for a $300 million project in the Philippines, and it hinges on securing export credit financing from the Ex-Im. Without it, that business is going to likely go to a South Korean rival and, with it, the 400 jobs he would have added.

Boeing, again, the gentlewoman made mention of layoffs in El Segundo, California. That was not the first but the second satellite sale to a foreign company and country that we lost as a consequence of the uncertainty surrounding the Export-Import Bank.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HECK of Washington. The outgoing CEO, Mr. MCNERNEY, said: "We never would have considered that before this craziness on Ex-Im. We love making and designing airplanes in the U.S. We are now forced to think about doing it differently."

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, we have now moved beyond the theoretical and the abstract. We are now in the phase of this debate where real people with real jobs and real families are losing their livelihood. The question is right: Where are the jobs? The answer is: In reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank.

Defeat the previous question so that we might do what a majority of this body wants to do, which is continue to compete in a global economy.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the will of the majority is being thwarted in this House, the people's House. Mr. BOEHNER, our Speaker, said when he took his office as Speaker that the House worked best when the House was allowed to work its will. Mr. Speaker, let the House work its will.

□ 1300

We are about to take a vote on whether this House should move to reopen the Export-Import Bank and save thousands—thousands—of jobs that Speaker BOEHNER has admitted will be lost without our action.

The Export-Import Bank is a critical tool that supports job creation here in America by helping American businesses compete in foreign markets—in other words, making goods here with American workers and selling them abroad. That is what we need to be doing. The Export-Import Bank facilitates that happening. It has over 300 votes out of 435 on this floor, but we cannot vote if it is not brought to the floor.

When the Speaker and majority leader allowed the Bank's authorization to expire in June, they did so with the full knowledge that a reauthorization has the votes to pass and will pass with strong, bipartisan support if brought to the floor. Now, we have a chance to defeat the previous question and bring that bill to the floor today.

Now, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, to some of my colleagues who may be new, that voting down this rule, defeating the previous question is a vote to open the Export-Import Bank.

Now, I know some of you will say: Well, it is a procedural vote. My party makes me do this.

Well, if you have that answer, look in the eye those who are losing their jobs and say: I had to do this for my party, not my country, not the competitiveness of America, not for American jobs, not for American businesses, but I voted for the previous question for my party.

Sometimes, my friends, party demands too much. When you raise your hand, it is to defend the Constitution and laws thereof, but in a real sense, it is to defend and make America better.

Let's refuse to engage in what Chamber of Commerce CEO Tom Donohue today called a "unilateral disarmament in the face of other governments' far more aggressive export credit agencies."

Let me repeat that. That is Tom Donohue, president of the Chamber of Commerce. The Republican Party used to be a party of business, the party that wanted to grow jobs. We talk about that all the time.

Well, my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, you have an opportunity to do that on this upcoming vote. Don't do as Tom Donohue today said you might do, a "unilateral disarmament in the face of other governments' far more aggressive export credit agencies."

Last week, General Electric announced it would be moving 500 jobs from New York, Texas, South Carolina, and Maine to Europe and China because of the failure of this Congress to

pass the Export-Import Bank reauthorization. There are over 300 votes for that on this floor.

The American people think we are dysfunctional. They are right. They don't trust us because they don't think their board of directors is doing the job they sent us here to do. They are right. They are angry. They are anxious.

Let us for once, this day—we haven't funded the government yet; hopefully, we will get that done—but at least this day, given the opportunity on this previous question, say that we are going to make America competitive and we are not going to unilaterally disarm.

This is something the Business Roundtable wants us to do. It is something the Chamber of Commerce wants us to do. It is something the National Association of Manufacturers wants us to do. It is something that organized labor wants us to do.

In the face of unity of purpose, in the face of a majority of votes on this floor, party regularity still says: Tough. Tough. Yes, there may be 300 votes on this bill, but we are not going to allow it to come to the floor.

Ladies and gentlemen in your offices or on this floor, America expects you to do better. America expects you to be responsible. America does not want you to be simply partisan. America does not want you to be cowed by a small minority of this House and by radical groups outside this House who threaten Members they will spend a million or $2 million or $3 million to defeat them in a primary.

America wants us to do the right thing. America wants us to have the courage of our convictions. America expects this House to reflect the majority opinion, not be dictated to by a small minority.

Mr. Speaker, allow your Members to vote against the previous question. If you do so, we will bring to this floor the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank; and, ladies and gentlemen of this House—and all Americans ought to know as well—it will pass.

Bring the Export-Import Bank bill reauthorization to this floor so America can continue to be competitive and create jobs here in America. That is what our constituents want us to do.

Vote against the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, we are about to take a vote on whether this house should move to reopen the Export-Import Bank and save thousands of jobs that even Speaker BOEHNER has admitted will be lost without our action.

The Export-Import Bank is a critical tool that supports job creation here in America by helping American businesses compete in foreign markets.

When the speaker and majority leader allowed the bank's authorization to expire in June, they did so with the full knowledge that a reauthorization has the votes to pass—and will pass with strong bipartisan support—if brought to the floor.

Now we have a chance to defeat the previous question and bring that bill to the floor today.

Let's end the uncertainty that has already caused businesses to hold back investment in job creation and to move American jobs overseas.

Let's refuse to engage in what Chamber of Commerce CEO Tom Donohue today called a "unilateral disarmament in the face of other governments' far more aggressive export credit agencies."

Last week, general electric announced that it would be moving 500 jobs from New York, Texas, South Carolina, and Maine to Europe and China because of the failure to keep the export-import bank open.

Congress has a responsibility to help grow jobs here—not send them overseas.

It's time to reopen the export-import bank.

Defeat this previous question.

Bring the export-import bank up for a vote.

And let's complete the task that America's workers and their employers have asked us to do for months.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of my friend: Do you have any more speakers? Or are you prepared to close?

Mr. POLIS. We have a lot of Democrats that want to talk about keeping government open. I hear no Republicans here.

With good respect to my friend from Georgia, where are the Republican ideas to keep government open?

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Well, I am trying to get an answer to a question. That means you do not have any more speakers on this. Are you ready to close?

Mr. POLIS. We are ready to use all of our time.

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

Mr. POLIS. May I inquire of the Speaker how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 9½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 23 minutes remaining.

Mr. POLIS. May I inquire of the gentleman from Georgia if he plans to use his 23 minutes?

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. That is why I was asking the gentleman from Colorado if he is prepared to close. I have no other speakers.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I will use our 9 minutes. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, shortly, I will be offering an amendment to the rule. The amendment will waive the two-thirds requirement to consider a rule on the same day as reported from the Rules Committee on the legislative days of September 24 and September 25, 2015.

This will provide the flexibility necessary during the Pope's visit to ensure the House completes its business on behalf of the American people.

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

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

Again, I think it is clear. We have had many Democrats coming to the floor talking about what we should be doing. I think the gentleman from Georgia might be the only Republican in the Chamber. Maybe there is one other in the back. I don't have my glasses on.

We have a lot of ideas for keeping government open. Mainly, let's pass a continuing resolution to do it now. Let's work more than 6 days out of the next 14. Let's stay here until we can keep government open, until we can reauthorize the transportation and infrastructure bill.

It sounds obvious to me; yet there just didn't seem to be any interest from the other side. No Republicans have approached me about keeping government open. I hope you do, Mr. Speaker. I hope you encourage your colleagues to. There is no one here in the Chamber talking about what we can do to avoid a job-crushing government shutdown, which we are 14 days away from.

Instead, we are talking about unrelated bills. Now, I don't deny that these bills deserve their day in the sun. I just question whether, when we are 6 legislative days from a job-crushing shutdown, it is the time to discuss whether we should amend requirements set out by the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, that would reduce the role of public input and turn the idea of NEPA on its head by eliminating any illusion of objective or scientific analysis by allowing private sponsors to write parts of their own environmental reviews.

Now, look, we can discuss that. I am strongly for reforming the NEPA process. As an example, if we can make it easier to site renewal energy projects, I am a sponsor of a bill to expedite the NEPA process for solar and wind infrastructure projects.

Look, there are people who support this terrible bill in its current form; I completely understand that, but this bill does nothing to avert a job-destroying government shutdown that we are only 6 legislative days from reaching.

Now, the gentleman from Georgia mentioned this, what we call a martial law amendment. With this amendment that he is proposing with this rule—we just got notice of it last minute here on the floor—he is offering an amendment that will allow any bill to be brought up under martial law next week.

Now, in honor of Pope Francis' visit, I hope that they have a bill that they plan to bring to the floor under martial law to reduce our carbon emissions and finally do something to impact climate change, which I hope that Pope Francis will be addressing.

I also hope that, under martial law, they will bring forward a bill to replace our broken immigration system with a humane system, with a pathway to citizenship that replaces the chaos we have, with the rule of law, border security, and a pathway to normalization and citizenship for hard-working, aspiring Americans who are already here.

Now, I am not going to bet the ship that that is what they are going to do

with this martial law, but the fact of the matter is, from a process perspective, we—myself, my colleagues, and I think most of the Republican rank and file—simply don't know what they are going to do with that authority.

This is going around the normal rules of the House to establish a mechanism to avoid the normal process, avoid the normal process through Rules Committee and, through martial law, bring some sort of bill. I hope it is an immigration reform bill. I hope it is a climate change bill. I don't think it is.

Based on what we are seeing this week, it will probably be some NEPA bill or some—I don't know—some other bill that doesn't avoid a government shutdown to the floor of the House.

Maybe it will be a bill that is a Republican funding bill that will have a Presidential veto threat over it. That doesn't avoid a shutdown. Remember, the only way we can avoid a shutdown is the House, the Senate, and the President of the United States are on the same page for legislation to avoid a government shutdown.

Let's give them the benefit of the doubt, and we will be back next week, and I will hold my criticism. I hope it is an immigration reform bill. I hope it is a climate change bill.

I hope we honor Pope Francis by bringing forward two of his top priorities in a week that is appropriate, and if that is the case, I will support martial law for those two efforts, and I hope that that is what we will do.

I will withhold judgment until we see what the Republicans attempt to do with this procedural bypass of our normal mechanisms that they have scheduled for next week.

Look, these are bad bills under this rule. They are bad bills today. They would be bad bills if they were appropriate to consider. I believe they are inappropriate to consider in light of a job-crushing government shutdown occurring in 6 legislative days.

The RAPID Act, which would turn the idea of NEPA on its head, is a one-size-fits-all approach. It is not the right approach to NEPA reform.

There are thoughtful, bipartisan ideas that we could put together after we avoid a government shutdown. I am happy to do that.

The LARA Act is even worse. Our country tried a similar framework to LARA in the eighties and early nineties, and there is broad consensus that the experiment failed. Instead of reducing lawsuits, there was an explosion of litigation, causing delays and wasting judicial resources. Why on earth are we giving these failed ideas a second try?

The LARA Act would have prevented landmark decisions like the Brown v. Board of Education, which desegregated schools; Griswold v. Connecticut, which established constitutional protections for right to privacy; and Loving v. Virginia, which ended bans on interracial marriage.

Rather than ''preventing abuse,'' this bill would actually promote civil rights abuses and weaken the courts' ability to crack down on people who seek to discriminate illegally at work or school or at the voting booth, and Congress should not pass this bill, now or ever.

I think it is particularly offensive, when a job-crushing government shutdown is looming, to even be talking about these other items rather than discussing how we can avoid a job-crushing government shutdown.

□ 1315

Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure I am clear. These issues we should discuss. Natural resources. The World Health Organization estimates that 2 million people a year are killed because of air pollution. But putting forth these bills now does nothing to eliminate or deal with a job-crushing government shutdown.

Over just 16 days in 2013, our country lost $24 billion in economic growth, hundreds of thousands of Federal workers were furloughed, contractors and subcontractors were not paid. It is an avoidable scenario. It is a crisis created by Congress. We wonder why people don't like Congress. It is a crisis of our own making.

Why are we threatening the critical, everyday services Americans rely on, the millions of people that work for contractors and subcontractors of the Federal Government?

A small-R republic is a system of governance in which people exert influence over their elected officials, and those representatives are supposed to listen and act upon those requests.

We need to listen to the American people and take the responsible course, Mr. Speaker. I urge my colleagues to join me on this commonsense mission before it is too late.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule and the underlying legislation. We need to reinstate a legislative agenda that aligns with the desires and wills and aspirations of the American people and American businesses.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear, just to clear up a couple of things here. One, let me be clear that nothing in this rule or the amendment waives the normal Rules Committee hearing process.

It simply provides us with the flexibility to consider bills on the floor sooner while the Pope is here. It does nothing to waive the normal committee process for bills that should go to Rules, just to clear up that.

I do appreciate the gentleman from Colorado's concern about our speakers and the fact that he was counting today. I was glad to see that he had three people come to speak on the rule that had nothing to do with the bills in the underlying rule. So that was pretty impressive.

I will stand with one person speaking on the rules and the truth of the fact that regulatory burden has a crushing role on business. I will stand, one, by myself all day.

And then in just a few hours, when we discuss this in the debate process, we will have plenty of people to discuss the actual bills themselves.

So let me close up by talking about what we are here for. My friends across the aisle want to portray House Republicans as being against things and against people.

Yes, it is true we have said ''no'' to bad policies and priorities of the administration. We have refused to turn a blind eye to those who exploit our legal system.

We have said ''no'' to the Federal regulators who are indefinitely delaying projects that would put Americans back to work.

We have said ''no'' to the tax more, spend more, save less, Big Government, job-killing machine that is crushing the American spirit and our economic growth.

But this majority says ''yes'' to solid, principled legislation that protects Americans' personal and economic liberties. Later today, we will say ''yes'' to life.

We will vote to protect the babies born alive despite the efforts to abort them. Regardless of the circumstances in which a baby is born alive, they are a person just like you or I. To fail to recognize their humanity is to deny our own.

This House majority says ''yes'' to fiscal responsibility, ''yes'' to the commonsense principle that our Nation should have a budget and actually stick to it.

We say ''yes'' to responsible oversight efforts because we understand, as our Founding Fathers did, that Americans' rights and liberties are only safe while the Federal Government is held within the bounds of the Constitution.

We say ''yes'' to free market principles because we recognize that economic growth is rooted in the ingenuity of America's entrepreneurs, not government programs.

We have replaced government with growth and regulations with reform. We have restored transparency and trust. We have given our Nation reason to believe that one day our children won't be looking for a job because government has crushed them. They will be creating jobs.

House Republicans have heard the cries of the American people, and today, tomorrow, and every day to come we will continue to fight for them. We will fight so that they can realize their hopes, their dreams, and their ambitions.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COLLINS OF GEORGIA

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 4. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a

report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported on the legislative day of September 24, 2015, or September 25, 2015.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, does this amendment to the rule mean that Members of this body will have less than 24 hours to review any bill we consider next week?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not interpret the meaning of the pending proposition.

Mr. POLIS. Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe the meaning is very straightforward. That is exactly what it means.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 420 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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. 1031) to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. 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 fmal 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. 1031.

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. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the amendment and the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

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

Mr. POLIS. 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 question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3134, DEFUND PLANNED PARENTHOOD ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3504, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 421 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 421

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3134) to provide for a moratorium on Federal funding to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3504) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion. 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 and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon passage of H.R. 3134 the House shall be considered to have: (1) stricken all after the enacting clause of S. 764 and inserted in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 3134, as passed by the House; and (2) passed the Senate bill as so amended.

SEC. 4. Upon passage of H.R. 3504 the House shall be considered to have: (1) stricken all after the enacting clause of S. 1603 and inserted in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 3504, as passed by the House; and (2) passed the Senate bill as so amended.

SEC. 5. House Resolution 408 is laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. ROBY). The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 421 provides closed rules for consideration of H.R. 3134, the Defund Planned Parenthood Act, and H.R. 3504, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

Today, Madam Speaker, we provide for consideration of two vital pieces of legislation addressing one of the most important issues of our time.

On many previous occasions, my colleagues and I have spoken on the issue of abortion and the tragedy it is that unborn children are not safe and protected.

We are not here today, though, debating the policy of abortion on-demand. We are debating specific legislative reactions to horrific wrongs that have come to light: the deliberate dismemberment of unborn children to receive compensation for their organs and other body parts and the failure of abortion facilities to care for children born alive during failed abortions. Even some who support elective abortion agree that those practices are barbaric and must be stopped.

The horrific reality of these practices in the abortion industry have become clear over the past few months, as undercover videos have been released of Planned Parenthood's leaders and affiliates discussing painstakingly dismembering unborn children for compensation.

In these days of 3–D ultrasounds and high-definition screens, it is impossible to hide the humanity of these child victims. They have fingers and toes, heartbeats, and organs developed enough that tissue collectors will pay $60 a specimen for them.

In light of the serious questions raised by these videos, the House Committees on Energy and Commerce, Judiciary, and Oversight and Government Reform have each launched investigations.

While Planned Parenthood does not receive direct Federal funding for abortions, these investigations are warranted, as a recent report from the Government Accountability Office shows that the organization receives an average of $500 million taxpayer dollars each year for other lines of business. Money is fungible, and the Federal funds that Planned Parenthood receives ultimately subsidize their abortion services.

Given the serious allegations that have been raised about Planned Parenthood's abortion practices related to the procurement and sale of tissue and organs from aborted, unborn children, it is appropriate for Congress to pass H.R. 3134, the Defund Planned Parenthood Act, placing a 1-year moratorium on all Federal funds while Congress conducts its investigation.

No organization that performs divisive practices like abortion, particularly in such a gruesome, profitable manner, should receive taxpayer dollars, and this legislation advances that principle.

In addition, the examples of Kermit Gosnell's convictions for murdering children born alive at his house of horrors and separate reports of unborn children may have been born alive or ''intact'' prior to being sold to tissue collectors have exposed the need for strengthening the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act.

The Born-Alive Infants Protection Act, which became law in 2002, extended critical legal protections to babies who are born alive after a failed abortion attempt. That bill passed the House Judiciary Committee with only two dissenting votes and was passed by the Senate by unanimous consent.

The legislation before us today, H.R. 3504, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, goes one step further to protect these vulnerable lives by requiring healthcare practitioners present at the time of birth to administer professional skill, care, and diligence to preserve the life and health of the child.

This small, but important, step ensures the protection and preservation of precious, newborn life by providing for criminal penalties when that life is lost as a result of negligence.

These tiny, precious, vulnerable lives deserve the protection afforded all other persons under the law, and this bill ensures that their lives are protected.

□ 1330

Madam Speaker, I commend this rule and both the underlying bills to my colleagues for their support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina, my good friend, Dr. FOXX, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in very strong opposition to H.R. 3134 and H.R. 3504 and in very strong opposition to the underlying closed rule.

Today, the House should be debating a bill to keep the government open before funding runs out at the end of the month. We have just 6 legislative days before there is a government shutdown—6 legislative days—and instead of tackling this, we are once again debating another Republican attack on women's health.

In 6 legislative days, the government might shut down; and I am worried because, judging from recent events within the Republican caucus, the right hand doesn't know what the extreme right hand is doing. They can't seem to get along with each other, and I am afraid yet there will be another catastrophe and everything will come to a halt, and the people that will suffer will be the people of this country whom we are supposed to represent.

Madam Speaker, in fact, the Republicans were in such a hurry to waste our time with this destructive legislation that one of the bills we are considering, H.R. 3504, had no hearings—not one, none—no markup, and this is the first time we are seeing the bill—and no amendments, by the way. Nobody can offer an amendment. It is totally closed.

Whatever happened to regular order? This process, Madam Speaker, stinks, and it is indefensible.

Of all the measures that have come before the Rules Committee, more than 75 percent have completely ignored regular order and were rushed to the floor without a legislative hearing and markup, denying the people's elected representatives the opportunity to hear the experts and speak up for their constituents. Well, when you look at the politically motivated legislation that regularly comes before this body, I guess it is easy to see why. This is not how the people's House is supposed to work.

Late last night, the Republican majority of the Rules Committee took another shortcut through a process called self-executing that let them slip an amendment offered by Mrs. ELLMERS into today's legislation to redirect funding away from Planned Parenthood facilities. Under regular order, this amendment would have required three waivers—three. It would require three waivers from the committee to be considered on the House floor.

On top of that, the Ellmers amendment would have also violated section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act, which prohibits the consideration of legislation that exceeds a committee's allocation of budget authority. But the Republican-controlled Rules Committee said: Who cares? We are in charge. We don't care about the rules. We don't want to be fair. We don't want to be open. We don't want to be transparent. We are in charge, and we can do whatever we want.

Madam Speaker, this is just another attempt by the House majority to shut out debate on important issues and ignore the House rules when it is convenient for them. During this Congress alone, 118 waivers have been granted; 115 of those waivers, 97 percent, have been for Republicans. Instead of the House Rules Committee, we should be known as the House Break-the-Rules Committee, because that is all the Rules Committee seems to do. It breaks rules, goes around rules, and tries all kinds of trickery to be able to force legislation to the floor that limits debate and doesn't allow Members to offer amendments.

This legislative process in this House has become a joke. It is shameful, and this is not serious legislating.

With one bill after another, Republicans have repeatedly hurt our country's most vulnerable families, and

these bills today are just the latest chapter. This is nothing new.

One of the first acts of the Republican House majority in 2011 was to drive us to the brink of a government shutdown over Planned Parenthood. In October 2013, Republicans did shut down the government by insisting on defunding the Affordable Care Act. Now, 2 years later, they are right back to threatening a Republican government shutdown over Planned Parenthood.

H.R. 3134, the so-called Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015, is a bad and a backward-thinking bill. In the 114th Congress, the House has already taken four anti-women's health votes and today sets the stage for us to take two additional votes to restrict women's access to women's health care. Incredibly, this is already twice the number of anti-women's health votes than at this same point in the 113th and 112th Congresses—and this Congress is not even half over.

In this Republican Congress, facts don't matter. We don't talk about facts. They are inconvenient and they are a nuisance—especially when they get in the way of their extremist political agenda.

The fact is that Planned Parenthood plays a critical role in protecting and providing access to critical health services for both women and men. One in five women has relied on a Planned Parenthood health center for care in her lifetime, and Planned Parenthood serves 2.7 million patients each year. One of the most important statistics that my Republican friends like to ignore is that more than 90 percent of what Planned Parenthood does nationally is preventive care, including cervical cancer screenings, breast cancer screenings, and family planning—not abortion services.

I just came from a luncheon a few minutes ago where we were honoring individuals who were leaders in the cancer prevention field, people who have advocated that it is important for all of us to be able to get checkups on a regular basis in order to prevent cancer; and here we are about to vote on a bill that, if the Republicans get their way, would limit and would eliminate access to lifesaving cancer screenings for countless individuals across this country.

What are you thinking? This is not the way we should be proceeding.

Add to this the fact that Planned Parenthood clinics are often one of the few affordable healthcare options available for many women—nearly 80 percent of women using Planned Parenthood clinics have incomes at or below 150 percent of poverty—and it is easy to see why a majority of Americans don't think Federal funding should be eliminated. In one recent poll, 63 percent of voters, including 72 percent of Independents, do not agree with my Republican friends that Federal funding for Planned Parenthood should be eliminated.

Madam Speaker, we have also heard very little from my friends on the other side of the aisle about the consequences that defunding for Planned Parenthood would have for families across the country. One of the biggest myths perpetrated by Republicans is the idea that our Nation's community health centers—which I love, adore, respect, and support—could somehow magically pick up the slack overnight if Planned Parenthood is defunded.

For the millions of low-income women who depend on Planned Parenthood clinics, this scenario would mean the loss of affordable and accessible contraceptive services and counseling, as well as breast and cervical cancer screenings and testing. The idea that our community health centers could, overnight, suddenly step up and cover millions of new patients is simply wrong and shows a fundamental misunderstanding by Republicans of how our country's healthcare system works.

In fact, the Guttmacher Institute recently found that, in 21 percent of counties with a Planned Parenthood health center, Planned Parenthood is the only safety net family planning provider. The report also states: ''In two-thirds of the 491 counties in which they are located, Planned Parenthood health centers serve at least half of all women obtaining contraceptive care from safety net health centers. In one-fifth of the counties in which they are located, Planned Parenthood sites are the sole safety net family planning center.''

This makes clear just how devastating it would be for these communities to recklessly cut funding for these vital health services for the people who need them most.

Everyone here in this Congress, every single one of us, with the snap of our fingers, can get health care; but with today's bills, Republicans seem to be saying that for families who are poor or who live in rural areas or where this is the only option for preventive care where they live are simply out of luck. Talk about cruel.

Madam Speaker, I have a recent article from the Health Affairs Blog, titled, ''Planned Parenthood, Community Health Centers, and Women's Health: Getting the Facts Right.'' It says: ''a claim that community health centers readily can absorb the loss of Planned Parenthood clinics amounts to a gross misrepresentation of what even the best community health centers in the country would be able to do were Planned Parenthood to lose over 40 percent of its operating revenues overnight as the result of a ban on Federal funding.''

I will enter the full article into the RECORD.

[From Health Affairs Blog, Sept. 8, 2015]

QUANTIFYING PLANNED PARENTHOOD'S CRITICAL ROLE IN MEETING THE NEED FOR PUBLICLY SUPPORTED CONTRACEPTIVE CARE

(By Jennifer Frost)

Over the past few months, legislative attempts to defund Planned Parenthood have flared at both the federal and state levels; these moves are clearly an attempt to shutter Planned Parenthood health centers, potentially depriving women of the contraceptive services and counseling, sexually transmitted infection (STI) testing and treatment, and breast and cervical cancer screening that they provide.

Although proponents of closing Planned Parenthood argue that other providers would be easily able to fill the hole torn in the safety net, credible evidence suggests this is unlikely. In some areas, Planned Parenthood is the sole safety-net provider of contraceptive care. And even where there are other safety-net providers, they, on average, serve far fewer contraceptive clients than do sites operated by Planned Parenthood.

As this debate swirls, the Guttmacher Institute received a request from the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) regarding the publicly supported contraceptive care provided by Planned Parenthood health centers across the country. To respond, Guttmacher staff conducted special tabulations of our Contraceptive Needs and Services 2010 report (the most recent year for which these data are available).

Our analysis shows unequivocally that Planned Parenthood plays a major role in delivering publicly supported contraceptive services and supplies to women who are in need of such care nationwide. In two-thirds of the 491 counties in which they are located, Planned Parenthood health centers serve at least half of all women obtaining contraceptive care from safety-net health centers. In one-fifth of the counties in which they are located, Planned Parenthood sites are the sole safety-net family planning center.

Further, the average Planned Parenthood health center serves significantly more contraceptive clients each year than do safety-net centers run by other types of providers, such as federally qualified health centers (FQHCs) or county health departments. As a result, Planned Parenthood centers serve a greater share of safety-net contraceptive clients than any other type of provider. And, Planned Parenthood sites are more likely to make contraceptive care quickly and easily accessible to the women who need it.

CONTRACEPTIVE CARE BY THE NUMBERS

Below are the key takeaways of Guttmacher's findings related to Planned Parenthood's provision of publicly supported contraceptive care.

Planned Parenthood health centers serve a considerable proportion of all clients obtaining contraceptive care from safety-net health centers.

In 2010, 36 percent of the 6.7 million U.S. women receiving contraceptive care from safety-net family planning health centers were served at Planned Parenthood centers. And there are some areas of the country where women rely particularly heavily on Planned Parenthood: In 18 states, Planned Parenthood health centers serve more than 40 percent of women obtaining contraceptive care from a safety-net family planning health center. In 11 of those 18 states, Planned Parenthood serves more than half the women obtaining contraceptive care from a safety-net health center.

Planned Parenthood health centers often serve most or all of the safety-net contraceptive clients in their county.

In 68 percent of counties with a Planned Parenthood site (332 counties out of 491), these sites serve at least half the women obtaining publicly supported contraceptive services from a safety-net health center. And in 21 percent of counties with a Planned Parenthood site (103 counties), Planned Parenthood serves all of the women obtaining publicly supported contraceptive services from a safety-net health center.

The majority of women who need publicly supported contraceptive care live in counties with a Planned Parenthood health center.

Almost two-thirds (64 percent) of the 19 million women in need of publicly supported contraceptive services and supplies live in counties with a Planned Parenthood health center. Moreover, 30 percent of these women live in counties where Planned Parenthood serves the majority of those obtaining publicly supported contraceptive care from the family planning safety net. (Women are considered to be in need of publicly supported contraception if they have ever had sex; are aged 13–44; are able to become pregnant; are not pregnant, postpartum, nor trying to become pregnant; and either have a family income below 250 percent of the federal poverty level or are younger than age 20.)

Planned Parenthood health centers serve a greater share of safety-net contraceptive clients than do any other types of providers.

Although Planned Parenthood health centers comprise 10 percent of publicly supported safety-net family planning centers, they serve 36 percent of clients who obtain publicly supported contraceptive services from such centers. By contrast, centers operated by health departments serve 27 percent of safety-net contraceptive clients, FQHCs serve 16 percent, sites operated by hospitals serve 8 percent, and sites operated by other agencies serve 13 percent.

On average, Planned Parenthood health centers serve many more contraceptive clients per year than do other types of safety-net providers. Planned Parenthood health centers serve an average of 2,950 contraceptive clients per year, many times more than any other type of publicly supported health center. By contrast, those operated by hospitals serve an average of 770 contraceptive clients, health departments serve an average of 750, FQHCs serve 330, and centers operated by other types of agencies serve 680 contraceptive clients each year.

Planned Parenthood health centers are more likely to facilitate women's timely access to a wide range of contraceptive services and supplies.

Planned Parenthood sites are considerably more likely to offer a broad range of contraceptive methods than sites operated by other types of agencies. Specifically, 91 percent of Planned Parenthood health centers offer at least 10 of 13 reversible contraceptive methods, compared to between 48 percent and 53 percent of sites operated by other types of agencies.

Moreover, Planned Parenthood sites are particularly likely to help women who choose oral contraceptives to get their pills without having to make an additional trip to a pharmacy: 92 percent of Planned Parenthood health centers offer oral contraceptive supplies and refills on-site, as do 86 percent of health department sites. Considerably smaller proportions of sites operated by FQHCs and other types of agencies—37 percent and 55 percent, respectively—do so.

Finally, women are often able to get the care they need more quickly from Planned Parenthood than from other types of safety-net providers. Sixty-three percent of Planned Parenthood health centers offer same-day appointments, compared to between 30 percent and 40 percent of sites operated by other types of agencies. And the average wait for an appointment at a Planned Parenthood health center is 1.8 days, whereas wait times at sites operated by other types of agencies range from 5.3 to 6.8 days.

LOOKING AHEAD

We cannot predict whether or to what extent health centers operated by other providers could fill the significant gap in the family planning safety net that would be created if Planned Parenthood health centers were defunded—and therefore lost to the communities they serve. Certainly in the short term, it is doubtful that other providers could step up in a timely way to absorb the millions of women suddenly left without their preferred source of care and whether those providers could offer the same degree of accessible, quality contraceptive care offered by Planned Parenthood. (Indeed, Texas offers a cautionary tale; the state's family planning program for low-income women served far fewer women after Planned Parenthood health centers were cut out of the effort.)

What we do know is that women nationwide rely on Planned Parenthood health centers for the contraceptive services and supplies they need—and for women in many areas of the country, losing Planned Parenthood would mean losing their chosen provider and the only safety-net provider around.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Here are some more facts.

For every patient served by a community health center today, nearly three residents of low-income communities remain without access to primary health care. By voting for a sudden cutoff in funding, we would create an immediate healthcare access crisis for millions of women, placing an enormous strain on community health centers and other providers.

Community health centers offer women's health services as part of comprehensive primary care programs. They simply cannot put their other responsibilities aside. With so many of our Nation's community health centers already struggling to meet the needs of our most vulnerable communities, the last thing we should be doing is trying to make their jobs harder.

Now, on top of all of this, Senator MCCONNELL has already said that Senate Republicans do not have the votes to pass this bill and it will never reach the President's desk. So what are we doing here? This is not a rhetorical question. We are literally, as I said earlier, 6 legislative days away from another government shutdown; and instead of talking about how we are going to keep the doors open, how we are going to do what the people of the country have sent us here to do and keep government running, we are wasting time with this politically driven legislation that does nothing to make the country better.

Madam Speaker, the other bill before us, H.R. 3504, is not a simple restatement of the current born-alive law, by the way, which passed by a voice vote in 2002, no. Just so my colleagues understand, this bill fundamentally interferes with the sacred doctor-patient relationship and undermines doctors' clinical judgment and tells them how to provide medicine, or else they will face criminal penalties.

Madam Speaker, this bill is a solution in search of a problem. We already have strong Federal and State laws to protect babies born alive. The bottom line is that these anti-women's health bills would limit women's access to safe, legal, reproductive health care.

Congress should be governing responsibly and working to solve the real issues our country is facing. We should be focused on growing our economy and creating jobs. I think you may have forgotten that that is an important priority of the American people because my friends never like to mention the word ''jobs.''

But we ought to be focused on creating jobs. We ought to be protecting access to health care, increasing college affordability, and building a better future. Instead, 30 conservative House Republicans have decided to take government funding hostage, and that is what we are here for.

The American people deserve better.

Finally, let's be clear. Let's all kind of clear the air and be honest about one thing. The debate we are having today really isn't about the quality of care provided by Planned Parenthood. That is really not what is at the heart of all this. This is an effort by my friends on the Republican side to kind of pursue their agenda of criminalizing and outlawing abortion in every circumstance.

Many of my colleagues on the other side have been very vocal about the fact that they want to criminalize abortion, even in cases of rape or incest. They would make a woman who is a victim of rape or incest a criminal. They would criminalize the doctors. That is what this is all about, trying to force their narrow agenda down the throats of the American people.

I would say to my colleagues that we ought to reject this and get down to the business of governing this country. This is not what we should be doing here today. This is an insult, I think, to women. This is an insult to the good people who work at Planned Parenthood who provide excellent care to millions of people across this country, and, quite frankly, it is an insult to the American people that, with 6 legislative days left before you shut the government down, this is what you choose to bring to the floor and not a bill to keep the government open.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, if my colleagues would like to use parliamentary terms like ''regular order,'' ''self-execute,'' or ''waivers'' to hide from debate over the gruesome practices of abortionists, that is their prerogative.

They ignore what one key Planned Parenthood abortionist said: ''We've been very good at getting heart, lung, liver, because we know that, so I'm not gonna crush that part. I'm gonna basically crush below, I'm gonna crush above, and I'm gonna see if I can get it all intact.''

□ 1345

Republicans will continue to bring the truth to Americans and prevent taxpayer dollars from going to organizations that dismember children.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

Mr. BYRNE. Madam Speaker, by now, we have all seen the appalling videos which depict Planned Parenthood officials talking about how they crush babies in certain ways to preserve certain organs and then bargaining over the price of those organs.

I want to be crystal clear. The loss of any human life is a tragedy, but the casual nature in which the Planned Parenthood officials talk about killing a baby is simply heartbreaking and appalling. It is unconscionable that any American could be that cold and callous.

Let me tell you about the Planned Parenthood clinic in my hometown of Mobile, Alabama. They were cited by the Alabama Department of Health for performing two abortions on a 14-year-old girl in a span of 4 months without their complying with State laws that require the reporting of possible sexual abuse. This is the type of organization we are talking about.

Congress cannot simply sit on the sidelines and wait for someone else to respond. These egregious actions require a response.

Madam Speaker, I do not believe the Federal Government should be spending a single penny on Planned Parenthood, and H.R. 3134 would make that a reality. I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

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

I just want to say to my colleague from North Carolina that I am not hiding behind procedural rules.

In fact, in the way that my Republican friends have brought this bill to the floor, you won't allow us to debate amendments. We can't. You have stifled debate.

So I guess I would ask you: What are you afraid of? Why can't we have a more open process on legislation that didn't even go through the committees of jurisdiction? You ought to open this place up. A little debate is not a bad thing. A little openness is a good thing.

Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD the report by the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, Democratic members and staff, basically that refers to the heavily edited videos that my colleagues refer to.

I will just read one line here:

To date, the committee has received no evidence—underline ''no evidence''—to substantiate the allegations that Planned Parenthood is engaged in the sale of fetal tissue for profit.

Furthermore, the committee has received no evidence to support the allegation that fetal tissue was procured without consent, that Planned Parenthood physicians altered the timing, method, or procedure of an abortion solely for the purposes of obtaining fetal tissue, or that Planned Parenthood physicians performed intact dilation and evacuation in order to preserve fetal tissue for research.

Thus far, the investigation has revealed that PPFA requires all affiliates to ensure compliance with all State and Federal laws and that specific PPFA guidance requires affiliates to ensure that reimbursement for fetal tissue is limited to actual cost.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE
Washington, DC, September 9, 2015.

MEMORANDUM

To Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations Democratic Members and Staff
From Committee on Energy and Commerce Democratic Staff
Re Update on the Committee's Ongoing Investigation of Planned Parenthood Federation of America

I. INTRODUCTION

This memorandum serves as an update on the Committee's ongoing investigation into claims regarding the alleged sale of fetal tissue by affiliates of Planned Parenthood Federation of America (PPFA) to tissue procurement organizations (TPOs). The review has included bipartisan briefings by Planned Parenthood officials as well as representatives from StemExpress, Novogenix Laboratories, and Advanced Bioscience Resources—three TPOs that partner with Planned Parenthood affiliates and other healthcare providers to collect specimens to supply to researchers working with fetal tissue.

In addition to these briefings, the Committee has received documents and written responses to a series of questions it posed in writing to PPFA regarding its ''practices relating to fetal tissue collection and sale or donation.'' To date, the Committee has received no evidence to substantiate the allegations that Planned Parenthood has engaged in the sale of fetal tissue for profit. Furthermore, the Committee has received no evidence to support the allegations that fetal tissue was procured without consent, that Planned Parenthood physicians altered the timing, method, or procedure of an abortion solely for the purposes of obtaining fetal tissue, or that Planned Parenthood physicians performed intact dilation and evacuation in order to preserve fetal tissue for research. Thus far, the investigation has revealed that PPFA requires all affiliates to ensure compliance with all state and federal laws and that specific PPFA guidance requires affiliates to ensure that reimbursement for fetal tissue is limited to actual costs.

The Committee received evidence that the individuals making these unsubstantiated claims misrepresented themselves in order to gain access to Planned Parenthood personnel and facilities, and that the videos released by the Center for Medical Progress (CMP) are incomplete, selectively edited, and intentionally misleading.

II. THERE IS NO EVIDENCE THAT PLANNED PARENTHOOD OR ITS AFFILIATES HAVE VIOLATED ANY FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS

A. PPFA REQUIRES ALL AFFILIATES TO COMPLY WITH ALL STATE AND FEDERAL LAWS, INCLUDING LAWS PERTAINING TO THE DONATION OF FETAL TISSUE FOR RESEARCH

i. PPFA Guidance to Affiliates Regarding Human Fetal Tissue Donation Specifically Advises That It Is Illegal to Receive ''Valuable Consideration'' for Fetal Tissue, and Requires Affiliates to Ensure that Reimbursement Represents Actual Costs

The NIH Revitalization Act of 1993 established the legal standards governing fetal tissue donation. The law states, ''It shall be unlawful for any person to knowingly acquire, receive, or otherwise transfer any human fetal tissue for valuable consideration if the transfer affects interstate commerce.'' The law further provides: ''The term 'valuable consideration' does not include reasonable payments associated with the transportation, implantation, processing, preservation, quality control, or storage of human fetal tissue.''

Current PPFA guidance on fetal tissue donation tracks federal law, and it clearly and explicitly prohibits affiliates from receiving valuable consideration for fetal tissue. The guidance also requires affiliates to ensure that reimbursement represents actual costs incurred by the affiliate. The current PPFA guidance, revised in May 2015, provides as follows:

Federal law prohibits the payment or receipt of money or any other form of valuable consideration for fetal tissue, regardless of whether the program to which the tissue is being provided is federally funded or not.

There are limited exceptions that allow reimbursement for actual expenses (e.g. storage, processing, transportation, etc.) of the tissue. If an affiliate chooses to accept reimbursement for allowable expenses, it must be able to demonstrate the reimbursement represents its actual costs. PPFA recommends that an affiliate consult with CAPS [Consortium of Abortion Providers] about steps to take to document and demonstrate actual cost. [emphasis in the original]

The guidance also advises affiliates that ''there are federal, and frequently, state laws that govern these activities, as well as ethical considerations. Great care must be taken to assure that these programs are above reproach in all respects.''

In a briefing with Committee staff, Dr. Raegan McDonald-Mosley, the Chief Medical Officer of PPFA, explained that PPFA accredits its affiliates. Affiliates are autonomous legal entities, with their own separate boards, executive personnel, and legal counsel.

Dr. McDonald-Mosley further described how PPFA oversees its affiliates and verifies their compliance with its fetal tissue donation guidance. Each affiliate is independently responsible for ensuring compliance with the guidance, as well as with all applicable state and federal laws.

PPFA oversees its affiliates through an accreditation process, whereby each affiliate is reviewed at least once every three years. Affiliates are evaluated on a range of hundreds of possible elements of performance, including, as of 2013, compliance with PPFA's fetal tissue donation guidance. Accreditation involves both offsite reviews of affiliate documentation as well as onsite reviews that include interviews with staff and direct observation of patient care. Non-compliance with PPFA required standards may affect an affiliate's accreditation status and result in actions that jeopardize that affiliate's ability to continue to use the Planned Parenthood trademark.

Although the precise language of PPFA's fetal tissue guidance has been revised over the years, affiliates have always been required to ensure that their tissue donation programs are in compliance with all state and federal laws, including the prohibition on receiving valuable consideration. For example, an earlier version of the guidance from 2001 provided to the Committee instructs affiliates that federal laws ''forbid the payment or receipt of valuable consideration for fetal tissue. However, they permit 'reasonable payments associated with the transportation, implantation, processing, preservation, quality control, or storage' of fetal tissue.'' This guidance was reissued to affiliates in 2011.

Several years ago, PPFA undertook an effort to revise their Manual of Medical Standards and Guidelines (the Manual) by removing those sections not directly related to clinical care. According to Dr. McDonald-

Mosley, the Manual is a desk reference for clinicians for directing medical care. It is intended to assist practitioners in providing regular care for a patient and is revised on a two-year cycle. As a result of this revision effort, the fetal tissue guidance was separated from the Manual and is now a standalone document. It is distributed to affiliates through the PPFA intranet. Dr. Deborah Nucatola, who is PPFA's Senior Director for Medical Services and has had primary responsibility for the Manual since July 2009, explained to Committee staff that guidance on fetal tissue donation was removed from the Manual as part of this process to streamline and remove non-clinical information.

As of November 6, 2013, affiliates are now permitted to facilitate fetal tissue donation without prior approval from PPFA. PPFA distinguishes between ''core services,'' which all affiliates are required to provide, such as well-women visits and education and prescribing for all FDA-approved methods of contraception, and services which are voluntary or optional for affiliates to offer. Earlier versions of the fetal tissue guidance instructed affiliates to ''submit a written request to initiate an aborted tissue and/or blood donation program to PPFA for review and approval.'' According to PPFA, it ''implemented this policy change as part of a broader effort to reduce the administrative burden on affiliates and support affiliate service expansion.

This overhaul affected other services besides facilitation of tissue donation; PPFA no longer requires prior approval for an affiliate to offer certain other non-core services.''

ii. PPFA Guidance to Affiliates Includes Additional Requirements Pertaining to Fetal Tissue Transplantation Research, Although This is Not Required by Law

Federal law imposes additional requirements on providers and on researchers when the donated tissue is used in federally funded research involving the transplantation of human fetal tissue for therapeutic purposes. Under the statute, human fetal tissue may be used in federally funded research on the transplantation of fetal tissue if the attending physician declares in writing 1) that the woman's consent for abortion was obtained prior to requesting or obtaining consent to donate the fetal tissue for research; 2) that the timing, method, or procedure used to terminate the pregnancy were not altered in order to obtain the tissue; 3) that the abortion was performed in accordance with applicable state law; and 4) the woman has been fully informed of the physician's interest, if any, in the research, and of any medical or privacy risks associated with the tissue donation.

According to the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the federal government has not funded any fetal tissue transplantation research since 2007. The federal rules relating to the timing and method of abortion are therefore not applicable to any recent fetal tissue donations in the United States. However, PPFA's fetal tissue donation guidance nonetheless incorporates these requirements as recommended practices for affiliates. The 2015 PPFA guidance provides:

Federal law establishes additional requirements applicable whenever the research involving fetal tissue is conducted or supported by the federal government. PPFA recommends that these requirements be adhered to without regard to whether the tissue donation program is federally supported or not. These requirements are:

1. That the client's consent to donate not be sought until after she has decided to have an abortion and has signed the consent form for the abortion.

2. That the client acknowledge that the blood or tissue is being donated as a gift and that she will not be paid.

3. That the client acknowledge that she has not been told and that she has no control over who will get the donated blood and/or tissue or what it will be used for.

4. That there will be no changes to how or when the abortion is done in order to obtain the blood or tissue.

The guidance further instructs affiliates that ''It must be documented that no substantive alteration in the timing of terminating the pregnancy or of the method used was made for the purpose of obtaining the blood and/or tissue.''

Similarly, earlier versions of the PPFA guidance required the clinician to make a notation that: ''[a]borted tissue was donated,'' ''[c]onsent for the abortion was obtained prior to requesting or obtaining consent for the tissue donation,'' and ''[n]o substantive alteration in the timing of terminating the pregnancy or of the method used was made for the purpose of obtaining the tissue.'' Previous versions of the guidance also required specific language in consent forms used for tissue donation. These versions were issued under the previous system, in which affiliates were required to seek service approval from PPFA for tissue donation programs.

Appended to PPFA's May 2015 guidance is a recommended sample consent form, which prompts the patient who is donating tissue to affirm the following statements:

Before I was shown this consent, I had already decided to have an abortion and signed a consent form for it.

I agree to give my blood and/or the tissue from the abortion as a gift to be used for education, research, or treatment.

I understand I have no control over who will get the donated blood and/or tissue or what it will be used for.

I have not been told the name of any person who might get my donation.

I understand there will be no changes to how or when my abortion is done in order to get my blood or the tissue.

I understand I will not be paid.

I understand that I don't have to give my blood or pregnancy tissue, and this will not affect my current or future care at (affiliate name).

Earlier versions of the guidance included a substantially similar consent form, although use of the consent form was required rather than recommended under the previous system of service approvals by PPFA, and substantive deviations from the consent form required approval from PPFA Medical Services.

B. THERE IS NO EVIDENCE THAT PLANNED PARENTHOOD AFFILIATES KNOWINGLY RECEIVED VALUABLE CONSIDERATION IN EXCHANGE FOR FETAL TISSUE

The Committee has received no evidence that any Planned Parenthood affiliate or employee ever received any ''valuable consideration'' for donated fetal tissue. The information and the documentary evidence received by the Committee support Planned Parenthood's assertions that the few affiliates that have participated in fetal tissue donation comply with the requirement to limit reimbursement to reasonable payments associated with facilitating tissue donation.

In an August 27, 2015, letter to congressional leaders, PPFA President Cecile Richards listed the reimbursement rates at affiliates that are currently or were recently participating in fetal tissue donation. At present, only two out of PPFA's 59 affiliates are participating in fetal tissue donation, and only one affiliate is receiving any reimbursement for costs. An additional four affiliates facilitated fetal tissue donation for research in the past five years. The California affiliate that is currently participating receives a reimbursement of $60 per tissue specimen from a TPO. The other four affiliates, which had participated in fetal tissue donation programs in the past five years, either sought no reimbursement or had reimbursement rates ranging from $45 to $55 per tissue specimen. The letter states, ''[i]n every case, the affiliates report that these amounts were intended to recover only their costs, as allowed under the federal law and our guidance.'' The evidence received by the Committee during the course of this investigation supports this assertion.

The May 2015 tissue donation guidance notes that affiliates ''must be able to demonstrate the reimbursement represents its actual costs.'' Dr. McDonald-Mosley explained that the way that each affiliate determines cost is fact-specific to that affiliate. Dr. Nucatola stated that fetal tissue donation is not a revenue stream for affiliates, and that reimbursement should generally be reasonable for the impact it has on the clinic.

Both the statute governing fetal tissue donation and Planned Parenthood's May 2015 guidance on pregnancy tissue donation outline the exceptions for reimbursement. The types of costs that may arise for clinics facilitating tissue donation include staff time to identify patients who are interested in donating fetal tissue, staff time spent explaining fetal tissue donation and securing consent, staff time spent drawing maternal blood samples, space in the pathology lab, storage of supplies, sterilization of equipment, and other related costs.

In a briefing with the Committee, Cate Dyer, the Chief Executive Officer of StemExpress, stated that it is her understanding that the valuable consideration requirement applies to all fetal tissue her company obtains. The contracts between StemExpress and two Planned Parenthood affiliates state, ''The reasonable costs associated with the services specified in this Agreement shall be fifty-five dollars ($55.00) per POC [product of conception] determined in the clinic to be usable.'' According to Dyer, the reimbursement covers the space and storage at the Planned Parenthood facility, particularly within the lab and pathology departments, sterilization of equipment, and staff participation in consent and facilitating involvement in the clinic. Additionally, clinic staff is also involved in obtaining maternal blood samples for StemExpress, so that the company can screen for infectious diseases. Dyer stated that she believed Planned Parenthood is losing money on fetal tissue donation, given the amount of staff time involved and space StemExpress takes up at the clinics.

In a briefing with Committee staff, Dr. Ben Van Handel, the Executive Director of Novogenix Laboratories, confirmed that at the affiliate where Novogenix has a contract, Planned Parenthood set the price of $45 for services rendered on a per specimen basis. The contract between Novogenix and the Planned Parenthood affiliate states, ''Novogenix will reimburse [the Planned Parenthood affiliate] for reasonable administrative costs associated with the identification of potential donors, as well as the obtaining of informed consent.''

Similarly, in a briefing with Committee staff, Advanced Bioscience Resources (ABR) confirmed that the reimbursement rate at the Planned Parenthood affiliate with which they partner is $60 per patient product of conception. it The contract between ABR and the Planned Parenthood affiliate states:

[Affiliate] will provide, and ABR will pay the reasonable costs for, services and facilities . . . associated with obtaining consents

and with the removal of fetal organs and tissues from POCs [products of conception], and their processing, preservation, quality control, transportation, and storage; including appropriate space in which ABR employees can work, disposal services for non-used portions of cadaveric materials, and for seeking consent for donation of tissues and organs from appropriate donors, and maintaining records of such consents so that verification of consent can be supported.

C. THERE IS NO EVIDENCE THAT PLANNED PARENTHOOD PHYSICIANS CONDUCTED INTACT DILATION AND EVACUATION TO PRESERVE FETAL TISSUE

To date, the Committee has received no evidence that any physician employed by Planned Parenthood affiliates has performed an ''intact'' dilation and evacuation (D&E) to preserve fetal tissue for research. CMP claims suggesting that Planned Parenthood physicians are violating the Partial Birth Abortion Act in order to preserve fetal tissue for research appear to have no basis in fact.

There are three primary methods of surgical abortion: D&E, induction of labor, and hysterotomy. D&E is the only method available at Planned Parenthood facilities. In a briefing with Committee staff, Dr. McDonald-Mosley stated to the Committee that the confusion over ''intact'' fetuses is the result of deceptive video editing by CMP, and that she believes that the ''intactness'' that Planned Parenthood staff are referring to is the intactness of the tissue and specific organs. She noted that during most procedures, such as a D&E, the fetus is not delivered intact. She stated there is no evidence that Planned Parenthood staff are removing the fetus in an intact manner.

Similarly, Dr. Nucatola explained that it would be rare for a patient to be sufficiently dilated to deliver an intact fetus. When questioned whether it was possible to do a D&E resulting in an intact fetus, she stated that while possible, no Planned Parenthood physician would intentionally perform such a procedure because to do so would be illegal.

Representatives of all three TPOs also stated to the Committee that the donated fetal tissue specimens they receive do not include intact fetuses.

D. THERE IS NO EVIDENCE THAT PLANNED PARENTHOOD PHYSICIANS ALTERED THE TIMING, METHOD, OR PROCEDURE SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSE OF OBTAINING FETAL TISSUE FOR RESEARCH

To date, the Committee has not obtained any evidence that Planned Parenthood physicians altered the timing, method, or procedure of an abortion solely for the purpose of obtaining fetal tissue for research. The law requires physicians to certify that ''no alteration of the timing, method, or procedures used to terminate the pregnancy was made solely for the purposes of obtaining the tissue.'' Although this section of the law applies only to federally funded research involving transplantation of human fetal tissue for therapeutic purposes, Planned Parenthood has voluntarily incorporated the principles of the law into its tissue donation guidance. The PPFA May 2015 guidance instructs affiliates that ''[i]t must be documented that no substantive alteration in the timing of terminating the pregnancy or of the method used was made for the purpose of obtaining the blood and/or tissue.''

There are limited methods of abortion. At Planned Parenthood affiliates, there are two methods of an early abortion: (1) a medication abortion, and (2) surgical abortion involving mechanical or manual aspiration. For abortions after approximately 13 weeks gestation, the only surgical abortion method available at a Planned Parenthood facility is D&E. A physician's decision about which method to use is made in consultation with the patient.

PPFA has not identified any cases in which changes in methods for abortions were made for the purposes of fetal tissue donation. It is reasonable for providers to make small adjustments in technique for clinical reasons, and such small adjustments would not constitute a change in method or procedure. As is common across the medical profession, techniques are different for each physician, and physicians commonly make clinical judgments to adjust their approach in the course of a surgery.

Dr. Nucatola confirmed that changing the position of the fetus is not a change in the method or procedure; instead, it often needs to be done for patient safety. Although she does not personally change the position of the fetus in her practice, she believes that some physicians may need to convert the fetus to breech position in order to perform the abortion procedure safely; it is a matter of skill and experience.

All Planned Parenthood staff emphasized that patient safety is their top priority. Dr. McDonald-Mosley stated, ''The ultimate goal is the safety of the patient.'' Dr. Nucatola said, ''Patient safety comes first.'' PPFA's August 27, 2015, letter reiterated the same message: ''Our patient's health is our paramount concern.''

Mr. MCGOVERN. These heavily edited videos that my friends keep on referring to, again, I think is just a cover for what really is behind all of this, and that is their attempt to criminalize and outlaw abortion in all circumstances.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank my colleague, Mr. MCGOVERN, for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in defense of Planned Parenthood, an organization that for nearly 100 years has been the only accessible and affordable health care for millions of Americans, men and women.

Yet again, we find ourselves debating a bill that has no chance of becoming law, that attacks women and their healthcare decisions, and that distracts from what we should be doing: a budget to keep the government funded, which the majority shows no interest in moving forward.

Instead, we are rehashing old bills that we have seen many times before. These Republican broadsides fly in the face of the millions of women across the country and undermine the health and well-being of poor and rural women, who, in most cases, have no place else to turn except to Planned Parenthood for basic medical treatment.

Need I remind the Chamber that one in five American women has relied on a Planned Parenthood health center for care in her lifetime, as my colleague said, more than 90 percent of which is for preventive care: cervical cancer screenings, breast cancer screenings, and even HIV counseling?

There is no other medical procedure so furiously debated. Do we spend years here debating whether men can get vasectomies during their reproductive years? Maybe we should do that because, obviously, we have cloaked ourselves in the medical field so that we can make those priceless decisions that people should make for themselves. Do we threaten to shut down the government over access to Viagra? No, we don't.

This week, I received an email from a local Planned Parenthood affiliate about a woman who, when she was 19 years old, went to Planned Parenthood to get a prescription for birth control. During a routine screening, the doctor found a cluster of abnormal cells that could have turned into life-threatening cancer.

The woman wrote: ''Early detection and treatment . . . allowed me later in life to have a healthy baby who is the light of my life. Planned Parenthood is the provider I know and trust. Why should politicians tell anyone where they can and cannot go for care? Planned Parenthood was there for me when I needed affordable, quality health care, and I don't know what I'd have done without their services.''

That is what is at stake. In spite of these pleas, Republicans continue their obsession with attacking women's health—I would think, by now, they would know better—and co-opting the most personal decisions of a woman's lifetime.

Legislatures across the country, including this one, waste valuable time in pretending to be doctors instead of doing their jobs. Legislators do not spontaneously become medical professionals upon their elections.

These constitutionally protected decisions are for women with the advice of their doctors, their families, and anyone she wants to consult, be it her priest or rabbi or pastor.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. What terrible decisions there are to be made between medical personnel and the patient. I don't want anybody to have to say: I have to wait until LOUISE SLAUGHTER gets here because Congress has the last word in whether we live or die.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Speaker, this debate is not about any one organization that receives tax dollars. This isn't about Republicans versus Democrats. It is not even about pro-life versus pro-choice. The issue before us today, Madam Speaker, is about defending the most vulnerable among us.

It is about a fundamental question: Will we allow and, indeed, give the people's money to an organization that takes a tiny baby outside the womb—with a beating heart, with lungs that function—and takes a scalpel and cuts open the head so that the brain can be extracted and sold for profit?

That is gruesome—I am sorry—but watch the video. Or are we going to

say: Let's suspend the funding to this organization while we investigate? That is a reasonable position.

Any organization that receives Federal funds and that is being investigated for breaking the law ought to have its funds suspended.

My wife, Renee, and I are expecting our first child in just a matter of days. So this is an issue that is very personal to me.

I would just say to my colleagues: Let's support this legislation and make sure that no baby is ever again cut into pieces and sold for scrap parts in this country.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Ms. MATSUI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and to stand with millions of American women and men who receive essential health services from Planned Parenthood.

These attacks against Planned Parenthood threaten access to health care across this country, particularly for low-income women and men who already face barriers to access.

For many of our Nation's underserved populations, Planned Parenthood is the only source for vital services, such as contraceptive services and counseling and breast and cervical cancer screenings.

If the majority succeeds in its effort to defund Planned Parenthood, millions of Americans will be stripped of access to health care, in turn, creating hardships for American families.

More troubling still is the majority's willingness to shut down the government in order to deny health care to millions of women. Women's health should not be used as a bargaining chip for political messaging.

I urge my colleagues to put aside partisan politics driven by purposefully misleading videos. Attacking Planned Parenthood is a dangerous distraction to the real issues facing American women and families.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Utah (Mrs. LOVE).

Mrs. LOVE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3134, to defund Planned Parenthood, and H.R. 3504, which requires that babies born alive during abortions get the same medical treatment as any other child.

It is crucial that we stand for those who cannot speak for themselves: the unborn. These bills are critical to curtailing the horrific practices that include harvesting fetal tissue while babies are still alive.

We, as Americans, value human life. We are fighting terrorists in Iran because we value the lives of people. Fighting for the unborn is no different.

I demand a full investigation into Planned Parenthood's donation of fetal tissue and the removal of taxpayer funding for the organization.

My colleagues will try to distract, distort, and divide us into thinking that this is all about women's health issues. This is, in fact, about saving American lives.

Let me remind my colleagues that Black Americans make up 12 percent of the population and that the fetuses that are being aborted make up 78 percent of who is being aborted.

We must act to protect life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. I know my job. Please do yours.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, there are two issues that are very contentious: abortion and fetal research. I support the right of a woman to choose. I support medical research that is legal under our laws so we can get cures for diseases like Alzheimer's and diabetes. I also respect those who disagree with me, but this bill is terrible.

Here is why: It is unfair to women who are not part of this debate and whose access to Planned Parenthood is about getting preventive health care, 16,000 women in our State. The second reason is that this bill, as designed, is destructive to the institution we represent.

Here is how it is designed: One, take the money away and then investigate. In a fair society, we do it the opposite way.

Second, it eliminates access to care for innocent people, who have nothing to do with this, as I mentioned, 16,000 in Vermont.

Three, it is a prelude to the shutdown, resorting to the tactic of, unless you get your way, we are shutting down the entire government.

Four, it is part of the ''dump the Speaker'' campaign, as though, if the Speaker resists a shutdown, his job should be taken away.

Bad for women. Bad for the institution.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I stand today in support of the innocent and the unborn. I strongly believe now is the time for Congress to stand up for those who cannot stand up for themselves.

The videos that have been released that expose the appalling acts committed by Planned Parenthood are horrifying.

These are despicable acts that are on par with the sickest of criminals who are behind bars, and that is exactly where these people belong: in prison, behind bars. These videos have given everyone insight into the inexcusable and horrific culture at Planned Parenthood.

Taxpayer funds should never be used to fund or to offset the cost of providing abortions; and it is especially unacceptable when these illegal and horrific practices, like the selling and trafficking of unborn fetal tissue, are happening.

As a father and a grandfather, I believe we must seek justice for these crimes that have been committed.

I urge Federal law enforcement to execute a full criminal investigation into these alleged actions by Planned Parenthood.

These two bills being debated today, of which I am a cosponsor, are the necessary next steps. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and to support life.

□ 1400

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, let's be clear. This is not a debate about abortion. There are different points of view on that question, but it is a settled question by the U.S. Supreme Court. Those who want to make this about something that it is not need to look at the legislation that they are supporting.

This is about whether or not families have access through Planned Parenthood to preventative health care, to lifesaving cancer screenings, to basic health care that ought to be available in every possible way. This bill would have an extreme and devastating impact on access to those fundamental services that Planned Parenthood provides.

Here we are, 7 legislative days before this government shuts down; and what is preoccupying the floor of the House of Representatives today? An ideological debate that everyone on both sides of the aisle acknowledges will not become law.

Everyone acknowledges it will not become law, but we are taking time to pander to some of the voices that simply oppose women's healthcare choices instead of taking up the questions that the American people sent us here to do. Where is the budget? Where are the budget negotiations? Where is the discussion about roads and bridges?

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY).

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, no taxpayer should be forced to fund an organization that aborts more than 350,000 unborn babies every year. This is a commonsense truth that even pro-abortion activists have a hard time arguing.

Guess what—they changed the argument. They pretend that abortion doesn't exist and that Planned Parenthood is the only place where low-income women can get health care. Taking away taxpayer funding from Planned Parenthood means denying women access to health care, they say.

That is untrue, and anybody spreading that should be ashamed. There are more than 13,000 federally qualified and rural health centers throughout this country offering low-cost health care

to women. They outnumber Planned Parenthood clinics 20 to 1.

If this was really about making sure women had access to health care, we could all agree right now that supporting these community health centers is the right thing to do; but that is not what this is about.

It is because community health centers don't perform abortions; Planned Parenthood does. That is what this is about. It is about preserving a pipeline of funding to the Nation's largest abortion provider. We all get this. Let's drop the phony women's health charade.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and the underlying bill. With this bill, the majority has declared war on the health and well-being of millions of women.

Planned Parenthood serves 2.7 million Americans every year with lifesaving services, like pap tests, breast exams, screenings for sexually transmitted infections. For many low-income families, Planned Parenthood is their only option.

The majority claims that other clinics can take up the slack, but just listen to Dr. Mark DeFrancesco, the president of the American Congress of OB/GYNs: ''If Planned Parenthood went away, there are a good number of patients just in my service area that no longer will have a doctor. If they start calling my office, it is going to be 'we could take you, but it might be 2, 3 months down the road.' And if they call other places, it might be 'we can't even take you.' ''

This bill creates chaos, and in that chaos, people's lives will be put at risk. This bill is spiteful; it is mean spirited, and it is cruel. It tells millions of low-income Americans: Forget your health. You can just die.

Enough is enough. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, there are many more options for women's health care than the discredited abortion provider, Planned Parenthood.

While Planned Parenthood is only approximately 665 clinics, federally qualified health centers, FQHCs, and rural health centers, RHCs, provide over 13,000 publicly supported locations, providing alternatives for women's health care. This means there are 20 federally funded comprehensive care clinics for every one Planned Parenthood.

This bill does not change the availability of funds for women's health. It simply establishes a safeguard so that the Nation's largest abortion chain is not the one providing such services.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK).

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Madam Speaker, there comes a time when we must face the truth, regardless of how disgusting or offensive that truth is. As much as we dislike where we are and the shame the harvesting of baby parts has brought on our Nation, we are the ones who must face this truth and take action.

Some who oppose this bill and other actions this Congress may take state that defunding this or other organizations will not completely stop these horrific acts, and that may be true.

Did our involvement in World War II against Hitler end anti-Semitism? No, it didn't. Did our government's decision to take out Osama bin laden end terrorism? No, it didn't. How many innocent lives were spared because we did take action?

The question before us is not whether our actions will stop this evil, but if this government will continue to fund it, sanction it, and tolerate it.

For years, William Wilberforce fought against the evil of slavery, and he challenged his fellow countrymen with these words: ''You may choose to look the other way, but you can never say that you did not know.''

If we know the truth, which we do, and decide not to respond, we will, in part, share the blame, share the responsibility, and share in the judgment.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition.

These bills today are the direct result of a series of videos that have been found to be purposefully misleading, alleging misdeeds that never happened that will result in the punishment of millions of women who have absolutely nothing to do with it.

In many areas of this country, Planned Parenthood clinics are one of the few affordable healthcare options for women.

During the Senate debate on defunding, a letter was introduced from California's community health centers, stating in no uncertain terms that defunding the Planned Parenthood clinics would place untenable stress on the community healthcare providers, but our Republican colleagues are indifferent to the experts.

Truth, as usual, is the first casualty when they wage their cultural wars; and all that matters is the theater, their bizarre kabuki theater, of ritualized outrage.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule and on the underlying bill.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank VIRGINIA FOXX, who is a tremendous leader for life and a great leader in this Congress, for yielding.

Mr. MCGOVERN said we are wasting our time. Mr. KILDEE talked about pandering, which I think is an insult.

I would just like to ask Mr. MCGOVERN: Yes or no, has the gentleman watched the videos?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The gentleman has?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Okay. It is disappointing then that the gentleman is not moved to compassion over the terrible inhumanity displayed on those videos by the Planned Parenthood personnel.

Madam Speaker, human dismemberment is a painful and absolutely frightening way for anyone to die, but in Planned Parenthood clinics across the country, such violence against children is commonplace.

Subsidized by half-a-billion dollars annually, Planned Parenthood kills a baby every 2 minutes, snuffing out the lives of over 57 million infants since 1973, a staggering loss of life, a staggering loss of children.

Madam Speaker, now, because of undercover videos by The Center for Medical Progress, we know Planned Parenthood is also trafficking in baby parts, turning babies into human guinea pigs while making the abortion industry even richer than before.

Although much of the media continues to ignore this scandal, Planned Parenthood's meticulously crafted facade of care and compassion has been shredded. Caught on tape, Planned Parenthood's top leadership, not interns or lower-level employees, show callous disregard for children's lives while gleefully calculating the financial gain.

This begs the question: Do Americans really know what horrors are done to children in Planned Parenthood clinics? Have congressional colleagues and has President Obama watched the videos yet?

In one clip, Dr. Deborah Nucatola, senior director of Planned Parenthood Federation of America's Medical Services and a late-term abortionist herself says on camera:

> We have been very good at getting heart, lung, liver because we know that, I am not going to crush that part. I am going to basically crush below, I am going to crush above, and I am going to see if I can get it all intact. . . . I would say a lot of people want liver; and for that reason, most providers will do this case under ultrasound guidance, so they will know where they are putting their forceps.

In other words, crush the baby to death, but do it in a way that preserves organs and body parts for sale.

Planned Parenthood's medical directors council president, Dr. Mary Gatter, appears on the video nonchalantly talking about utilizing ''less crunchy'' abortion methods, again, to preserve body parts.

Regarding the price tag for baby body parts, she says, ''Let me just figure out what others are getting and, if this is in the ballpark, then, it is fine. If it is still low, we can bump it up,'' that is, the price. ''I want a Lamborghini,'' she says.

Planned Parenthood's national director for the Consortium of Abortion Providers, Deborah VanDerhei, says, ''We are just trying to figure out as an industry''—abortion is an industry—''how we are going to manage remuneration because the headlines would be a disaster''—concern for making money and avoiding bad press, no concern whatsoever for the child victim.

Holly O'Donnell, a tissue procurement technician for StemExpress, a biotech company that partners with Planned Parenthood, says some women undergoing abortions did not give consent for these baby body parts to be trafficked.

She says on the video, ''Pregnancy tests are potential pregnancies, therefore, potential specimens.'' They think of the pregnancy test as a way of getting more specimens, so it is just taking advantage of the opportunity.

O'Donnell also says how her supervisor told her to cut through the face of a baby in order to get brain tissue. ''She gave me the scissors and told me that I had to cut down the middle of the face. I can't even describe what that feels like,'' she says on tape.

H.R. 3134, made in order under this rule, authored by an extraordinarily caring and compassionate Member of Congress, DIANE BLACK of Tennessee, places a yearlong moratorium on funding for Planned Parenthood and redirects withheld monies to other facilities that provide women's health.

Madam Speaker, the videos have also brought into sharp focus the fact that some babies actually survive abortions.

Dr. Savita Ginde, vice president and medical director of Planned Parenthood Rocky Mountains, confesses:

> Sometimes we get—if someone delivers before we get to see them for a procedure then they, the baby, are intact.

That means born alive. That means born alive.

''The fetus just fell out,'' she says. It just fell out. It, the baby, fell out. What happens to that baby? Tragically, we know what happens. They are killed, and some of their organs are stolen.

The second bill made in order by the rule—the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, authored by pro-life champion TRENT FRANKS—simply says any child who survives an abortion must be given the same care as any other premature baby born at the same gestational age. The new bill builds on the landmark Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002, authored by STEVE CHABOT, by ending important enforcement prohibitions.

I would remind my colleagues that it was just 2 years ago that the infamous Philadelphia abortionist Kermit Gosnell was convicted of killing children, as well as women in his clinics, but children who were born alive after an attempted abortion.

The grand jury report describes his practice—and I read the entire report; you ought to read it—Gosnell had a simple solution for unwanted babies he delivered. He killed them. He didn't call it that. He called it ''ensuring fetal demise.'' He called it ''snipping.''

Support these two bills, I say to my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, human dismemberment is a painful and absolutely frightening way for anyone to die but in Planned Parenthood clinics across the country, such violence against children is commonplace and usual.

Subsidized by half a billion taxpayer dollars annually, Planned Parenthood kills a baby every two minutes, snuffing out the lives of over seven million infants since 1973—a staggering loss of children.

Now, because of undercover videos by the Center for Medical Progress, we know Planned Parenthood is also trafficking in baby body parts—turning babies into human guinea pigs while making the abortion industry even richer than before.

Although much of the media continues to ignore this scandal, Planned Parenthood's meticulously crafted façade of care and compassion has been shredded. Caught on tape, Planned Parenthood's top leadership—not interns or lower level employees—show callous disregard for children's lives while gleefully calculating the financial gain.

Which begs the question: do Americans really know what horrors are done to children in Planned Parenthood clinics? Have congressional colleagues—has President Obama—watched the videos yet?

In one clip, Dr. Deborah Nucatola, Senior Director of Planned Parenthood Federation of America's Medical Services and a late term abortionist herself says on camera: ''We have been very good at getting heart, lung, liver, because we know that, I am not going to crush that part. I am going to basically crush below, I am going to crush above, and I am going to see if I can get it all intact . . . I would say a lot of people want liver; and for that reason, most providers will do this case under ultrasound guidance, so they will know where they are putting their forceps.''

In other words, crush the baby to death, but do it in a way that preserves organs and body parts for sale.

Planned Parenthood Medical Directors' Council President Dr. Mary Gatter appears on a video nonchalantly talking about utilizing a ''less crunchy'' abortion method—again to preserve baby body parts. Regarding the pricetag for baby body parts she says: ''let me just figure out what others are getting, and if this is in the ballpark, then its fine, if it's still low, then we can bump it up. I want a Lamborghini.''

Planned Parenthood's National Director for the Consortium of Abortion Providers Deborah VanDerhei says ''we're just trying to figure out as an industry . . . how we're going to manage remuneration because the headlines would be a disaster''. Concern for making money and avoiding bad press—no concern whatsoever for the child victim.

Holly O'Donnell, a tissue procurement technician for StemExpress, a biotech company that partners with Planned Parenthood says some women undergoing abortions did not give consent: ". . ." there were times when they would just take (the body parts) what they wanted. And these mothers didn't know. On the video, Ms. O'Donnell says: ''Pregnancy tests are potential pregnancies, therefore potential specimens. So it's just taking advantage of the opportunities.''

O'Donnell also tells how her supervisor told her to cut through the face of a baby in order to get brain tissue. ''She gave me the scissors and told me that I had to cut down the middle of the face. I can't even describe what that feels like'' she says.

H.R. 3134 authored by an extraordinarily caring and compassionate Member of Congress DIANE BLACK of Tennessee places a yearlong moratorium on funding to Planned Parenthood and redirects withheld monies to other facilities that provide women's health.

At the instruction of Speaker BOEHNER, several committees of congress have launched probes into this baby body parts trafficking scandal.

I suspect that if the President watches at least one of the videos, he'd at least demand real answers concerning Planned Parenthood's inhumane behavior. Or at least I hope he would.

Mr. Speaker, the videos have again brought into sharp focus the fact that some babies actually survive abortion.

Dr. Savita Ginde, Vice President and Medical Director of Planned Parenthood Rocky Mountains confesses that ''Sometimes, we get—if someone delivers before we get to see them for a procedure then they (the baby) are in intact . . .'' A fetal tissue broker describes watching a ''fetus . . . just fell out.''

It just fell out. It, the baby, fell out, she says. And then what happened to that baby?

Tragically, we know what happens to these victimized babies—they are killed and some have their organs stolen.

So the second bill made in order by the rule—The Born Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act (H.R. 3504)—authored by pro-life champion Trent Franks, simply says any child who survives an abortion must be given the same care as any other premature baby born at the same gestational age. The new bill builds on the landmark Born Alive Infant Protection Act of 2002 authored by Steve Chabot by adding important enforcement provisions.

I would remind my colleagues that it was just two years ago the infamous Philadelphia abortionist Kermit Gosnell was convicted of murder for killing children who were born alive after an attempted abortion. The Grand Jury report described his practices, ''Gosnell had a simple solution for the unwanted babies he delivered: he killed them. He didn't call it that. He called it ''ensuring fetal demise.'' The way he ensured fetal demise was by sticking scissors into the back of the baby's neck and cutting the spinal cord. He called that ''snipping.''

Gosnell's grisly after-birth abortion practices were only exposed when he was investigated for illegal drug charges and, in the words of the Grand Jury ''the search team discovered fetal remains haphazardly stored throughout the clinic—in bags, milk jugs, orange juice cartons, and even in cat-food containers. Some fetal remains were in a refrigerator, others were frozen.''

Last week Gianna Jessen an abortion survivor, told the House Judiciary Committee:

''My biological mother was seven and a half months pregnant when she went to Planned Parenthood, who advised her to have a late-term saline abortion.

''This method of abortion burns the baby inside and out, blinding and suffocating the child, who is then born dead, usually within 24 hours.

''Instead of dying, after 18 hours of being burned in my mother's womb, I was delivered

alive in an abortion clinic in Los Angeles on April the 6th, 1977. My medical records state: ''Born alive during saline abortion'' at 6 am.

''Thankfully, the abortionist was not at work yet. Had he been there, he would have ended my life with strangulation, suffocation, or leaving me there to die. Instead, a nurse called an ambulance, and I was rushed to a hospital. Doctors did not expect me to live.

''I did. I was later diagnosed with Cerebral Palsy, which was caused by a lack of oxygen to my brain while surviving the abortion. I was never supposed to hold my head up or walk. I do. And Cerebral Palsy is a great gift to me.

Gianna asked the committee,

''If abortion is about women's rights, then what were mine? You continuously use the argument, 'If the baby is disabled, we need to terminate the pregnancy,' as if you can determine the quality of someone's life. Is my life less valuable due to my Cerebral Palsy?

''You have failed, in your arrogance and greed, to see one thing: it is often from the weakest among us that we learn wisdom—something sorely lacking in our nation today. And it is both our folly and our shame that blinds us to the beauty of adversity.''

Gianna Jesson's reminds us that we have a duty to protect the weakest and most vulnerable.

□ 1415

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, let me just state three facts here: We know that these videos that have been mentioned have been selectively edited; we know for a fact that 90 percent of what Planned Parenthood does is preventive care, including screenings for cervical cancer, nothing to do with abortion; and we know for a fact, because it is the law, that no taxpayer dollars can be used to pay for abortion.

Having said that, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bills. This closed rule makes in order misguided legislation that would seriously limit access to crucial healthcare services, like cancer screenings, and limit access to contraception that would prevent unwanted pregnancies.

We are talking about defunding Planned Parenthood? How counterproductive. In my home State of Oregon, more than 72,000 patients were served by Planned Parenthood in 2013 alone. We are talking about real women and men who received compassionate, preventive care. I have heard from Oregonians like Stacy, who went to Planned Parenthood and got a lifesaving cancer screening when she had no insurance.

It is unfortunate that the House is using its limited time to debate legislation that harms women, but it is downright irresponsible to even consider shutting down the government over access to these vital services. There is no evidence that Planned Parenthood has broken any laws.

We have seen proposals like this before. It is time to end these attacks on women's constitutional reproductive rights. I urge my colleagues to reject this rule and other legislation that limits access to vital healthcare services.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My colleagues have asked for an investigation into The Center for Medical Progress, which released these videos. The Center for Medical Progress does not receive half a billion in taxpayer dollars every year; Planned Parenthood does. It is the role of Congress to exercise oversight on those who receive taxpayer dollars. It is also appropriate for Congress to cease funding a scandal-ridden organization.

It is extremely interesting to hear my colleagues across the aisle talk about investigating the creators of these videos. If only there was such enthusiasm for oversight on other issues, such as ObamaCare implementation, immigration executive orders, and Hillary Clinton's refusal to share her actions on Benghazi.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I would not be here on the floor to lend suspicion to the faithfulness of anyone, but as evidenced by what we have been hearing from our friends on the other side of the aisle, this is nothing but a politically charged debate and an undermining of women's health care.

We made it very clear in the Committee on the Judiciary that Roe v. Wade is the law of the land. We know that because the Texas Supreme Court, in 2014 and 2015, rolled back the Texas law that was going to close a number of clinics evidencing and providing for women's health care. Planned Parenthood provides for 378,000 pap tests and 487,000 breast exams. 87,000 women found out they had cancer through Planned Parenthood.

As it relates to the fetal tissue, we know that there are laws in place that do not allow the sale of such, but we also know the fetal tissue research has generated spinal cord, neurological research and cures.

Therefore, let me say to my colleagues, the law of the land is Roe v. Wade. This is a protracted political fight, and I would only say, ask the person who filmed these particular videos. He stole the identity of his high school classmate to do this underhanded work. That shows you that this is a political effort.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Rule and the underlying bills.

I strongly oppose this latest attempt by the Republican House majority to defund Planned Parenthood and undermine women's right to make their own choices regarding their reproductive healthcare.

Instead of spending time fueling a politically-charged attack on America's leading provider of reproductive health care services for women, and attempting to roll back women's constitutionally protected rights, this House should be advancing legislation that will reform our truly broken immigration and criminal justice systems.

We are brought here today to examine the practices and procedures of Planned Parenthood. Yet, tellingly, the Majority has failed to reach out or obtain any direct information or witnesses from Planned Parenthood.

The bills before us are offered not for the purpose of exposing any wrongdoing of Planned Parenthood, but simply to sensationalize opposition to abortion and serve as a political decoy to shut down our government.

The United States Supreme Court ruled over 40 years ago, in *Roe* v. *Wade* (410 U.S. 113 (1973)), that a woman's constitutional right to privacy includes her right to abortion.

Since this landmark decision, abortion rates and risks have substantially declined, as have the number of teen and unwanted pregnancies.

Restricting all access to reproductive and women's health services only exacerbates a woman's risk of an unintended pregnancy and fails to accomplish any meaningful overthrow of Roe v. Wade.

In recent years, state policymakers have passed hundreds of restrictions on abortion care under the guise of protecting women's health and safety. Fights here in Congress have been no different.

In my state of Texas a law that would have cut off access to 75 percent of reproductive healthcare clinics in the state was challenged before the U.S. Supreme Court in 2014 and 2015.

On October 2, 2014, the Supreme Court struck down as unconstitutional a Texas law that required that all reproductive healthcare clinics that provided the full range of services would be required to have a hospital-style surgery center building and staffing requirements.

This requirement meant that only 7 clinics would be allowed to continue to provide a full spectrum of reproductive healthcare to women.

Texas has 268,580 square miles, only second in size to the state of California.

The impact of the law in implementation would have ended access to reproductive services for millions of women in my state.

In 2015, the State of Texas once again threatened women's access to reproductive health care when it attempted to shutter all but 10 healthcare providers in the state of Texas.

The Supreme Court once again intervened on the behalf of Texas women to block the move to close clinics in my state.

It seems every month we are faced with a new attack on women's access to reproductive health care, often couched in those same terms.

And in fact we are here today supposedly to talk about the safety of medical care provided by Planned Parenthood.

But we know that's not really the case.

If my colleagues were so concerned about women's health and safety, they would be promoting any one of the number of evidence-based proactive policies that improve women's health and well-being.

Instead, they are attacking Planned Parenthood in a back-handed attempt to ban abortion.

That is their number one priority. This is certainly not about protecting women's health, it's about politics.

Just as the 1988 Human Fetal Tissue Transplantation Research Panel (or the Blue Ribbon Commission) sought to separate the question of ethics of abortion from the question of ethics of using fetal tissue from legal elective abortions for medical research when laying the foundation for the 1993, NIH Health Revitalization Act (which passed overwhelmingly with bipartisan support), we must separate the personal views of abortion from the legal issues of federal compliance.

Namely, the NIH Health Revitalization Act prohibits the payment or receipt of money or any other form of valuable consideration for fetal tissue, regardless of whether the program to which the tissue is being provided is funded or not.

A limited exception, and crux of the applicable issue of legality, lies with the provision allowing for reimbursement for actual expenses (e.g. storage, processing, transportation, etc.) of the tissue.

Planned Parenthood repeatedly maintains and supports that their affiliates involved with fetal tissue research comply with this requirement.

In fact, of the 700+ affiliate health care centers across the country, only 4 Planned Parenthood affiliates currently offer tissue donation services and of those 4, only 2 (California and Washington) offer fetal tissue donation services—that's 1 percent of all Planned Parenthood service centers.

The California affiliate receives a modest reimbursement of $60 per tissue specimen and the Washington affiliate receives no reimbursement.

It is worth noting that fetal tissue has been used for decades.

Since the 1920's researchers have used fetal tissue to study and treat various neurological disorders, spinal cord injuries, diabetes, immune deficiencies, cancers and life-threatening blood diseases.

One of the earliest advances with fetal tissue was to use fetal kidney cells to create the first poliovirus vaccines, which are now estimated to save 550,000 lives worldwide every year.

The most widely known application in the field of human fetal tissue transplantation has been the treatment of Parkinson's disease.

Many of our other common vaccines, such as polio, measles, chicken pox, rubella and shingles, have been developed through the use of fetal tissue or cell lines derived from fetal tissue.

When looking at the 1 percent of health care providers involved in fetal tissue donation and research, and no clear credible proof of illegal activity, it is obvious that attacks on Planned Parenthood are wholly misguided.

Planned Parenthood has one of the most rigorous Medical standards and accreditation processes in the country.

It is the only national provider that has developed a single set of evidence-based Medical Standards and Guidelines that define how health care is provided throughout the country.

Guidelines are developed and updated annually by a group of nationally-renowned experts, physicians, and scientists, including medical experts from Harvard and Columbia.

Planned Parenthood affiliates must submit to accreditation reviews that include 100 indicators (or high level areas of review) and over 600 individual Elements of Performance (or measures for review). Half of these relate to the provision of medical care and patient safety.

Planned Parenthood has strict requirements regarding compliance with all federal, state, and local laws and regulations. A specific area of compliance is with mandatory reporting laws and regulations regarding reporting in instances where the welfare of a minor is endangered.

All staff with patient contact are rigorously trained regarding compliance with federal, state and local laws and regulations governing service to minors.

Violations of mandatory reporting regulations are subject to disciplinary action, up to and including termination.

It is no secret that the Center for Medical Progress is an extreme anti-choice organization with a goal of outlawing legal abortion procedures in this country.

To achieve that goal, they have shamelessly targeted Planned Parenthood and the funding that provides healthcare services to millions of women every year.

They continue to use deceptive tactics and secret videos to try and undermine Planned Parenthood.

Just like Live Action, the Center for Medical Progress is not a group that can be taken credibly.

The Center for Medical Progress is simply recreating a history of doctoring and manipulating video intended to create misimpressions about Planned Parenthood.

It is a coordinated effort by anti-choice forces—not only on Planned Parenthood or a woman's right to choose, but on women's health care across the board.

At the same time, national media is reporting about a major coordinated push by anti-choice groups and Members of Congress to defund Planned Parenthood.

This coordinated effort to defund Planned Parenthood is an assault on all progressive health care, service, and advocacy organizations who aim to provide vital care and services to women and men across this country.

The public is standing by Planned Parenthood, which plays a vital role in defending women's health and rights.

Hundreds of thousands have already spoken up, including leading groups and communities such as the growing voice of our millennial generation.

My colleagues should be doing more to connect our youth and women to services that help them reduce their risk of unintended pregnancies and STD's, and improve their overall health through preventative screenings, education and planning, rather than restricting their access to lawfully entitled family planning and private health services.

I urge all Members to vote against the rule and the underlying bills.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. May I inquire of the gentlewoman from North Carolina how many more speakers she has on her side?

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I am expecting one more speaker that I am trying to accommodate. However, if the gentleman is prepared to close, then I will do my best to do that also.

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

I am going to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question. If we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up legislation that would treat wildfires like similar major natural disasters and eliminate the need to transfer funds from forest management and conservation programs for fire suppression. It is time to make commonsense changes to the Federal wildfire budget.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. ROBY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, the bills that the rule will make in order that are before us today, these bills and others are ongoing attacks that are part of the Republican drumbeat for a government shutdown over women's healthcare choices. It isn't enough to attack women's health. Republicans are now willing to take down the entire Federal Government in their political attacks.

As I mentioned at the outset in my opening statement, the facts are the facts; and I know for some of my colleagues, they are inconvenient and they like to avoid talking about them, but the reality is that these videos that my colleagues are referring to have been selectively edited.

We also know that 90 percent of what Planned Parenthood does is preventive care: cervical cancer screenings, important lifesaving procedures that benefit women. They do preventive care that benefits men as well.

It is also important for my colleagues to realize that there are no Federal funds, no taxpayer dollars that go to fund abortion. That is illegal. That is the law of the land. That is the Hyde amendment.

To shut down these important preventive healthcare services, to kind of advance this agenda that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have, which is to criminalize abortion under all circumstances—including, many of my colleagues advocate no exceptions even for rape or incest. A young girl who was a victim of rape or incest would be a criminal if she had an abortion.

This is all about taking away a woman's right to choose. That is what this is all about. Planned Parenthood happens to be the pawn, the latest pawn in this debate.

It is interesting. I watched the Republican debate last night. It was really quite entertaining. I heard Donald Trump and MARCO RUBIO and TED CRUZ say that they would be open to putting civil rights activist Rosa Parks on the $10 bill, but Republicans might be surprised to learn that Rosa Parks sat on the national board of Planned Parenthood Federation of America, the organization that my Republican friends, including the people who invoked her

name last night, are now trying to defund.

This is about preserving access to good, quality health care, and I really regret the fact that this has become such a political wedge issue in this Congress, but I get it. I know where my colleagues are coming from. That you would take up the time of this House to do this, which the Senate won't take up and which the President wouldn't sign even if they did, at a time when we have 6 legislative days left before the Federal Government shuts down, I don't know what my colleagues are thinking.

Part of what your job is is to keep this government running; and instead of doing that, we are doing these right-wing message bills that don't even go through regular order, that committees of jurisdiction don't even have a chance to consider, when every Member, Republican or Democrat, is told you can't even amend any of this stuff no matter what kind of idea you have.

This whole process is disgraceful. We need to get our priorities in order here. We ought to protect women's healthcare services; we ought not to be defunding an organization like Planned Parenthood, which does good work all across this country; and we ought to be bringing a bill to the floor to keep this government running.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question and vote ''no'' on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Last evening when I spoke on this legislation in the Committee on Rules, I mentioned that this is a very emotional issue for those of us who value life so much. One of my colleagues has already spoken to the fundamental issue of life, but I think we always should have time to talk about our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution.

Particularly as it relates to this issue, it is the Declaration of Independence which says: ''We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness—That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men.''

Madam Speaker, that is what we are talking about here today. We are talking about what our government should be doing in the light of knowing that the most vulnerable among us are being destroyed, and that without life, there is nothing else.

Our colleagues keep saying there are things that are more important for us to be debating today. Madam Speaker, I would purport that there are few things more important than this debate over the trafficking of hearts and other body parts of unborn children, some of whom may have been born alive.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim that this legislation is part of a war on women, but in reality it is designed to stop the war on children that is going on in abortion facilities across this country.

Large majorities of Americans believe their tax dollars should not go to fund abortions. They felt this way even before learning that, during those abortions, children are dismembered and sold piece by piece. It is unfathomable that we have to debate stopping the provision of tax dollars to organizations participating in such activities. It is also unbelievable that we do not immediately pass, by unanimous consent, legislation ensuring that children born alive, breathing and crying, like each of us was on our first day outside the womb, deserve the same medical care that any child born in a hospital would receive.

What is heartening, in the face of this contentious debate, is the principle that the truth always comes out. Abortionists can no longer hide in the dark back rooms of their facilities and sell unborn children piece by piece under an illusion that no one will ever know their crimes.

Our debate today and the videos that have been released have shattered that darkness and exposed the callousness of the abortion industry toward life and the consequences of accepting abortion on demand as acceptable. Both of these bills, the Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015 and the Born Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, contain commonsense provisions addressing the barbaric actions that have come to light in the abortion industry, and I commend the underlying bills in this rule providing for their consideration to all of my colleagues for their support.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 421 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

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

SEC. 6. 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. 167) to provide for adjustments to discretionary spending under section 251(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to support wildfire suppression operations, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. 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. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 167.

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.

Ms. FOXX. 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. McGOVERN. Madam 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 question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 420 and the amendment thereto;

Adopting the amendment to House Resolution 420, if ordered; and

Adopting House Resolution 420, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 348, RESPONSIBLY AND PROFESSIONALLY INVIGORATING DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 758, LAWSUIT ABUSE REDUCTION ACT OF 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution (H. Res. 420) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 348) to provide for improved coordination of agency actions in the preparation and adoption of environmental documents for permitting determinations, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 758) to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 179, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 497]

YEAS—238

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

NAYS—179

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

NOT VOTING—16

Barr
Bera
Bustos
Clay
Dingell
Fincher
Frankel (FL)
Granger
Jolly
Pelosi
Sanchez, Loretta
Smith (WA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Wagner
Westmoreland

□ 1458

Mr. MILLER of Florida changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 497, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast a vote on rollcall vote No. 497, ordering the previous question, because I was at the Pentagon Ceremony Recognizing the Heroism and Valor of Airman First Class Spencer Stone, Specialist Alek Skarlatos, and Mr. Anthony Sadler. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 11, 2015.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a facsimile copy of a letter received from Mr. Steven S. Sandvoss, Executive Director, State Board of Elections for the State of Illinois, indicating that, according to the preliminary results of the Special Election held September 10, 2015, the Honorable Darin LaHood was elected Representative to Congress for the Eighteenth Congressional District, State of Illinois.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk.

Enclosure.

STATE BOARD OF ELECTIONS,
STATE OF ILLINOIS,
Springfield, IL, September 11, 2015.

Hon. KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. HAAS: This is to advise you that the unofficial results of the Special Election held on Thursday, September 10, 2015, for Representative in Congress from the Eighteenth Congressional District of Illinois, show that Darin LaHood received 35,213 votes or 75% of the total number of votes cast for that office.

It would appear from these unoffiaial results that Darin LaHood was elected as Representative in Congress from the Eighteenth Congressional District of Illinois.

To the best of our knowledge and belief at this time, there is no contest to this election.

As soon as the official results are certified to this office by all 19 jurisdictions involved, an official Certificate of Election will be prepared for transmittal as required by law.

Sincerely,

STEVEN S. SANDVOSS,
Executive Director.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE DARIN LAHOOD, OF ILLINOIS, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, as the dean of the Illinois delegation, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable DARIN LAHOOD, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will Representative-elect LAHOOD and the members of the Illinois delegation present themselves in the well.

All Members will rise, and the Representative-elect will please raise his right hand.

Mr. LAHOOD appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 114th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE DARIN LAHOOD TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, DARIN LAHOOD is a central Illinois native who was born and raised in Peoria, Illinois. He comes to the U.S. Congress after serving over 4 years in the Illinois State Senate. Before that, he was a State and Federal prosecutor; an assistant United States attorney; an assistant State's attorney in Cook County in the narcotics unit; and a felony prosecutor in Tazewell County. He is known for his work fighting terrorism and making America safer.

On a personal note, DARIN's dad was former Member of the House Ray LaHood.

I would just like to hasten to add that I can't think of a Member of the House that I love or care for more than Ray LaHood. And I just want to say to his son, everybody keeps saying: Who is the new Congressman? Everybody says: Well, that is Ray LaHood's son. Well, pretty soon—I want to make everyone know—he is going to be known for a lot more than that. But what a wonderful beginning.

I yield to my colleague from the State of Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

Mr. SHIMKUS. I thank my colleague.

I don't have much to add. We are glad to have DARIN here as a new Member of the 114th Congress. Obviously, he is joined by his dad. Also who we had hoped was going to be here—but I know he is watching—is former Minority Leader Bob Michel, who is really part of the LaHood clan, and we think of him as we swear in DARIN.

DARIN has already hit the ground running, and I can speak for all my colleagues here, DARIN, that we will do all we can to help you be successful.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that I can't wait to work with him. And I know very soon that former Congressman Ray LaHood is going to be known as his father.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to now welcome the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD).

Mr. LAHOOD. I thank Speaker BOEHNER for swearing me in today.

Mr. Speaker, it is a true honor to be here. I am humbled and honored to be a part of this body. And I want to thank my colleagues—Congressman SHIMKUS, Congressman GUTIÉRREZ, and the rest of the Illinois delegation—for being here today. I look forward to working with them and being a productive Member of this body.

I would just like to thank my constituents that voted for me in this special election. We worked hard over the last 6 months in this race, and I am proud to be entrusted with the responsibility that 710,000 people gave me in my district in Illinois. I am proud of that district, and I am proud of my record in the State Senate. Again, I look forward to bringing the values that I have had in Illinois to this body.

I also want to thank my family. The family is the pride and joy of who I am. I have my three boys up here today—McKay, who is 13; Teddy, who is 8; Lucas, who is 11—and my wife Kristen, who is in the gallery. I couldn't do this without her.

Kristen, please stand up.

I guess I would just say that I look forward to working hard in this body, to meeting my colleagues, doing a lot of listening, and doing a lot of learning to be the best Member of Congress I can be.

I also want to thank my mom and dad and my extended family for being here.

I am proud to be the son of Ray and Kathy LaHood and the values that they instilled in me: faith, family, working hard, remembering where you came from, doing the best job you can for the people you represent, and staying grounded in your district.

I couldn't be prouder to be here today with the legacy in this district going back to Abraham Lincoln; and Bob Michel for 38 years, who I am sorry couldn't be here today. When I think about Bob Michel and think about 71 years ago he began his service to this country on the beaches of Normandy and spent 38 years in this body representing Peoria, and then he, during his time when Reagan was here, ushered in Reagan's values to help change this country, to have that legacy means so much.

I know I have got a lot to learn. I look forward to hitting the ground running, being the best Member of Congress that I can, and working hard for my district.

Thank you very much.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), the whole number of the House is 435.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. ROBY). The gentleman from Colorado will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, does this martial law amendment mean that any bill next week can be brought up without the 24-hour notice that we normally have to read a bill directly to the floor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not interpret the pending proposition.

Mr. POLIS. Well, Madam Speaker, that is the plain language of this amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the amendment to House Resolution 420 offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. 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 237, noes 187, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 498]

AYES—237

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

NOES—187

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

NOT VOTING—10

Barr
Dingell
Fincher
Pelosi
Posey
Sanchez, Loretta
Smith (WA)
Thompson (CA)
Wagner
Westmoreland

□ 1517

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. 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 238, noes 183, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 499]

AYES—238

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

NOES—183

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano

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

NOT VOTING—13

Barr
Clark (MA)
Conyers
DeFazio
Dingell
Fincher
Mulvaney
Pelosi
Sanchez, Loretta
Smith (WA)
Thompson (CA)
Wagner
Westmoreland

□ 1524

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I unfortunately missed the vote on adoption of H. Res. 420. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

LAWSUIT ABUSE REDUCTION ACT OF 2015

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 420, I call up the bill (H.R. 758) to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN). Pursuant to House Resolution 420, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 758

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 "Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. ATTORNEY ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) SANCTIONS UNDER RULE 11.—Rule 11(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "may" and inserting "shall";

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking "Rule 5" and all that follows through "motion." and inserting "Rule 5."; and

(3) in paragraph (4), by striking "situated" and all that follows through the end of the paragraph and inserting "situated, and to compensate the parties that were injured by such conduct. Subject to the limitations in paragraph (5), the sanction shall consist of an order to pay to the party or parties the amount of the reasonable expenses incurred as a direct result of the violation, including reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. The court may also impose additional appropriate sanctions, such as striking the pleadings, dismissing the suit, or other directives of a non-monetary nature, or, if warranted for effective deterrence, an order directing payment of a penalty into the court.".

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or an amendment made by this Act shall be construed to bar or impede the assertion or development of new claims, defenses, or remedies under Federal, State, or local laws, including civil rights laws, or under the Constitution of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 758, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 758, the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act, would restore mandatory sanctions for frivolous lawsuits filed in Federal Court. Many Americans may not realize it, but today, under what is called rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, there is no requirement that those who file frivolous lawsuits pay for the unjustified legal costs they impose on their victims, even when those victims prove to a judge the lawsuit was without any basis in law or fact. As a result, the current rule 11 goes largely unenforced, because the victims of frivolous lawsuits have little incentive to pursue additional litigation to have the case declared frivolous when there is no guarantee of compensation at the end of the day.

H.R. 758 would finally provide light at the end of the tunnel for the victims of frivolous lawsuits by requiring sanctions against the filers of frivolous lawsuits, sanctions which include paying back victims for the full costs of their reasonable expenses incurred as a direct result of the rule 11 violation, including attorneys' fees.

The bill also strikes the current provisions in rule 11 that allow lawyers to avoid sanctions for making frivolous claims and demands by simply withdrawing them within 21 days. This change eliminates the free pass lawyers now have to file frivolous lawsuits in Federal Court.

□ 1530

The current lack of mandatory sanctions leads to the regular filing of lawsuits that are clearly baseless. So many frivolous pleadings currently go under the radar because the lack of mandatory sanctions for frivolous filings forces victims of frivolous lawsuits to roll over and settle the case because doing that is less expensive than litigating the case to a victory in court.

Correspondence written by someone filing a frivolous lawsuit, which became public, concisely illustrates how the current lack of mandatory sanctions for filing frivolous lawsuits leads to legal extortion.

That correspondence to the victim of a frivolous lawsuit states, "I really don't care what the law allows you to do. It's a more practical issue. Do you want to send your attorney a check every month indefinitely as I continue to pursue this?"

Under the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act, those who file frivolous lawsuits would no longer be able to get off scot-free; and, therefore, they could not get away with those sorts of extortionary threats any longer.

The victims of lawsuit abuse are not just those who are actually sued. Rather, we all suffer under a system in which innocent Americans everywhere live under the constant fear of a potentially bankrupting frivolous lawsuit.

As the former chairman of The Home Depot company has written, "An unpredictable legal system casts a shadow over every plan and investment. It is devastating for start-ups. The cost of even one ill-timed abusive lawsuit can bankrupt a growing company and cost hundreds of thousands of jobs."

The prevalence of frivolous lawsuits in America is reflected in the absurd warning labels companies must place on their products to limit their exposure to frivolous claims.

A 5-inch brass fishing lure with three hooks is labeled "Harmful if swallowed." A Vanishing Fabric Marker warns it "Should not be used . . . for signing checks or any legal documents, as signatures will . . . disappear completely."

A household iron contains the warning "Never iron clothes while they are being worn." A piece of ovenware warns "Ovenware will get hot when used in oven." A hair dryer warns "Never use while sleeping."

A cardboard car sun shield that keeps sun off the dashboard warns ''Do not drive with sun shield in place.'' Not to be outdone, a giant Yellow Pages directory warns ''Do not use this directory while operating a motor vehicle.''

Here are just a couple of examples of frivolous lawsuits brought in Federal court in which judges failed to award compensation to the victims:

A man sued a television network for $2.5 million because he said a show it aired raised his blood pressure. When the network publicized his frivolous lawsuit, he demanded the court make them stop.

Although the court found the case frivolous, not only did it not compensate the victim, it granted the man who filed the frivolous lawsuit an exemption from even paying the ordinary court filing fees.

In another case, lawyers filed a case against a parent, claiming the parent's discipline of his child violated the Eighth Amendment of the Constitution, which prohibits cruel and unusual punishment by the government, not private citizens. One of the lawyers even admitted to signing the complaint without reading it.

The court found the case frivolous, but it awarded the victim only about a quarter of its legal costs because rule 11 currently doesn't require that a victim's legal costs be paid in full. The Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act would change that.

In his 2011 State of the Union Address, President Obama said, ''I'm willing to look at other ideas to . . . rein in frivolous lawsuits.''

Mr. President, here it is: a one-page bill that would significantly reduce the burden of frivolous litigation on innocent Americans.

I thank the former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Congressman LAMAR SMITH, for introducing this simple, commonsense legislation that would do so much to prevent lawsuit abuse and to restore Americans' confidence in the legal system. I urge my colleagues to support it today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I was duly impressed with the statement and position of my chairman, but I find it hard to believe it is on this bill because this bill is not a bill that should be passed.

This bill is an affront to the judges of this country, to the Judicial Conference, and to the American Bar Association.

The American Bar Association, a conservative organization, has come out against it. The Judicial Conference, made up of predominantly appellate judges, headed by Chief Justice Roberts—mostly of Republican-appointed judges—came out against it because it is not necessary.

It will clog the courts with unnecessary litigation, cost money, and make it more difficult to get your cases disposed of. It is just unnecessary.

Indeed, it would amend rule 11, but in such a way that it could have a serious deleterious effect on civil rights claims as well as to increase the volume and cost of litigation. If this House were a court and not a legislative body, rule 11 sanctions could apply here.

These concerns are not hypothetical. They are based on actual experience. From 1983 to 1993, there was a version of rule 11 that this law would reinstate.

So all you have to do and all any legislative body ought to do is go back and look at what happened in history. These rules were in effect from 1983 to 1993, taking a judge's discretion away.

Judges can order sanctions. They can make sure that those cases that were brought up about reading a phone book and having a wreck are out, gone. They can do that.

This takes their discretion away, and they have got to give costs and compensation to the other side's lawyers. And then there are hearings and all of that stuff.

Presently, the court has discretion, and there is a 21-day safe harbor provision where an attorney can withdraw or correct any alleged submissions that were wrong.

This requires the courts to award reasonable attorneys' fees and other costs. It does not leave it to the discretion of the court.

Currently, such awards are entirely at the court's discretion, and they are limited to deterrence purposes, not for the compensation of lawyers.

Simply put, H.R. 758 will have a deleterious impact on the administration of justice for these reasons:

First, civil rights. Think about Brown v. Board of Education. When it came before the court, it was a novel case, and a judge in certain places, especially in the South in 1954, might have said: Sorry, lawyer. You are out of here.

The judge would have had no option under this but to grant costs against the attorney who brought the case, Mr. Marshall, and we might not have ever had Brown v. Board of Education.

Civil rights cases comprise 11 percent of Federal cases filed, but more than 22 percent of the cases in which sanctions have been imposed for civil rights cases. H.R. 758 would restore this problem. Just imagine that result. There are other cases that are similar.

The legal arguments in landmark cases where certain novel arguments are made that are not based on then-existing law would be affected. Litigation would be prolonged and may be too expensive to continue.

Secondly, H.R. 758 will also substantially increase the amount, cost, and intensity of litigation. Experts in civil procedure are virtually unanimous on this point.

By making sanctions mandatory and having no safe harbor, the 1983 rule spawned a ''cottage industry'' of litigation. There were financial incentives to file rule 11s.

Prior to the 1983 rule taking effect—this really gets me—there had been only 19 rule 11 proceedings over the course of 45 years, but in the decade that this rule was in effect, which this bill wants to reinstate, there were 7,000 proceedings in 10 years—11 in 45 years and 7,000 in 10 years. So we are talking about a lot of litigation and clogging up of the courts.

One-third of all Federal lawsuits were burdened by these satellite litigations that came about because of this rule. It strips the judiciary of discretion, and it utterly ignores the thorough process by which the Federal court rules are usually amended.

H.R. 758 overrides this judicial independence by removing the discretion to impose sanctions and to determine which sanctions might be appropriate. It circumvents the painstakingly thorough Rules Enabling Act process that Congress itself established 80 years ago.

The 1993 amendments to rule 11 have been a tremendous success. That is what this would throw out. As documented by the Judicial Conference of the United States, these amendments resulted in a ''marked decline in rule 11 satellite litigation without any noticeable increase in frivolous filings.''

H.R. 758, however, would undo this. That is why the American Bar Association and the Judicial Conference oppose it.

It is also opposed by the Alliance for Justice, the Center for Justice & Democracy, the Consumer Federation of America, the Consumers Union, and Public Citizen.

This is a deeply flawed bill that addresses a nonexistent problem. We have this bill, and we have a bill on abortion. It seems like today's actions in Congress are Shakespearean, first, ''kill the lawyers,'' but, this time, it is ''kill the judges.'' The other one is ''kill the doctors.''

Congress knows the answer. We can tell the judges what they need to do because they are not doing it, and we will tell the doctors what they need to do, and we will tell the women what they need to do. Unfortunately, that is what we have come down to, a bad bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to say to the gentleman from Tennessee that no judges have to find a frivolous lawsuit to be a frivolous lawsuit. They have that discretion in every case.

But once they find it to be a frivolous lawsuit, it is injustice to not award attorneys' fees under rule 11 to those who have been wronged by being the victims of a frivolous lawsuit.

What about the burden on the court?

When the mandatory rule 11 sanction provision was in effect for almost 10 years between 1983 and 1993, the number of rule 11 court proceedings was easily manageable by the courts.

The number of rule 11 court proceedings during that time amounted to 7.5 reported rule 11 cases per Federal district court per year, or one reported decision for each Federal district court

judge per year, one per judge per year. That is not an unreasonable burden on our Federal judiciary to see justice done.

Quite frankly, if that were done more often today, we would see a lot fewer frivolous lawsuits to begin with and, therefore, fewer requests for attorneys' fees.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the author of the legislation, the former chairman of the House Judiciary Committee and the current chairman of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) for bringing this legislation to the House floor.

I appreciate all of his efforts to do so, and I appreciate his taking the initiative on this and on so many other issues as chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act, known as LARA, is just over one-page long, but it would prevent the filing of hundreds of thousands of pages of frivolous lawsuits in Federal court.

For example, frivolous lawsuits have been filed against The Weather Channel for failing to accurately predict storms, against television shows people claimed were too scary, and against fast food companies because inactive children gained weight.

In other cases, prison inmates have sued alcohol companies, blaming them for a life of crime. A teacher sought damages from her school district based on her fear of children. A father demanded $40 million in compensation after his son was kicked off the track team for excessive absenteeism. There are many, many more examples.

Frivolous lawsuits have simply become too common. Lawyers who bring these cases have everything to gain and nothing to lose under current rules, which permit plaintiffs' lawyers to file frivolous lawsuits, no matter how absurd the claims, without any penalty whatsoever. Meanwhile, defendants are often faced with years of litigation and substantial attorneys' fees.

These cases have wrongly cost innocent Americans their reputations and their hard-earned dollars. They amount to legalized extortion because defendants must settle out of court rather than endure a more expensive trial.

According to the research firm Towers Watson, the annual direct cost of American tort litigation now exceeds over $260 billion a year, or over $850 per person.

Before 1993, it was mandatory for judges to impose sanctions, such as orders to pay for the other side's legal expenses when lawyers filed frivolous lawsuits.

Then the Civil Rules Advisory Committee, an obscure branch of the courts, made penalties optional. This needs to be reversed by Congress.

□ 1545

As Chairman GOODLATTE noted, even President Obama has expressed a willingness to limit frivolous lawsuits. If the President is serious about stopping these meritless claims, he should support mandatory sanctions for frivolous lawsuits to avoid making frivolous promises.

LARA requires lawyers who file frivolous lawsuits to pay the attorneys' fees and court costs of innocent defendants. It reverses the rules that made sanctions discretionary rather than mandatory.

Further, LARA expressly provides that no claim under civil rights laws would be affected in any way, and I trust this will address the concerns expressed by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN). I would like to direct his attention to page 2 of the bill, lines 18 to 23, which explicitly protect civil rights lawsuits.

Opponents argue that reinstating mandatory sanctions for frivolous lawsuits impedes judicial discretion. This is patently false. Under LARA, judges retain the discretion to determine whether or not a claim is frivolous. If a judge determines that a claim is frivolous, they must award sanctions. This ensures that victims of frivolous lawsuits obtain compensation, but the decision to find a claim frivolous still remains with the judge.

A report earlier this year from the Administrative Office of the United States Courts found that civil lawsuits increased by tens of thousands last year. Such an increase makes this legislation necessary in order to discourage abusive filings, which further strain court dockets with lengthy backlogs.

The American people are looking for solutions to obvious lawsuit abuse. LARA restores accountability to our legal system by reinstating mandatory sanctions for attorneys who file these frivolous lawsuits. Though it will not stop all lawsuit abuse, LARA encourages attorneys to think twice before filing a frivolous lawsuit.

I want to, again, thank Chairman GOODLATTE for bringing this much-needed legislation to the House floor, and I ask my colleagues who oppose frivolous lawsuits and who want to protect hard-working Americans from false claims to support the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act.

Now, furthermore, Mr. Speaker, similar bills to this have passed in the last several Congresses, and I hope this legislation will be approved today.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for Mr. SMITH, as I do for Mr. GOODLATTE, but I would submit that the rule of construction, nothing in this act or an amendment made by this act, shall be construed to bar or impede the assertion or development of new claims, defenses, or remedies under Federal, State, or local laws, including civil rights laws or under the Constitution of the United States.

That is the same thing as the committee having—if they would have accepted the amendment that we offered to specifically exempt civil rights laws. That was not accepted.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. This particular rule of construction was a bipartisan effort led by BOBBY SCOTT, a former member of the Judiciary Committee, to avoid the problem that you are concerned about, and that is that this bill in any way would seem to dampen or prohibit civil rights legislation.

Again, this rule of construction was put in there to address the very problem that the gentleman is concerned about.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, at the same time, I would submit the rule of construction is not the same thing as if the committee would have accepted the amendment offered that said specifically civil rights laws would not be affected by this because you could still offer a rule 11 under this. It just says nothing in this action will be construed to borrow or impede the assertion.

It doesn't borrow or impede the assertion of a new claim, but it doesn't say the court cannot find a rule 11 violation and then the mandatory imposition of costs would take place. It doesn't do what you are submitting, I would suggest.

The bottom line is the court felt that this wasn't necessary. The court said, in all those cases he talked about that seem so absurd—I don't understand—and particularly as lawyer—why a lawyer would waste his time doing it because there is no chance of success and no chance of remuneration in cases like that.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT), who can explain easily and in a very facile fashion why those arguments are not good.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I will say, with due deference to respected colleagues from Virginia and Texas, this is a misguided piece of legislation.

I speak as not only a Member of this House, but also as somebody who has practiced civil litigation for the last 25 years. I have represented companies, consumers, defendants, and plaintiffs in all sorts of civil litigation; and I have done this before and after the 1993 changes that led to the current rule 11.

Where I come out on it is that this really is an attack on the Federal judiciary. Yes, they have discretion on whether to decide whether there has been a rule 11 violation of in initio, but this is something that encourages rule 11 motion litigation.

It encourages rule 11 motion practice, and that is why the Federal judges oppose it. The Judicial Conference surveyed the Federal judges of this Nation, and fully 87 percent of United States district judges prefer the current version of rule 11. After all, it already allows monetary sanctions for silly lawsuits.

I think something of a false picture was presented a little bit earlier, the implication that Federal judges don't have the power to impose monetary sanctions. Court costs and legal fees of the so-called victims of frivolous lawsuits, that is in the current practice of rule 11. They can do that now.

If a Federal judge decides that he or she thinks that a lawsuit has been frivolous and dismissed, on that basis, they can fully award all defense costs and defense fees. As a result, this is completely unnecessary and superfluous legislation. It offends the Federal judiciary. After all, we are talking about limiting the discretion of Federal judges.

Federal judges are folks that are appointed. We work very, very hard here on Capitol Hill in making sure that we appoint only the Federal judges who will exercise good discretion, Federal judges that are completely vetted, who are interviewed, who go through hearing after hearing and are very carefully selected here by the United States Congress.

To say that we cannot and we should not repose full discretion in our Federal judges is what is being said here, and I think it is a misguided attempt to take away the discretion of our Federal judges.

Not only that, it leads to unnecessary litigation. Everybody in court who ever won a motion or threw out a case thinks that the opposition's position was frivolous.

When you say rule 11 sanctions are mandatory, it creates this compulsion to follow up a motion victory with a rule 11 motion: Not only did I win the case, but I want you to pay my attorney's fees and costs.

When you make it a mandatory sanction like this, you create this compulsion to file rule 11 motions, and I don't say that out of theory, Mr. Speaker.

The truth is that we did have, in that 10-year period, 7,000 rule 11 motions. This is the type of a rule that we lived under for 10 years that this legislation would go back to that spawned all this extraneous litigation. You say: Your position was frivolous, so I am filing a rule 11 motion.

Guess what—rule 11 motions themselves are subject to rule 11 so that they could be frivolous so that the receiving end says: Well, your rule 11 motion was frivolous, so I am filing my own rule 11 motion against you.

That is something that happened.

In fact, a United States district judge from the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, Robert S. Gawthrop, in the suburban Philadelphia area, he termed that ''zombie litigation.'' That is something that gets spawned by this type of litigation. We don't need zombie litigation in this country.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just ask the gentleman this: What other sorts of legal claims should a victim be able to prove in court—prove in court, but be denied damages by the judge?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I am afraid I am not following the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. It is a simple question. What other sorts of legal claims should a victim be able to prove in court—because they are allowed to do this under rule 11—prove that they have suffered damages in court, but be denied those damages by the judge?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. This is not something that is denied. Judges have discretion.

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

Mr. COHEN. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that this is misguided legislation.

More ominously, it disproportionately hurts the people filing claims—civil rights claims, consumer rights claims—and it has a chilling effect on legal innovation. It was legal innovation on the part of Thurgood Marshall to come up with Brown v. Board of Education. Who are we to chill that kind of legal innovation in this Chamber?

For those reasons, I oppose this legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to respond to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who was not able to identify a single other sort of legal claim where the victim would be able to prove their damages in court, but still be denied those damages by the judge.

What I am getting at is that in no other area of the law can a person prove to a judge that they are a victim under the standards that define the wrong they have suffered, yet the judge retains the discretion to refrain from compensating the victim of the legal wrong.

All this bill does is provide equal treatment by allowing victims of frivolous lawsuits, who prove the lawsuit against them was frivolous, the right to compensation for the harm done to them, just like every other victim of a legal wrong.

I would continue to ask: In what other area of the law can a person prove to the judge they were the victim of a legal wrong and still be denied compensation by the judge?

This only occurs after the judge has already found that the lawsuit was frivolous, which would not apply to some of the great cases through history where courts have found merit to the case. They are not going to find it frivolous.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

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

The answer is that, every time somebody with damages proves his or her case in front of a jury, the jury has the discretion to award whatever they think is proper damages. For example, if they accept some of the damages and reject other parts of the damages, they don't award the full amount, and that is the kind of discretion a Federal judge should retain.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the judge has that discretion under current law, has that discretion under this bill, but they don't have the discretion to say they are not going to award any damages where the case is found to be frivolous and, in fact, damages have been incurred.

Obviously, the judge has a discretion to determine what those actual damages are, but he doesn't have the discretion to simply say: I am not going to award damages, even though I found the case to be frivolous.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 758, the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act, commonly called LARA, sponsored by my good friend and colleague from Texas, Mr. LAMAR SMITH. The legal system in the United States needs to driven by justice, not by dollars.

Right now, there are too many lawyers out there throwing their money at frivolous lawsuits to manipulate and abuse the system. No one should be able to abuse our system.

It is simple to file a lawsuit, and you can cost the defendant hundreds of thousands of dollars on a frivolous claim going through discovery and going through all of the legal processes. That simply isn't right.

LARA ensures that judges impose monetary sanctions against lawyers who file these frivolous lawsuits, including the costs of attorneys' fees incurred by their victims. It prevents bad lawyers from using the judicial system as a weapon and provides justice for those who have been abused by these attorneys.

By passing LARA, these attorneys will no longer be able to exert power over their victims with these suits that are not based on facts or in law, but are merely intended to scare or extort money out of the victims.

I remember when I was in law school in Congressman SMITH's hometown of San Antonio, Texas, and one of the professors in one of my classes said something that has stuck with me for all these years about a lawsuit: You may be able to beat the wrap, but you can't beat the ride.

□ 1600

LARA helps with that. You are not going to be able to stop the emotional

roller coaster ride the defendant and his family, his partners, his employees, his friends all go through as a result of the lawsuit that is frivolous, but you will be able to beat some of the cost of that ride by holding the attorneys who file frivolous lawsuits responsible for that. That is what we need to do.

Frivolous lawsuits drain victims of their money and damage their reputations. Let's stop them before they start by putting the lawyers at risk for filing frivolous lawsuits.

In many countries, there is a loser pay system. We are not proposing we go that far here in the United States, but we do want justice for those who are victims of clearly frivolous lawsuits, and this legislation will make sure that that happens. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), who was a distinguished barrister before becoming a Congressman.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the so-called Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act.

Today, Mr. Speaker, is Constitution Day. How is the House GOP celebrating Constitution Day? By trampling on our Framers' vision of an independent judiciary as one of three separate but equal branches of government.

The Framers of our Constitution established an independent judicial branch because they believed the judges should be able to interpret the law without interference. They believed that only when judges were shielded from the influence of politicians and pundits and special interests could they issue rulings fairly and impartially. In short, they worked to create a system that shielded judges from efforts like the one behind today's Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, is nothing more—I repeat, this legislation is nothing more—than a giveaway to corporate special interests that seek to price Americans out of their day in court. The bill restores a rule, reimposes a rule that our independent judiciary system abandoned over 20 years ago because it unfairly disadvantaged workers and consumers and other Americans that dared to take on big corporations in court.

Our judges put in place this rule—or kept this version that we use today of this rule—20 years ago, and they remain strongly in support of it today. That is because today's rule, Mr. Speaker, gives judges the flexibility to determine when to apply sanctions against attorneys who file frivolous lawsuits.

This legislation flies in the face of our Framers' vision of an independent judiciary. It strips our judges of their discretion, imposing congressionally mandated rules that drove up costs and clogged our courts when these were the rules before.

We don't have to debate the harmful consequences of this legislation because history has already shown us how the 1983 version of rule 11 tipped the scales of justice in favor of those with the deepest pockets.

Mr. Speaker, too often everyday Americans feel that they have got the cards stacked against them in our economy and in our elections. Let's give them a fighting chance in the courtroom and reject this frivolous bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 758.

This is not an attack on the Federal judiciary. This is an attack on those unscrupulous lawyers and con artists who are bilking the American people out of hundreds of millions of dollars that they have had to earn and work hard in order to achieve. Our system is out of whack today, and today we find our honest citizens exposed to this type of threat. This would take care of that somewhat.

First, I would like to thank my good friend from Texas, LAMAR SMITH, for his bill, which I believe is so important, as many small- and medium-sized businesses like we have in California are hit every year with frivolous and abusive lawsuits.

I would also like to thank my friends Chairman TRENT FRANKS from Arizona and especially Chairman BOB GOODLATTE from Virginia for their leadership on this much-needed legislation.

Frivolous lawsuits have cost honest Americans hundreds of millions of dollars by encouraging lawyers and scam artists to attack honest citizens, expecting that these honest citizens will opt for a settlement. This is what we call a legal shakedown, and it must be ended, which is what H.R. 758 intends to do.

Let us note that giving in when someone reaches a settlement rather than trying to fight people who have more resources than they do, even though it is a frivolous lawsuit, encourages more people to have more lawsuits and encourages certain lawyers to go down a route where they are only aimed at trying to use their leverage against honest citizens to enrich themselves.

I would note that this legislation will go a long way in these specific areas in terms that threaten all Americans, honest citizens, but it especially will take care of another concern that I have had, of course, and Chairman GOODLATTE and Chairman SMITH have had, and that is it takes care of patent trolls, who are scam artists who use claims of patent infringement in their frivolous lawsuits.

Other proposed approaches to this problem deal with the problem in a way that would hurt legitimate inventors—this is where we have a little disagreement—but this solution will help these inventors and help all enterprisers and entrepreneurs. H.R. 758, combined with the actions of the FTC and other States on bad faith demand letters, gives small-business owners the tools they need to fight scam artists, including patent trolls who attempt to use our judicial process to extort America's job creators.

I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 758. Support those people who are creating jobs throughout our society. Support those people who deserve the protection and are not trying to scam our system.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO).

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, should those filing a frivolous lawsuit be held accountable to the victims of that frivolous lawsuit? I think most people would say yes. There are hard-working Americans and small businesses across this country spending tens of thousands of dollars, collectively millions of dollars every year defending themselves from frivolous lawsuits.

A frivolous lawsuit, as it is defined, has no basis in fact or in law, no basis whatsoever. A judge can make a determination—must make a determination—whether a lawsuit is frivolous or not upon the question being presented and yet not award damages even upon a finding of a frivolous lawsuit. That just doesn't make sense, and it is not fair to the victims of frivolous lawsuits.

The bill that we are voting on here stands for something very basic. A judge shouldn't be allowed to deny damage awards to the victim of a frivolous lawsuit. A vote for this bill is a vote to reduce the filing of frivolous lawsuits; a vote for this bill is a vote to protect the integrity of the judicial system; and a vote for this bill is a warning shot to anyone who thinks that filing a frivolous lawsuit is a way to extort money.

It has been said—and I practiced law—what is the nuisance value of this claim? In other words, what would you advise your client to just pay the other side to make a frivolous lawsuit go away because of how costly it is and how much time you spend worrying and preparing?

Lawsuits can be very intimidating to a defendant, and those who have a good faith claim will litigate it out, and the judge won't find there to be anything frivolous about it; but when it is frivolous, those filing it should have to pay. This is very, very common sense.

A vote for this bill is standing on the side of small business and preserving the integrity of our judicial system.

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

First, I just want to go back to the Judicial Conference of the United States and their committee on rules of practice and procedure, which came out against this. They were just against it totally. In a letter signed by Judge Jeffrey Sutton and Judge David

Campbell, they said it is going to cost money, going to impede justice, and is not necessary.

Now, we have heard this is common sense and all these frivolous cases and how absurd it is and how wrong it is and how terrible it is. Well, the two judges that wrote this letter to Mr. GOODLATTE and said that this was unnecessary, that we should just keep the rule we have got, that the rule that we are adopting was an error in 1983 to 1993, it cost a lot of money in frivolous litigation, satellite lawsuits, explosion of satellite litigation, and it just didn't work.

Judge Sutton was appointed to the bench by President Bush after clerking for Justices Scalia and Powell. I would assume that if you were appointed by President Bush, approved by the United States Senate, and you clerked for Justices Scalia and Powell, you are not some kind of a big supporter of frivolous lawsuits in the plaintiffs' bar.

The other gentleman is Judge Campbell from Arizona, also appointed by President Bush. They were pretty adamant that this was a bad idea. They took some surveys, and 80-some-odd percent of folks said it was a bad idea. The bar association said it was a bad idea. The bar association had a group of 200 lawyers, litigants, judges, and academics who participated in the 2010 conference at Duke University Law School convened by the advisory committee to search for ways to address the problem. Not one of the 200 people proposed a return to the 1983 version. So 200 lawyers, litigants, judges, and academics met, and none of them suggested this type of bill.

The Judicial Conference, headed up by two people appointed by President Bush, conservative judges, said this is a very bad idea. The bar association says it is a terrible idea. Yet we are to come here and think that Congress has got the best idea, better than all these specialists. That is one of the things that is wrong with this Congress. People realize that we are not respecting logic, expertise, and history.

In their letter, the judges said that this was a return to previous attempts to amend this rule, that it would eliminate this provision adopted in 1993, and their concerns that they expressed here mirrored the views expressed by the Judicial Conference in 2004 when the Republicans, I believe, had both Houses, the House and Senate, but they certainly had the House.

In 2005, this bill came up, and they came out against it. The Republicans had the House and maybe the Senate, I don't know. The bill came up again in 2011 and 2013. So this bill has been here in 2004, 2005, 2011, and 2013, and the Judicial Conference, the judges, the lawyers, and the experts almost two to one have said it is a bad idea. I know it is throwback Thursday, but that is no reason to bring this bill forward.

□ 1615

I find it hard to be against my good friends, Mr. SMITH and Mr. GOODLATTE. They are fine gentlemen. Mr. ROHRABACHER was here. He is my buddy. But it is a bad bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for yielding.

A couple of things. First of all, we have found in the past that the judiciary, of course, always opposes anyone else changing these rules except for themselves. That is no surprise, that they object to this change that we propose today.

That doesn't mean the change isn't a good one, but that is their history. If they didn't think of the change, they don't like it. Clearly, this is good for the American people because it reduces the number of frivolous lawsuits.

The gentleman from Tennessee mentioned a poll a few minutes ago. I would like, first of all, to mention a poll that was taken when this rule was in effect in 1990.

At that point, 751 Federal judges responded to that survey, and they overwhelmingly supported a rule 11 with mandatory sanctions.

The gentleman mentioned, I believe, a 2005 survey. In that survey, only 278 judges responded. Over half of the judges who responded had no experience under this stronger rule 11 because they were appointed to the bench after 1992.

So the 2005 survey tells us very little about how judges actually view the stronger versus the weaker rule 11.

It is just amazing to me to hear individuals try to justify these frivolous lawsuits. There is no effort in this bill to deny individuals the right to file lawsuits if they have legitimate claims.

But to try to justify frivolous lawsuits and lawsuits that are found to be frivolous by judges, to me, is so contrary to the best interest of Americans who are innocent of these charges. I just don't understand the opposition to this bill.

Innocent Americans sacrifice reputations. They sacrifice money. They oftentimes lose their livelihoods to frivolous lawsuits. I think we ought to do everything we possibly can to reduce the number of these frivolous lawsuits.

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

I respect Mr. SMITH and understand what he is saying about judges wanting to control their own courtrooms and control the system, but they have the expertise.

The bar association is not the judges. The bar association is against this, too. So you have got the bar association and the Judicial Conference, both of which are conservative organizations, against it.

In the study, yes, some of those folks might not have been there in 1983 to 1993, but they still knew what the rule was and they were able to study and they were able to understand things.

They weren't there when cases were filed. They didn't know the facts of the case. They learned. They have got minds that are capable of absorbing information, analyzing it, synthesizing it, and coming to decisions.

You didn't have to be alive when slavery was around to know slavery was bad. You didn't have to be on the bench from 1983 to 1993 to know that rule 11 was working and that this bill which brings back that old rule would be a failure.

So I think there is deference you should give to the bar association and to the Judicial Conference, both of which have come out against this.

There are motions for summary judgment. They talk as if there is no way to get rid of a frivolous lawsuit. If you bring a frivolous lawsuit, you are going to get a motion for summary judgment. A court can order that. It can find a motion to dismiss. You don't even have to go into discovery.

The courts are the ones that suffer the most. You said that, sure, sometimes the defendants do from defending these cases, but the courts have to put up with it.

The courts don't want frivolous litigation at all. They probably are one of the first groups that don't want frivolous litigation.

I know some people that serve in this Congress who have been judges. They are outstanding men. They understand how important judges are and that their opinions should be revered and respected.

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

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

I would just say that sometimes I see Mr. ROHRABACHER and I think about the fact that we have traveled some together. One of the things I have learned on those travels is the thing people in foreign countries appreciate most about the United States of America is our justice system, the fact that you have got a system where you go in and get a case heard. That is one of the things that is best about our country.

What this is about is taking power from judges and giving financial incentives. The defendants have got the heavy pockets, and it will end up squeezing plaintiffs from bringing actions. If they are so frivolous, the judges will dismiss them on summary judgments or motions to dismiss.

The judges can still have sanctions and damages, but just not have all power taken from them. And there are other rules where they can have sanctions if you are just messing with discovery and violating the rules.

I just think this is going to help close our courts, and that is not the right way to go, particularly on Constitution Day.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

First, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Tennessee, who is

my friend, that I was pleased that he cited as one of the credentials for the two judges that wrote to the committee on behalf of the Conference that they had been schooled by Justice Scalia.

Here is what Justice Scalia himself had to say about this. He specifically opposed the weakening of rule 11 when it occurred in 1993, writing that it would ''render the Rule toothless, by allowing judges to dispense with sanction, by disfavoring compensation for litigation expenses, and by providing a 21-day 'safe harbor,' '' entitling the party accused of a frivolous filing to escape with no sanction at all.

Justice Scalia further observed, ''In my view, those who file frivolous suits and pleadings should have no 'safe harbor.' The Rules should be solicitous of the abused (the courts and the opposing party), and not of the abuser. Under the revised Rule, parties will be able to file thoughtless, reckless, and harassing pleadings, secure in the knowledge that they have nothing to lose: If objection is raised, they can retreat without penalty.''

So I also want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Tennessee and I agree on one of the great hallmarks of this country, and that is our judicial system. The hallmark of our judicial system is that, when you are victimized in this country, you have a place where you can go and seek justice.

That is exactly what Mr. SMITH's bill does. It allows people who are victimized by aggressive plaintiffs—abusive, frivolous, and fraudulent lawsuits—to be able to get justice themselves.

Because when you are the victim of an expensive, costly lawsuit that can damage your business, damage your reputation, cost you huge amounts of money, you are indeed a victim, if the court finds that that whole lawsuit was brought on a frivolous basis.

And, yet, I challenge again the other side of the aisle and those who oppose this legislation to name one other sort of legal claim—just one—where the victim is able to prove in court their damages and then be denied those damages by the judge.

They have not done that. They have not made their case in this court, the people's court. The elected representatives of the people today should pass this legislation and give justice to victims of frivolous lawsuits.

I urge my colleagues to support this great legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I oppose H.R. 758, the "Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act of 2015."

This bill is substantially identical to bills that we considered in the 112th and 113th Congresses, and we have considered even earlier versions of this bill going back at least a decade.

H.R. 758, like its predecessors, is a solution in search of a problem that would threaten to do more harm than good if enacted.

H.R. 758 would restore the 1983 version of Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure by making sanctions for Rule 11 violations mandatory and by eliminating the current safe-harbor provision that allows a party to withdraw or correct any allegedly offending submission to the court within 21 days after service of such submission.

Moreover, the bill would go beyond the 1983 Rule by requiring a court to award reasonable attorneys' fees and costs related to Rule 11 litigation. Current Rule 11 makes such awards entirely discretionary.

Yet no empirical evidence suggests any need for a change to the current Rule 11.

In fact, there were good reasons why the Judicial Conference of the United States amended the 1983 version of Rule 11. For these same reasons, H.R. 758 is ill-advised.

The 1983 Rule caused excessive litigation. Many civil cases had a parallel track of litigation—referred to as "satellite litigation"—over Rule 11 violations because having mandatory sanctions and no safe-harbor provision caused parties on both sides of a Rule 11 motion to litigate the Rule 11 matter to the bitter end.

The dramatic increase in litigation spawned by the 1983 Rule not only resulted in delays in resolving the underlying case and increased costs for the litigants, but also strained judicial resources.

In light of this history, it is clear that H.R. 758 will result in more, not less, litigation and will impose a great burden on the federal judiciary.

Ultimately, the type of Rule 11 sanctions regime that H.R. 758 envisions will only favor those with the money and resources to fight expensive and drawn out litigation battles.

H.R. 758 also threatens judicial independence by removing the discretion that Rule 11 currently gives judges in determining whether to impose sanctions and what type of sanctions would be most appropriate.

It also circumvents the painstakingly thorough Rules Enabling Act process, recklessly attempting to amend the rules directly, even over the Judicial Conference's objections.

Finally, we know that the 1983 Rule had a disproportionately chilling impact on civil rights cases, and there is no reason to think H.R. 758 would not have a similar chilling effect if it is enacted.

Civil rights cases in particular depend on novel arguments for the extension, modification, or reversal of existing law.

Not surprisingly, a Federal Judicial Center study found that the incidence of Rule 11 motions was higher in civil rights cases than some other types of cases when the 1983 Rule was in place, notwithstanding the fact that the 1983 Rule was neutral on its face.

Even the decision in Brown v. Board of Education arguably may have been delayed or stopped had H.R. 758's changes to Rule 11 been in effect at the time, given the novel nature of the plaintiffs' arguments in that case.

At a minimum, the defendants could have used Rule 11, as amended by H.R. 758, as a weapon to dissuade the plaintiffs or weaken their resolve.

H.R. 758 is a flawed bill for many reasons. I would urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee and a strong defender of the civil rights and liberties of all Americans, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 758, the "Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act of 2015," which can more accurately be described as the "Denial of Access to Civil Justice Act."

This ill-considered and misguided legislation would rescind the current version of Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which has been in effect since 1993, and reinstate the disastrous 1983 version of the rule.

I strongly oppose H.R. 758 because it hampers the ability of federal district courts to deter frivolous litigation—while preserving access to the courts—by limiting the ability of judges to exercise discretion in imposing sanctions for Rule 11 violations.

Under H.R. 758, federal district judges would be required to impose sanctions for all violations of Rule 11, even in cases in which it would be manifestly inappropriate to do so.

Mr. Speaker, the reason the version of Rule 11(c) in effect from 1983–1993 was rescinded is because the results of its 10-year experiment proved conclusively that it did not work.

Instead of reducing frivolous litigation, mandatory imposition of sanction actually had the opposite effect of increasing litigation.

Indeed, according to the American Bar Association, "during the decade of that the 1983 version of the Rule requiring mandatory sanctions was in effect, an entire industry of litigation revolving around Rule 11 claims inundated the legal system and wasted valuable court resources and time."

Studies by the Judicial Conference of the United States, the administrative arm of the federal judiciary, found that the 1983 version of Rule ii(c) quickly became a tool of abuse.

Aggressive filings of Rule 11 sanctions motions required expenditure of tremendous resources on Rule 11 battles having nothing to do with the merits of the case and everything to do with strategic gamesmanship.

Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 758 would undermine civil rights cases.

During the decade between 1983 and 1993, mandatory sanctions under Rule 11 were disproportionately imposed in civil rights cases.

A leading study on this issue showed that although civil rights cases made up 11.4% of federal cases filed during this period, 22.7% of the cases in which sanctions had been imposed were civil rights cases.

If this bill were to be enacted, once again, as happened between 1983 and 1993, defendants in civil rights cases could wield Rule 11 as a weapon against legitimate plaintiffs, tying up civil rights cases in long and costly satellite litigation on Rule 11 and preventing legitimate civil rights cases from moving forward.

For these reasons, I urge all Members to vote against H.R. 758.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 420, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. DELBENE. I am opposed, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. DelBene moves to recommit the bill H.R. 758 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following:

SEC. 3. PROTECTING EQUAL PAY FOR WOMEN.

This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall not apply in the case of any action brought under employment discrimination laws, including laws that ensure that women receive equal pay for equal work.

Ms. DELBENE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

The so-called Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act would turn back the clock to deter good-faith litigants seeking justice, like women who are denied equal pay for equal work.

The harmful effects of this bill are not speculative. We know this bill will undercut important civil rights and equal pay litigation because it would restore a version of rule 11 that was in effect from 1983 to 1993.

Under the version of rule 11 that this bill would resurrect, sanctions were disproportionately imposed against plaintiff's in civil rights and anti-discrimination cases. The old rule's onerous provisions created a chilling effect on civil rights litigation, created time-consuming and costly satellite litigation, and gave rise to needless delay and harassment in the courtroom.

This amendment would ensure the bill's harmful effects do not apply in cases brought under employment discrimination laws, including laws to ensure women earn equal pay for equal work.

When President Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act into law 50 years ago, women, on average, made 59 cents for every dollar earned by men.

While we have made some progress since then, with women appointed to the Supreme Court and to executive leadership roles at Fortune 500 companies, we are still nowhere near the goal of equal pay for equal work.

Just as recently as 2007, the Supreme Court ruled against Lilly Ledbetter, making it nearly impossible for workers who suffered discrimination to seek justice.

Because she was prohibited from discussing her salary with coworkers, Lilly didn't find out she was making significantly less than her male counterparts until her retirement.

The court ruled that she waited too long to file her lawsuit. Luckily, in 2009, Congress intervened, passing the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act to reverse the Supreme Court's decision.

Unfortunately, stories like this are not unique. Women still make only 79 cents on the dollar, about 20 percent less take-home pay than their male counterparts.

That is why it is critical that Congress vote for this amendment: to ensure women can continue fighting for equal pay at work.

Because equal pay is not just good for women, it is good for families, businesses, and our economy. When women aren't paid what they deserve, middle class families and communities pay the price.

Families today rely on women's wages to put food on the table, save for retirement, and pay for their children's education. It is estimated that the pay gap costs a woman and her family more than $10,000 in lost earnings each year, a significant number by any standards.

I recently spoke with a mother of three named Adriana. She told me that, while working her way through college as a waitress, she had to approach her manager after discovering her less-experienced male colleague made more than $1 an hour than she did.

Adriana said she felt lucky that she worked for a small, family-run business. Otherwise, she might have been too intimidated to ask for equal pay.

She said it seemed ''criminal and ridiculous'' to pay people unfairly and that lawmakers should think about their wife, sister, or daughter and the effect this financial barrier would have on them. I agree. I hope everyone in this Chamber does as well.

For women seeking justice under employment discrimination laws, the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act would be a disaster.

Women taking on huge corporations with limitless funds and armies of attorneys will face an uphill battle in court, at best, or may be completely deterred from even pursuing their day in court.

We have come a long way in expanding opportunities for women, but there is no question that we have a lot more to do. We cannot create more barriers to success than women and families already face in America today.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this motion to recommit and support the women and families in our communities who we were sent here to represent.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1630

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit must be strongly opposed by anyone who understands that the victims of frivolous lawsuits are indeed victims.

No one who supports civil rights laws or the Constitution should support the filing of frivolous claims without penalty, but that is exactly what this motion to recommit would allow.

The base bill makes sanctions for filing frivolous lawsuits in Federal court mandatory. Under rule 11, a lawsuit is frivolous if it is presented for any improper purpose, such as to harass, cause unnecessary delay, or needlessly increase the cost of litigation if it is not warranted by existing law or if the factual contentions have no evidentiary support.

In other words, a lawsuit will only be found frivolous if it has no basis in law or fact.

Who here thinks that lawyers should be able to avoid any penalty when the lawsuit they file is found by a Federal judge to have been filed simply to harass or cause unnecessary delay or to needlessly increase the cost of litigation or when the Federal judge finds that the lawsuit is not warranted by existing law or has no evidentiary support?

If you think lawyers should be able to get off scot-free when they file those sorts of frivolous lawsuits, vote for this motion to recommit; but if you agree with me that the victims of frivolous lawsuits are real victims and that they have to shell out thousands of dollars; endure sleepless nights; and spend time away from their family, work, and customers just to respond to frivolous pleadings with no basis in law or fact, then you should oppose this motion to recommit and support the base bill, and join me in taking a clear stance against frivolous lawsuits.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this motion to recommit and to support the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered, ordering the previous question on House Resolution 421, and adopting House Resolution 421, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 179, nays 239, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 500]

YEAS—179

Adams	Ashford	Beatty
Aguilar	Bass	Becerra

Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
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
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—239

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

NOT VOTING—16

Barr
Carter (TX)
Cleaver
Dingell
Fincher
Gutiérrez
Johnson, Sam
Lewis
Olson
Sanchez, Loretta
Sewell (AL)
Smith (WA)
Thompson (CA)
Wagner
Waters, Maxine
Westmoreland

□ 1702

Messrs. POE of Texas, PALMER, ZINKE, NUNES, WITTMAN, KELLY of Pennsylvania, MULLIN, and BARTON changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. HASTINGS, Ms. LEE, Messrs. PETERS and SCHRADER, Mses. KAPTUR and VELÁQUEZ, and Mr. PASCRELL changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 497–500, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on 497, 498, 499 and "no" on 500.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 185, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 501]

AYES—241

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

NOES—185

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings

Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Cleaver
Dingell
Fincher
Sanchez, Loretta
Smith (WA)
Thompson (CA)
Wagner
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1711

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3134, DEFUND PLANNED PARENTHOOD ACT OF 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3504, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 421) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3134) to provide for a moratorium on Federal funding to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc.; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3504) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion; and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 183, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 502]

YEAS—243

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

NAYS—183

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

NOT VOTING—8

Dingell
Fincher
Sanchez, Loretta
Smith (WA)
Thompson (CA)
Wagner
Waters, Maxine
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1719

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. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 246, noes 179, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 503]

AYES—246

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

NOES—179

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

NOT VOTING—9

Dingell
Eshoo
Fincher
Sanchez, Loretta
Smith (WA)
Thompson (CA)
Wagner
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1728

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.

PULMONARY FIBROSIS AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, September is Pulmonary Fibrosis Awareness Month and a time to shine a light on a disease that is deadly. While some may not be familiar with pulmonary fibrosis, approximately 200,000 Americans suffer from the disease.

This serious illness takes the lives of 40,000 Americans every single year, which equates to about one death every 13 minutes. That is the same mortality rate as breast cancer.

There is no known cure for pulmonary fibrosis. There is no known treatment to extend the life of a patient or improve the symptoms. As a result, the median survival rate is just 2½ years, and as many as 80 percent of patients die within 5 years of diagnosis.

Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity to bring attention to this serious illness that affects so many. With more research and a renewed commitment, we will find a cure to this deadly disease, and I will keep working to make this a reality.

CONFECTIONARY INDUSTRY

(Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the confectionary industry directly employs 70,000 people in the United States and more than 400,000 jobs in agriculture, retail, transportation, and other industries that rely, in part, on the sale of confections for their livelihood.

For every job that is created in confectionary, another six are supported in related industries, which means that candy drives a multiplier effect of 6 to 1.

Chicago was once known as the candy capital of the world. However, due to an unfair sugar program, many decent and good-paying manufacturing jobs are now located outside the United States.

The candy industry is comprised of hundreds of small- and medium-sized family-owned businesses, as well as the multinational companies with global brands that operate more than 1,000 manufacturing facilities in all 50 States.

The confectionary industry is doing its part to help address the ongoing conversation about food and nutrition, policy wellness, and food safety. NCA member companies are providing consumers with the information options and support they need to make the choices that are right for them.

Candy helps to make America just a little sweeter.

WELCOMING POPE FRANCIS

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, next week, the Holy Father, Pope Francis, will make his historic trip to the United States. I ask that all Americans join me in welcoming the Holy Father, both as Pope and as a man. This is Pope Francis' first visit to the United States ever and will be the first time in history that a pope will address a joint session of the Congress.

The Pope's message to fight against complacency and corruption and to help those in poor communities have resonated with the American people and invigorated Catholic communities throughout our country.

I am eager for the Pope to see the United States of America, her people at

work and play, and I look forward to his visit and his words of inspiration to the people's House where the government for and by the people is practiced daily.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

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

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Speaker, as the House prepares next week to take up a discussion about Planned Parenthood, I want to speak very briefly to what the debate is not about. It is not about women's health.

The proposal that many of us are making to this House is that we simply take this money away from Planned Parenthood and move it to federally qualified healthcare clinics, clinics that provide better services and more services to women. There are 13,000 of these clinics versus 900 Planned Parenthood units, services that go to women that Planned Parenthood does not provide.

Planned Parenthood does not do mammograms; the clinics do. This debate is not about women's health care, and anyone who wants you to believe that it is, is simply afraid to tell you what it is really about, which is whether or not we should give taxpayer money to an entity that sells pieces of dead children.

THE FIVE MERCENARIES

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, Secretary of Defense Ash Carter stunned Congress and the country when he admitted that the administration's $500 million program to train and equip so-called moderate Syrian rebels had resulted in the training of 60 individuals. The original goal was to have 5,000 within the first year, but they only had 60.

The information gets worse. Today, most of those 60 mercenaries have been killed, captured, or just gone missing.

Mr. Speaker, where, oh, where have the fighters gone? Where, oh, where could they be? Have they gone to fight with the enemy—which just leaves us how many? It is four or five, according to General Austin. Four or five fighters for a cost of $500 million, is that the plan for the war in Syria to defeat ISIS?

The lack of a plan in Syria has created chaos. Thousands of people have panicked and are running from the Syrian turmoil. The U.S. needs to lead.

Expecting five mercenaries to defeat ISIS is disgraceful. The United States needs an aggressive strategy to defeat the enemy of civilization, ISIS.

And that is just the way it is.

DEFUNDING PLANNED PARENTHOOD

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

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a father of four, a regular dad who loves my children more than I love my own life. I know I speak for millions when I say that my wife, Jenny, and I fell in love with our children before they were even born.

It is this love for my children that led me to the pro-life movement, to serve on the board of directors of a crisis pregnancy center, to offer free legal services for those who want to adopt.

It is in this spirit of love, informed by powerful life experiences, that I rise today in strong support of legislation to defund Planned Parenthood.

Now, Hoosiers have made it clear. They should not be forced to violate their own conscience so that Planned Parenthood can continue to operate.

Given the light that has recently been shed on Planned Parenthood's gruesome practices and procedures, can we not agree that taxpayers shouldn't have to foot the bill for these atrocities?

Now, if the best argument on the other side is that eliminating taxpayer subsidies for Planned Parenthood would create access problems, that is just not the case. The 73 federally qualified health centers, 63 rural clinics, and 24 community health centers in the State of Indiana, all of which provide women vital health services without providing abortions, prove otherwise.

Theirs is an empty argument, one I would encourage my colleagues, as a matter of integrity, to put to rest. Let's free Americans from participation in this morally reprehensible practice.

THREATS OF CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a member of the Safe Climate Caucus to note the extraordinary damage done by wildfires in Washington State this summer.

It is a fact that our climate is changing. We just had one of the driest springs and summers in more than a century that led to trees and vegetation becoming kindling for the massive fires that we have seen.

The largest wildfire in our State's history hit central Washington, forcing thousands to flee and putting firefighters in harm's way. We have a wildfire that continues to smolder in Olympic National Park, a rain forest. From Washington to California, brave emergency responders have spent this summer on the front lines, battling flames, with no signs of abating.

I believe it is time we pay attention to these warning signs. If we want a better future for our kids, if we want to protect the communities in which we live, then we need to confront the threats of climate change.

INTERNATIONAL COASTAL CLEANUP DAY

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Saturday, September 19, as International Coastal Cleanup Day. I encourage everyone nationwide to participate by visiting a local beach and assisting with this special event.

Ocean pollution is a serious problem that negatively impacts wildlife, humans, and our economy, including many small-business owners. Debris found in ocean water and on shores is detrimental to aquatic life and has the potential to injure water sports enthusiasts and beachgoers, as well as destroy boats and their propellers.

In 2012, more than 10 million pounds of trash were collected by 500,000 volunteers in 97 countries. Earlier this year, my staff and I spent a morning cleaning up the beaches on Stock Island in the Florida Keys and saw just how much trash washes ashore.

Unfortunately, this amount is just a snapshot of an even larger problem. Though International Coastal Cleanup Day happens annually, it is important that we make a stronger effort to protect our beaches more than once a year.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, in America, the practice of abortion is now referred to as women's health care. Yes, in the 21st century, even with all the science, we refuse to ask the question: What about the baby?

The cavalier spirit and the cold-hearted callousness in taking a live baby and then cutting into her face to retrieve fresh body parts—can you imagine the national outrage if we were carving up puppies in the same manner?

We don't condemn these young mothers who have been convinced that no other options exist; yet we will be negligent if we stand silent over the atrocities of an abortion mill that goes by the name Planned Parenthood. Whether you are pro-life or not, surely, most Americans are appalled by the idea that our tax dollars are funneled to this organization.

I cannot look the other way. It is my belief, and I am thoroughly convinced that this is no longer a political issue. This is about a human rights violation that parallels other barbaric times throughout history. Ultimately, we will stand before almighty God.

The Psalmist David wrote:

For You, God, formed my inward parts. You wove me together in my mother's womb. I praise You because I am fearfully and wonderfully made.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, graphic videos, personal testimony, and verbal assent reveal the true colors of Planned Parenthood.

There is probable cause to believe that America's largest abortion provider is altering abortion procedures to obtain uncrushed baby body parts; is performing partial-birth abortions; and is selling baby hearts, brains, and other fetal specimens for monetary value. This is atrocious.

Planned Parenthood staff doesn't want to lowball fees for baby body parts, and third parties are drooling over intact unborn children. It is unimaginable how one can camouflage the humanity of a clinician's announcement of ''another boy'' and watch a baby's beating heart just before harvesting the baby's brain to sell; yet Federal funding continues to pour unabashed, unabated into the coffers of Planned Parenthood, America's number one killer of unborn babies. This must stop.

Mr. Speaker, I do not support this allotment of taxpayer dollars and will vote against any spending bill that funds Planned Parenthood.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, a nation, like an individual, is judged by the way it speaks for those who can't speak for themselves and by the way it treats those without total capacities.

It is in this regard that our Founders brought this Nation together with the core principles of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—life being the first of those.

It is a constitutional requirement that I think that we have to speak for the unborn. When we see the atrocities in the videos, the callousness of the organization that is trafficking in body parts from dead babies, we should react in horror and remove the funding for that.

The greatest argument the other side puts up is that they provide women other services. This chart shows the Planned Parenthood locations in New Mexico versus those providing other services. We simply seek to move the funding from them to here.

The coverage from our State is much broader and much better and would be a voice for those unborn who can't scream out for their own sake.

□ 1745

FUNDING PLANNED PARENTHOOD

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the question we must ask ourselves today in light of recent revelations: Why does Congress insist on giving half a billion dollars of the taxpayer money to an organization that has such disregard for human life?

Considering the budget constraints currently imposed on our military, why are the American people's hard-earned money being diverted to Planned Parenthood, which reports more than $127 million in excess revenue and more than $1 billion in net assets?

When I was back home in Texas during the August recess, I had the pleasure of visiting the Austin Pregnancy Resource Center, a model women's health organization that can and should lead by example.

The APRC does a lot to support women's health and provide guidance on accessing women's health services. The APRC's slogan of building the culture of life is one that we should all be able to get behind, but there are many pro-life women's health organizations like APRC that take no Federal dollars.

Even so, some of my colleagues prefer to continue to send taxpayer dollars to Planned Parenthood, an organization that takes in money from aborted fetal parts, an organization that alters abortion procedures so they can harvest organs, an organization that, frankly, rips off the Federal Government.

Not only are the alleged actions of Planned Parenthood illegal under Federal law, they are morally reprehensible.

I am disgusted that an organization that is involved in such repulsive activity would promote itself as a protector of women's health. It is beyond hypocritical. It is deceitful and I believe fraudulent.

When I first ran for Congress, I promised that I would vote with my conscience and use God's word as my guide. For this reason, earlier I called for an end to Federal funding for Planned Parenthood.

In God we trust.

MISINFORMATION ON THE PLANNED PARENTHOOD DEBATE

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

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, the Congressman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) is exactly right. There is all kinds of misinformation about this Planned Parenthood debate. The biggest line is this: We are headed to a government shutdown. Are you kidding me?

We are going to fund the government at the levels the Democrats agreed to, Republicans agreed to, the levels outlined in the Ryan-Murray plan. We are going to fund it.

We are going to do one change, though, one simple, but important, change: Take the money from the organization engaged in the gruesome, horrific things that Planned Parenthood was caught doing and give it to organizations that weren't doing that and still meet women's health needs. That simple fact. The same levels, but move it from the bad organization to good organizations.

It is that basic. That is what this debate is about, and that is what the American people want us to do.

TAXPAYER DOLLARS SHOULD NOT SUPPORT TRAFFICKING OF ABORTED FETAL TISSUE

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we have known for some time that Planned Parenthood is the largest provider of abortions in this country.

What we didn't know until recently was just how vile and disgusting they are willing to be in the trafficking of fetal tissue and the body parts of the unborn.

These actions uncovered from these videos have given the whole world insight into the inexcusable and horrific culture at Planned Parenthood. The heartlessness displayed represents an unraveling of the very moral fabric of our country.

The passage of the two bills before us is the appropriate action to address Planned Parenthood's illegal actions.

Taxpayer dollars should not be going to the killing of unborn babies. Taxpayer dollars should not go to organizations like Planned Parenthood that support the practice of abortion and trafficking of aborted fetal tissue.

I encourage my colleagues to support these two bills and to support precious, innocent lives of the unborn.

DEFUNDING PLANNED PARENTHOOD WILL HAVE NO EFFECT ON WOMEN'S HEALTH

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

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that this is not simply an issue of whether Planned Parenthood broke the law by selling fetal body parts obtained through abortions.

The real tragedy we are confronted with today is that human beings have been reduced to mere commodities in this practice, and Federal dollars are contributing to it.

I do not want to contribute to a system that profits from someone's fate nor do I want to subject millions of taxpayers to supporting this violation of life.

It is often a temptation to boil this argument down to medical terms and ignore the real losses our Nation faces when we choose to reject someone before he or she has been given the chance to live.

For this reason, I do not support funding Planned Parenthood and its tragic influence on our Nation's future.

Defunding Planned Parenthood will have no effect on women's health. In the State of Idaho alone, there are 76 federally qualified health centers, and only 3 Planned Parenthood facilities. Women can and will receive health care in these facilities.

CONSTITUENTS SICKENED BY PLANNED PARENTHOOD VIDEOS

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, debate over funding for Planned Parenthood has nothing to do with women's health care. I think we have just heard that on a couple counts.

Constituents on both sides are sickened and disgusted by the Planned Parenthood videos, videos that show officials discussing the killing of babies and harvesting of their organs like they were car parts out of a salvage yard.

American taxpayers are the single largest funder of Planned Parenthood, over $500 million last year alone. No American should ever be forced, under penalty of imprisonment, mind you—if you don't pay your taxes, you are going to go to jail—to support this activity with their tax dollars, period.

I am a husband, a father to two little girls, a son, and a friend who cares deeply about women's health care, everybody's health care. That said, I cannot and I will not support the dismemberment and sale of the body parts of infants.

I cannot in good conscience, I can't in any conscience, support legislation that funds disgusting actions of those who conduct that practice.

THE RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN ARE BEING VIOLATED

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

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, on social media, a new generation of parents and grandparents are sharing the joy of new life, posting pictures of baby bumps and sonograms for friends and family to view.

Now more than ever, it is easier to see and understand that an unborn child in the womb is a person with tiny toes and fingers and a heartbeat, created equal and entitled to unalienable rights.

However, recent events have demonstrated that these rights are being violated and that the public's trust has been betrayed.

Millions of taxpayer dollars have supported the horrific practice of allowing babies to be taken apart, dismantled, and sold piece by piece.

In response, House investigations are underway, and more needs to be done to protect our most vulnerable citizens.

H.R. 3134 restores trust for American taxpayers. It provides more funding for qualified health centers that offer pediatric care, immunizations, mammograms, and more lifesaving healthcare services that protect mother and child.

These better options are worthy of taxpayer funding and will make a positive difference for women and children across our country.

PROTECT THE SANCTITY OF LIFE

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

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the two pieces of legislation aimed at fighting evil and protecting the sanctity of life.

I have seen the horrendous videos showing the grotesque practice of harvesting and selling preborn baby body parts that Planned Parenthood executives now condone and encourage. This evil practice must stop.

Taxpayers should not be responsible for funding an organization that aborts babies, negotiates deals to sell body parts, and lets babies that have survived abortion be left to die on the operating table.

As a former judge, I have dealt with countless murder cases, and this is murder in my book. Planned Parenthood received 40 percent of their total revenue from taxpayers.

How much longer are we going to permit Planned Parenthood to murder on the taxpayer dime?

Rest assured, the House is conducting an investigation on Planned Parenthood. We will do everything in our power to hold these criminals accountable for their actions.

I implore my colleagues to support these two bills and protect the sanctity of life before and after birth.

STAND UP FOR CALIFORNIA'S ALMOND INDUSTRY

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, the California almond industry has shouldered the brunt of the drought finger-pointing over the last year.

The reality is that almond trees use about the same, if not less, the amount of water of any fruit or nut in the State of California.

It is like the old story of the frog in the pot of boiling water. If the pot has no water, then you have no frog nor agriculture in California. We need to build water storage. That said, our almond industry employs over 100,000 people and brings in $21 billion to the State each year.

In addition to being scapegoats on water, they also face a potential $4 billion loss if the European Union chooses not to extend the maximum residue levels allowed on fosetyl-aluminum. This chemical is not even used in almonds and poses no health risk. Inaction to extend this MRL will prevent almonds from being exported into the EU, depressing prices worldwide.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask Secretary Vilsack and the USDA to stand up for California and our agriculture and help obtain this critical extension.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD TARGETS MINORITY COMMUNITIES FOR DESTRUCTION

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

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask this House, indeed ask the American people: Do you believe your taxpayer dollars should be used to fund racism? Do you think your hard-earned taxpayer dollars should be used to target minority communities?

Mr. Speaker, I have adopted children. They don't look like me. They look like average Americans of various ethnic minority backgrounds.

Without a doubt, if you look at Planned Parenthood's history, as well as its current practices, they target minority communities for destruction and elimination.

That is the history of Margaret Sanger. That is the history of Planned Parenthood. That is the history that is being funded.

That is the current day practice of Planned Parenthood, to target minority communities with abortion, with destruction, with elimination.

Without a doubt, in my mind, I think in the mind of the American people, it is time to stop funding racism with our tax dollars.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT BE AN ACCESSORY TO CRIMINAL ACTIVITY

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there are those who say you shouldn't shut down the government. We are not going to shut down the government. We are going to fund the government.

And I am hoping that we are actually going to fund women's health with more money than what the President or the Democrats were pushing for to be given to Planned Parenthood.

In the history of Planned Parenthood, they have never, ever, ever done one mammogram because they are not certified to do mammograms. They bring people in and refer them out to get their mammograms.

I have been married for 37 years to the same woman, and I have three daughters. I want good women's health care. Let's fund it, but let's give it directly to the facilities that will do the mammograms and not send it to Planned Parenthood for them to take their cut.

When you pay for the rent and the utilities and you know there is criminal activity going on, you are an accessory. Congress should not be an accessory.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my deepest concerns for the health and safety of the women, children, all babies, and families in our great country.

Recent undercover videos by The Center for Medical Progress unearthed some of the most alarming information that has been hidden from the American people for years. These videos deeply disturb me, and I know I am not alone.

The practices uncovered in the Planned Parenthood videos are repulsive. I never dreamed I would be standing before this body questioning if our own government is a willing enabler in the profiteering from the buying and selling of aborted baby parts.

It is wrong that Planned Parenthood continues to do as it pleases and that the American taxpayers are bankrolling that organization. We are spending $450 million a year funding Planned Parenthood.

That is why I sent a letter along with 134 of my colleagues in the House of Representatives on July 27 that calls for a full investigation into Planned Parenthood by the Justice Department.

Mr. Speaker, I speak for the people that I am blessed to represent from the Second Congressional District in West Virginia. I am here to say that taxpayers should not fund abortions. Supporters of Planned Parenthood continually point to other services that they provide.

There is precisely one Planned Parenthood provider in all of West Virginia, located in Vienna, less than an hour outside of my district, right here. One. Does it even provide mammograms? No, it does not.

□ 1800

However, we have more than 300 federally certified women's care facilities in West Virginia that do provide these essential services. Taxpayers should not be forced to fund abortions through Planned Parenthood. We should defund that organization from taxpayer funding dollars right now.

Senior officials—on camera—were caught admitting to unethical, illegal activities in the selling of body parts.

Let's define what we are talking about here. This is a baby approximately 16 weeks after the moment of conception. Human life begins at conception. This is a baby.

Some would like to define it as something else—call it anything but a baby. They will call it a fetus, a blob of tissue, cells; but they do not want to call this little boy or girl a baby. However, you couldn't sell baby body parts, such as lungs, hearts, livers, as Planned Parenthood was caught doing, unless it was a baby.

This is a baby. This is what he or she looks like. This is what taxpayers in this country—you, the taxpayers—are being forced to pay for, the killing of this baby and the buying or selling of her body parts. That is wrong. That is what we are standing against here in the U.S. House of Representatives, and we need your support in this.

The Federal Government needs to stop enabling this black market business immediately. That is why I have cosponsored several pieces of legislation to make sure that the taxpayers and thousands of unborn children are protected from the activities and horrendous actions of Planned Parenthood and other abortion providers.

H.R. 3134, the Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015, simply prohibits funding of Planned Parenthood for a year to allow for a full congressional investigation to take place.

H.R. 3197, the Protecting Life and Taxpayers Act of 2015—this bill will prohibit Federal funding of an entity that performs abortions, including Planned Parenthood.

H.R. 3215, the End Trafficking of the Terminated Unborn Act of 2015—this bill will prohibit any transfer of fetal tissue from aborted babies for a purpose other than disposal. This will prevent both publicly and privately funded research involving the remains of unborn children who were aborted.

Finally, my bill, H.R. 816, the Life At Conception Act, would define life at the moment of conception, which is a biological fact.

The abortion issue, actually, in this bill defunding Planned Parenthood—which our goal is to defund Planned Parenthood—does not actually stop abortion. I wish we could. Abortion is the taking of a human life.

Defund Planned Parenthood is simply saying that taxpayers should not be forced to pay for those abortions. That is a widely accepted view of the majority of Americans, even those who may disagree with us pro-life advocates on the abortion issue. Many people think that abortion shouldn't be funded with taxpayer dollars.

All of these bills are crucial to making sure that the American taxpayer is no longer footing the bill or condoning the barbaric practices of Planned Parenthood or any other organization like them that traffics in aborted baby body parts.

I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for these four vital pieces of legislation and remove taxpayer funding of abortion in the spending bills before us in Congress. That is our duty in the U.S. House of Representatives.

We control spending in this Chamber. No one can tell us what to do. We represent the people in the districts that voted us into office. I am calling on the folks in this Chamber and in America to support the defunding of Planned Parenthood now.

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

WILDFIRES AND FOREST MANAGEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTERMAN. 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 materials on the topic of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to wildfires and forest management.

Recent headlines show that our forests are in terrible shape: 8.8 million acres have burned this year; $250 million was recently transferred from forest management accounts to fight fires, announced last week.

Emergency fire spending has already topped $700 million this year and is still growing. We have a problem that is greatly decreasing and impairing the value of our forest for the next generation.

I worked with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pass H.R. 2647, the Resilient Federal Forests Act, back in July. This bill was supported from Maine to Alaska by Democrats and Republicans. The bill ends the destructive practice of fire borrowing in a fiscally responsible manner. It creates a subaccount under the Stafford Act for wildfire. This ensures that resources to put out major fires are available when necessary.

This week, the Obama administration publicly called on the Congress to fix fire borrowing. While I appreciate the President's interest, I agree with him that we need to fix fire borrowing. I applaud the 19 Democrats who voted for H.R. 2647 that fixes fire borrowing.

Fixing fire borrowing alone won't solve the problem. Fixing fire borrowing alone simply is treating a symptom instead of a disease. It is like putting on a bandaid without cleaning out the wound.

Again, the House passed this bipartisan legislation back in July. We could be fixing these problems now, but

the Senate hasn't acted. It is time for the Senate to act. It is time to stop playing politics with our Nation's forests, one of our most treasured resources. The House offered a solution. Let's embrace constructive governance and make H.R. 2647 the law of the land.

I want to take a moment and look at what the Resilient Federal Forests Act does. We already talked about fire borrowing, but it also prevents future fires.

H.R. 2647 gives the Forest Service the tools it needs to better manage our national forests immediately after its passage. Our forests are overgrown, and therefore, they are fire prone. Fighting fires doesn't prevent future fires. That is why we need better management. Scientific thinning helps prevents future fires.

I would like to show some photographs from a forest in my home State of Arkansas. To some, this may look like a healthy, thriving forest because you see trees and you see a lot of greenery, but I am a forester, and when I look at that, I see an overstock stand of trees. I see too much undergrowth. I see too much dead and dying material on the forest floor. This is not a healthy forest, but this happens to be a control site in the middle of a healthy forest.

Next, I want to show how we get to a healthy forest on this particular side.

This area has been thinned, and there is controlled burns taking place. These burns take place on intervals of 3 to 5 years. They not only make the forest better to withstand potential forest fires; they also create better wildlife habitat. The biodiversity in this forest goes through the roof when these kind of management practices are put in place. We get healthy trees. We get an early successional habitat that is good for wildlife. It also is good for the soil; it is good for water quality, and it is good for air quality.

This last picture shows what a healthy forest in my district looks like. These trees are thriving. This is an early growth not too long after a fire. This is a great wildlife habitat. The biodiversity of wildlife and plant life is much higher in this photograph than what we saw in the previous photograph. This creates a win-win situation.

Now, this isn't the solution for everywhere across the country; this is what works in the forests in my district, but there are forest managers across this country that know how to manage their forests in their particular climate and in their particular setting to create healthy forests and forests that can withstand a fire. It would be almost impossible for a forest fire to destroy these trees.

The next thing that the Resilient Federal Forests Act does is it stops frivolous lawsuits. You may ask: Why do we need to stop frivolous lawsuits?

Well, frivolous lawsuits hinder forest plans that are developed locally, using science, best management practices, and collaborative efforts that represent stakeholder values. The end result is a forest that is decreased and impaired in value for our next generation.

This bill discourages frivolous lawsuits by requiring those suing to stop collaborative projects to post a bond. If the plaintiff loses, they pay the taxpayer's legal bills. If they win, they get their money back.

This bill also aids in better land management planning. In the words of former U.S. Forest Service chief Dale Bosworth: ''We do not have a fire problem on our Nation's forests; we have a land management problem. And it needs to be addressed quickly.''

Delayed decisionmaking or, even worse, no decisionmaking at all, is hurting our forests. Forests are dynamic. They are a living, growing organism. When we say no action, we are actually taking action. Since forests are not static, scientific analysis should not be static.

This bill requires the Forest Service to critically analyze the impacts of no action, which often are overgrowth, increased wildfire, and diseases. Increases in future wildfire problems are often caused because of poor land management. It makes it difficult for reforestation, ultimately decreasing and impairing the value of forests.

This bill sets up requirements for salvage plans in response to catastrophic events. It requires environmental assessments for salvage projects to be completed within 90 days so that timber can be removed while it is still commercially valuable.

The USDA completed post-Hurricane Katrina NEPA on the De Soto National Forest within 90 days. They expedited it. They were successful at that. As a result, 80 percent of the timber was salvaged that was in moderate to heavily damaged areas.

The management actions laid out in this bill must comply with forest plans. It is not taking a shortcut. Despite what some folks say, this doesn't mean thousands of acres clearcut. It doesn't mean destruction of snag habitats that often become available after a large fire.

In my home State, clearcuts are restricted to 180 acres, at most. We are talking about thousands of acres of land that still have to follow forest management practices.

This bill rewards collaboration. It incentivizes collaboration and speeds up the implementation of collaborative projects. It safeguards a strong, timely environmental review process through categorical exclusions for forest management projects.

You may ask: What are collaborative projects? This is simply where local land managers, environmentalists, citizens, and industry representatives come up with a plan. These groups spend hundreds if not thousands of hours working on a plan that is best for their local area. Why wouldn't we encourage this sort of compromise?

This bill encourages more collaborative projects. Passing this bill shows that we endorse commonsense plans that tend to local and ecological needs.

This bill creates greater reforestation after natural disasters. As a forester, this statistic is really disturbing to me. On average, less than 3 percent of an area is reforested after a catastrophic event on our national forests. This bill requires that 75 percent reforestation takes place within 5 years. This will revitalize our forests that are destroyed by fire or other natural events.

When we reforest an area, we have young trees that grow fast and sequester carbon faster than older, fully grown trees. If we want to sequester more carbon, then we should be planting more trees. We should demand that we reforest our land after the timber is destroyed in one of these catastrophic events.

We have to stop playing politics, and we need to pass this bill.

This bill creates greater roles for the tribes. Oftentimes, the Federal Government does not collaborate and work together with those who have expertise in forest health. This bill brings in State and tribal governments as strong partners in forest management.

It gives the Forest Service the authority to accept assistance from States willing to put money toward forest management.

□ 1815

It also reinforces existing tribal authority to assist in the management of national forest land adjacent to reservations.

The Resilient Federal Forests Act modernizes secure rural schools. This is an issue that is very important in my district. We have many rural areas near our national forests, and the schools are hurting because of the decreased funding because we are not keeping our forests healthy.

Rural communities not only depend on our forests for their sustenance, but they also provide emergency services, education, and support for the forests and residents who live near the forests. As forests lose value, communities suffer, and they will only suffer more in the future.

This bill gives counties flexibility to spend secure rural schools funding. It allows them to spend money on emergency services on Federal lands, and it puts 25 percent of stewardship contracts into the county treasury where the projects occurred.

This bill means more money for our schools and other public services, along with the benefits of a healthy and resilient forest.

One more time, I want to look at the fire borrowing issue. This is one of the worst fire seasons we have seen. We know what good management practices are. We know how to implement those practices on the land.

The House has acted by passing H.R. 2647, the Resilient Federal Forests Act. It solves fire borrowing. It completely reforms current bad management practices. And this is isn't just me saying

this. We have letters from hundreds of groups that have endorsed this bill. Here is a list of just a few of them: the Forest Products Industry National Labor Management Committee, the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, the National Association of Counties, the National Association of Forest Service Retirees, the National Water Resources Association, the International Association of Fire Chiefs, the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America. There are hundreds more that have supported this legislation because it is good, commonsense legislation that is good for our country; it is good for our forests.

The House has acted. It is time for the Senate to act. It is time for the administration to stop playing politics with wildfire. It is time to make H.R. 2647 the law of the land.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for bringing this subject up. It is a subject that all of us in the West deal with every year.

A couple of years ago, we had Tom Tidwell in New Mexico. He was there at a time when the Forest Service was in the process of burning down 255 homes in Ruidoso. The fire almost burned completely out of control and burned the entire town down. That is what the agency was surprised and frightened by.

These fires are caused by a lack of management. And instead of addressing the problem by reducing the number of trees in the forests, the Forest Service is saying, and Tom Tidwell himself said, that our policy is going to be to reintroduce fire into its natural habitat.

Introducing fire into the forest at this stage, with the years of no attention, with the years of fuel buildup, with the decades of drought that have put them in an explosive position in much of the West, is absolute lunacy. And yet this was the highest ranking Forest Service employee saying that we need to reintroduce fire into the wild.

I am sorry, but we need to clean up the forest first, then the fire can keep the forest healthy—but not until then. These raging wildfires are a natural conclusion to the management policies for the past decades, and so we can't start and act like that policy has not been in place.

Another policy that the Forest Service is engaged in is letting fire achieve management objectives. If I were to take a look at, say, one of the large fires out in Grant County, in the Gila Wilderness area of New Mexico, you can see the daily reports where they are talking about, well, the fire is 300 acres, it is 600 acres, and it is achieving its management objective.

Well, there is one truth about New Mexico: If the wind is not blowing today, it is going to blow tomorrow. Letting those fires go, while they are supposedly monitoring them, and the fire then gets the push from the wind and grows from 300 or 800 acres to 10,000 to 30,000 acres is, again, a natural conclusion to the management policies of this Forest Service.

It is time for us to revise the way our forests are managed. Mr. WESTERMAN has a bill that is exactly right, H.R. 2647, and we should pass that bill, and that process should go forward.

Let's start cleaning the excess timber out of our forests. It is much simpler than what everybody wants to make it. It is much simpler than the Forest Service would allow.

So again, I appreciate the fact that you are bringing this issue up. I appreciate the fact that you have yielded time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. I thank the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express thanks to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) for leading this discussion tonight. It is very important to many of us in rural America.

Of course, my district, which includes seven national forests, has experienced increasingly devastating forest fires caused by overgrown, mismanaged, or even nonmanaged forests, and has been economically strangled by restrictions on forest management.

Our Nation has already lost over 8½ million acres to wildfire, and the year isn't yet over. We are on pace to exceed the record of 10 million acres burned back in 2006, and that is not a record we want to break.

Our rural communities, public lands, and the environment are being destroyed through neglect. The habitat is gone, erosion into our lakes and waterways goes unchecked, and the people's asset, the value of the trees, is wasted.

In light of Forest Service surveys finding that over 12 million Sierra Nevada trees have died in the last year, we cannot afford to wait another year.

That is why we need Mr. WESTERMAN's bill, H.R. 2647, which will return active management to our forests by increasing flexibility, cutting red tape, and, most importantly, acting to manage forests before fires occur, not afterwards.

Streamlining review process means that forest management can occur when it is actually needed to address dangerous conditions, not after years of legal roadblocks.

Allowing categorical exclusions for post-fire salvage and rehabilitation hastens forest recovery and prevents fuel buildup that can contribute to future fires.

Expanding local involvement in forest management will improve the data and know-how available for planning and also respect local priorities.

Finally, the budget impact of forest neglect can no longer be ignored. Just this week, the Forest Service diverted yet another $250 million from forest management to fighting fire. That brings the Federal spending total so far this year on firefighting to $700 million, money that, though we agree, needs to fight fire this year, could surely be used better if we properly managed forests in the future.

This bill will end the borrowing by funding fires, as we do hurricanes, earthquakes, and other disasters, making them eligible for FEMA disaster funds.

In California, over 1,000 homes have burned. Tens of thousands have been evacuated from their homes or communities. Firefighters have lost their lives, as well as some residents now. This is a needless loss of life, needless suffering in rural America.

Let's start by keeping H.R. 2647 moving in the process through the Senate and on to the President's desk.

I again thank Mr. WESTERMAN for his leadership and allowing me to speak on this important topic here tonight.

Mr. WESTERMAN. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ZINKE).

Mr. ZINKE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support to remind my colleagues in the Senate that the Western United States is on fire. We don't have time for inaction and more political pandering.

The House has passed the Resilient Federal Forests Act, which includes vital reforms that can be implemented tomorrow if our colleagues in the Senate take the bill up.

So why don't we do what is right for America? Why don't we come together and move the bill?

This wildfire season has been one of the worst in the last 10 years, and it has had enormous cost. Despite the cooler conditions in Montana, we have 35 fires that are continuing to burn, a total of 334,000 acres gone. That is equivalent to 522 miles, square miles. Two-thirds of this acreage belongs to the public, our national forests.

And it is not just the physical damage. We lost four firefighters in Washington, four that paid the sacrifice fighting forest fires, and we have to remember that.

I was at a fire in Glacier National Park. It was a reburn from a fire that occurred in 2003. The reburn happened to occur because of a threat of a lawsuit which prevented the Forest Service from doing the right thing. What they wanted to do was salvage timber. But because there was standing timber, ground crews couldn't get at it. And when ground crews couldn't get it, that means they had to fly aircraft at $3,000 an hour to put out the fire. That is wrong. It is wrong for Montana, and it is wrong for America.

I know the firsthand value of our natural resources. I am a conservationist. But I also know the value of tourism in Montana. I also know the value of clean air. And when the smoke in Montana—which people travel all the way from across this country and

the world to go to—is worse than Beijing, it has an impact.

It also has an impact on the elderly, the asthmatic. It is unhealthy. Worst of all, it is preventable.

The problem is real. Not only does the Forest Service lack the resources to adequately fight fires, it has a land management problem at the source.

Former Chief of the Forest Service, Dale Bosworth, his quote before the hearing was: ''We do not have a fire problem . . . we have a land management problem.''

This isn't from a political member. This is from a scientist. And yes, we need more scientists in the woods and less lawyers.

That is why I am proud of what we did in the House on H.R. 2647. We passed it back in July because we saw this problem coming, and so we crafted a solution. That is what we are all sent here to do. We were sent here for solutions, to look at the challenges ahead and make a difference.

So this bill addresses both the fire borrowing problem and the practices that have created the crisis that we now, unfortunately, have to bear. It does address lawsuits that are frivolous. The number one expense in the Forest Service is fighting forest fires, Number two is litigation, and if they have any money left, then that is what they use for management.

Why are we spending, this fire season, over $600 million in August alone? Don't we all agree that $600 million can be better utilized by preventing forest fires, by restoring habitat, by providing better public access, better recreational activities and opportunities on our public lands?

Unfortunately, we have lost this fire season, and still it burns.

Unfortunately, the Senate won't take up the bill. My fellow Montanan Senator STEVE DAINES has been a loud and vocal advocate of this bill. He understands, and I am asking his colleagues to stand and do the right thing: Take the bill up. If you don't like a provision in the bill, then show leadership and put an amendment on it and we will work together to fix it. That is what leadership does. But to sit there and not take up the bill and have no action is unacceptable.

Mr. WESTERMAN. I thank the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add that when we passed this bill in the House, we put amendments on it that were offered by Democrats. We were open. We listened. We wanted to do what is best for the forest.

I encourage the Senate to take up this bill. If there is something you don't like, let's talk about it. But let's do what is best for the forest. Let's make this bill the law of the land.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

□ 1830

Mrs. LUMMIS. I join in thanking Representative WESTERMAN for this legislation and this Special Order tonight, explaining the extent to which these catastrophic wildfires are destroying the West and other areas of our country.

This year, over 9 million acres have burned in the West. It is a new record for catastrophic wildfires. This year, most of the damage has been in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and northern California.

You heard the gentleman from northern California earlier talk about the number of houses that have been destroyed; the lives that have been disrupted; the wildlife that has been destroyed; the habitat that has been destroyed; the carbon that has gone up in the air and the illness that that has caused; the watersheds that are destroyed; the oxygen that is destroyed when you have ash running down hillsides into streams, choking the oxygen out of the water, killing the fish.

The habitat destruction, the effects on people and ungulates and fish and resources, it is irresponsible. We have a stewardship obligation for these lands. We know how to manage these lands. This doesn't need to be happening.

Representative WESTERMAN is a professional forester and an engineer. He has spent his career studying the science of doing this right.

I have a photograph here of an example of how to do this right. He showed us some earlier from his State of Arkansas. I want to show you how his methodology works in the Black Hills that straddle the border between South Dakota and Wyoming.

You can't see this terribly clearly, but if you look at this vibrant green in the middle and compare it to the browns and yellows that you see down here—Black Hills National Forest—that has been thinned, that has been forested, that has been conservation logged.

It has created sunlight in places that were clogged and choked from sunlight. It has created healthy underbrush, as opposed to a clogged underbrush that burns. It has allowed wildlife to graze. It allows snow to be stored and held longer in the forest into the spring and very early summer before it melts and goes downstream, thereby preventing flooding downstream. It is a natural hedge against flooding.

We know all of this. All we have to do is pass and implement Representative WESTERMAN's bill, and we can start preventing this.

The day to save a tree is yesterday, but this summer, because we have ignored this problem for so long, we let 9 million more acres go up in smoke in the West.

I spent the entire August work period in my State of Wyoming. Although Wyoming, thank God, wasn't on fire this summer—it has been in the past—but I can tell you, every day, when I woke up on the western side of the State of Wyoming, my eyes were burning from fires that were burning hundreds of miles west of me in Idaho, in Oregon, in Washington, and in northern California.

To ignore science, to ignore management practices, and to allow this to continue is abominable.

The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) has the answer. The House passed it. I urge the Senate to take it up.

I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for his thoughtful contribution to the Congress of the United States by serving here.

Mr. WESTERMAN. I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming for her comments, and I also thank her for pointing out that forest management is different in different parts of the country.

We have trained forestry professionals all over this country. We have good people working for the Forest Service that know how to do the right job, but their hands are tied. They can't use the things that they have learned in forestry school. They can't use the things that they have learned through practice. They can't practice the art of forestry and the science of forestry because of policy here in Washington, D.C.

We need to untie their hands so that they can implement these management procedures on the land to make it healthier.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking Congressman WESTERMAN for organizing this Special Order tonight and for his indispensable work on the Natural Resources Committee and its Subcommittee on Federal Lands.

Mr. WESTERMAN is a professional forester, schooled at Yale University, which the founder of the U.S. Forest Service, Gifford Pinchot, did so much to shape.

Mr. WESTERMAN's H.R. 2647 represents the first step toward restoring the sound, well-established, scientifically validated, and time-tested methods that, for generations, produced healthy, thriving, and vibrant forests.

These forest management practices prevented vegetation and wildlife from overgrowing the ability of the land to support them. Not only did this assure robust and healthy forests capable of resisting fire, disease, and pestilence, but it also supported the prosperous economy.

Revenues from the sale of excess timber provided a steady stream of revenues to the Treasury which could, in turn, be used to further improve the public lands.

About 45 years ago, we replaced these sound management practices with what can only be described as a policy of benign neglect. In 1970, Congress adopted the National Environmental Policy Act that opened a floodgate of ponderous and Byzantine laws, regulations, and lawsuits, with the explicit promise that they would ''save the environment.''

Well, after 45 years of these policies, I think we are entitled to ask: How is the environment doing?

Well, according to every scrap of evidence submitted to our subcommittee by a broad cross-section of experts, the answer is that these laws have not only failed to improve the forest environment; they have catastrophically harmed that environment.

Surplus timber harvested from our national forests as a result of these laws has dropped dramatically since the 1980s, while acreage destroyed by forest fire has increased concurrently and concomitantly. Wildlife habitats that were supposed to be preserved are now being incinerated.

Precipitation that once flowed to riparian habitats now evaporates in overgrown canopies or is quickly claimed in the fierce competition of densely packed vegetation. We have lost vast tracts of our national forests to beetle infestations, as weakened trees can no longer resist their attacks.

The U.S. Forest Service reports that in the Tahoe Basin in my district, there is now four times the vegetation density as normal, and trees that once had room to grow and thrive now fight for their lives against other trees trying to occupy the same ground.

Revenues that our forest management agencies once produced and that facilitated our forest stewardship have all but dried up. This has devastated mountain communities that once thrived from the forest economy, while precious resources are diverted for lifeline programs like secure rural schools and PILT.

Despite a growing population, visitation to our national forests has declined significantly. We can no longer manage lands to prevent fire or even salvage dead timber once fire has destroyed it.

Appeals, lawsuits, and especially the threat of lawsuits have paralyzed and demoralized the Forest Service and created perverse incentives to do nothing to manage our lands.

The steadily deteriorating situation is forcing managers to raid forest treatment and fire prevention funds to pay for the growing costs of wildfire suppression, creating a fiscal death spiral—the more we raid prevention funds, the more wildfires we have; the more wildfires we have, the more we have to raid our prevention funds.

Ironically, our private forest lands are today conspicuously healthier than the public lands, precisely because the private lands are free from so many of the laws that are tying the hands of our public foresters. These laws may be making environmental law firms rich, but they are killing our national forests.

H.R. 2647 is the first step toward restoring sound, rational, and scientific management of our national forests. It streamlines fire and disease prevention programs and assures that fire-killed timber can be quickly removed to create both the revenues and the room to restore fire-damaged lands. It protects forest managers from frivolous lawsuits.

In my district, comprising the Sierra Nevada mountains in California, two major forest fires are now raging. The Butte fire in Amador County has already killed two people, left hundreds homeless, and destroyed 72,000 acres of forest land. The Rough fire in Fresno County has destroyed 141,000 acres, and they are still burning tonight.

We have exhausted our firefighting budget, and, without relief, we will have to begin stripping funds intended for fire prevention.

Mr. WESTERMAN's bill would allow these catastrophic wildfires to be funded like every other natural disaster.

Mr. Speaker, we have a very simple choice. We can continue the misguided environmental laws that, for 45 years, have become responsible for the destruction of hundreds of square miles of our national forests every year, or we can restore the sound forest management practices that will guarantee healthy and resilient forests for the next generation.

This bill has already passed the House. It is now sitting in the Senate, and it is essential that the Senate act soon to put it on the President's desk.

Mr. WESTERMAN. I thank the gentleman from California and would also like to thank the gentleman for his tireless efforts on the Natural Resources Committee, the chairman of the Federal Lands Subcommittee.

This is something that—I am a freshman, and I have been working on for a small amount of time—but he has spent years working on this issue. I thank him for his tireless efforts and his desire to see healthy forests not only in his home State but across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, sometimes overlooked in the debate surrounding wildfires is the importance of forestry practices intended to prevent the wildfires before they start.

The Resilient Federal Forests Act, authored by my friend from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), passed the House in July with bipartisan support. Since then, there have been multiple fires, major fires that are raging across the country.

This bill would simplify and streamline environmental process requirements and reduce the cost of forest management projects intended to prevent catastrophic wildfires. The bill would also allow for quick removal of dead trees to pay for reforestation after large fires and prevent the incidence of reburn.

As wildfires continue to burn in the Western United States, with tremendous costs to people and property, it is important to note that these fires are literally sending billions of dollars of Federal assets up in smoke, depriving State government, local government, and the Federal Government of billions in revenues not just in wood products, but in recreation revenues.

I am a small forest owner myself. I understand the value of a healthy well-managed forest.

Mr. Speaker, America has already lost 9 million acres in valuable forests this year. Our forests continue to burn and more will be burned unless we act on this legislation. I encourage my colleagues in the Senate to quickly pass this much-needed legislation and send it to the President's desk.

Mr. WESTERMAN. I thank the gentleman from Alabama. We are from Southern States, but good forestry management is very important to us as well. I have about 2.5 million acres of Federal forest in my district in Arkansas, and we want to see that land managed properly. We don't want to see it go up in smoke.

Mr. Speaker, we face a lot of contentious issues in this body and in Congress, but this shouldn't be one of them.

President Roosevelt, who was the father of our national forests, along with Gifford Pinchot, said that this is one of our most treasured natural resources. We need to leave it in better shape for the next generation than what we received it in.

Right now, we are not doing that. This is not a partisan issue. This is something that we need to look at the science, we need to work together, and we need to do what is right for America. We need to do what is right for forests because healthy forests create a winning situation on many levels.

We get better air quality. We get better water quality. We get a better economy. We get better wildlife habitat. We sequester more carbon.

□ 1845

There is not a downside to a healthy forest, but we have to get our act right here in Washington, D.C.

It is with that that I, again, plead with and encourage the Senate to take up this issue. Let's have a debate on it. Let's fix this and get ourselves back on the right path to healthy forests. We didn't get here overnight, and we are not going to fix everything overnight, but we have to start sometime. The sooner we start, the sooner we can have our forests back in a healthy condition and the sooner we can enjoy this national treasure that belongs to all of us in America.

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

VOTE ''NO'' TO DEFUNDING PLANNED PARENTHOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk about defunding Planned Parenthood. Some Republicans have made this such a priority that they are vowing to shut down our government, shut down our programs for veterans and hinder their ability to access services, WIC programs serving moms and babies, curtail services for domestic violence, and close our national parks and landmarks.

The last Republican shutdown cost our economy $24 billion, but many of the GOP's Presidential candidates said in their debate just last night that defunding Planned Parenthood is a priority.

We are not talking about abortion here. We are talking about access to health care. Under current law, Federal money cannot be used for the coverage for abortion except in the most extreme circumstances of rape, incest, or the possibility of the death of the mother. Even though most Americans disagree with that restriction and believe firmly that decisions surrounding pregnancy should be between a woman, her doctor, and her faith, that is not the law of the land currently.

So if we are not talking about abortion, what are we talking about? What is this threat that will be stopped by cutting off all Federal funding for Planned Parenthood? What we are talking about is denying health care to the 2.7 million patients who received care just last year at Planned Parenthood.

More than 90 percent of what Planned Parenthood does is preventative care. This includes wellness exams, cancer screenings, contraception, prenatal care, and testing and treatment for STIs. Just last year, Planned Parenthood had over 2 million contraception patients, performed approximately 3.7 million STI tests, 370,000 Pap tests, and 450,000 breast exams. These are the types of services patients receive at Planned Parenthood, and this preventive health care is what the majority would like to get rid of by defunding it.

That is what is most important about this debate: the care that patients receive, the care that one in five American women will receive from Planned Parenthood at some point in their life.

I would like to welcome my colleague, at this point, from New Jersey's 12th District, Congresswoman WATSON COLEMAN. She is a strong voice for women and families. I am proud to call her a friend and a colleague, and I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, for the umpteenth time, men in Congress are leading the charge to limit women's access to health care, but now, instead of just wasting taxpayer dollars and time, they plan to take their outrageous tactics to a whole new level, perhaps shutting down the entire Federal Government if they don't get their way. As the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has already explained, that is absolutely ridiculous.

Rather than consider legislation that would fund repairs to our Nation's infrastructure or invest in our schools or create jobs for millions of Americans still out of work, we are considering legislation that would cut off support to an organization that provides vital health services to women and men who might not otherwise have access.

Mr. Speaker, Planned Parenthood is, first and foremost, an organization dedicated to women's health. What is more, despite the endless conservative rhetoric to the contrary, Planned Parenthood does not use a single dollar of Federal funds to provide abortions. This is really just a thinly veiled attempt to allow Congress to regulate a woman's uterus, and the end result won't be the end of very legal abortions. It will be the erosion of care, family planning, and medical treatment for thousands of women.

Wednesday's Washington Post offered a perfect example. It profiled a single Planned Parenthood clinic in Ohio, a clinic that does not offer abortion services. According to The Post, that clinic sees 7,100 patients each year, most of them young and poor. They administer 3,400 pregnancy tests, they write 2,900 birth control prescriptions, and they provide 13,200 screenings for sexually transmitted infections.

Facilities like this make up nearly half of the Planned Parenthood centers nationwide. Cutting their funding will only result in more illness, more unplanned pregnancies, and more babies born to mothers unprepared to care for them.

In 2013, Planned Parenthood provided more than 71,000 patients with care in my State, the State of New Jersey. They provided almost 16,000 Pap tests to New Jersey women, and they conducted more than 33,000 breast exams.

In a shortsighted response to a series of questionably edited videos and false claims, we are going to take health care away from Americans with few, if any, alternatives. That is not what my constituents elected me for. That is not what they expected me to be doing in Congress. I am here to create jobs, to better educate our young people, and to reform our broken criminal justice system. By no means am I here to relitigate a woman's right to choose.

Quite frankly, I am not sure which I am more disgusted by: the fact that we are doing this again, or the fact that I have come to the floor of this House so many times before to express that disgust.

I urge my colleagues to consider taking up the work that really matters to the American people. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

I want to reiterate something that the Congresswoman said, that this is really a thinly veiled extremist position. What we are talking about is exactly as the gentlewoman from New Jersey put it. We are talking about relitigating rights that are established under the law and that have really nothing to do with abortion. They are having everything to do with the way that one in five American women receives her health care. And Planned Parenthood not only has a huge reach in the patients that they serve, but they historically serve low-income and underserved populations.

For example, in 2013, 78 percent of Planned Parenthood patients had incomes of 150 percent of poverty or less. To put that in real terms, that is an income of a little over $36,000 dollars a year for a family of four. So not only does Planned Parenthood provide critical services to low-income families, but they also have a geographic reach to help ensure all patients have a healthcare access point.

Nationwide, they represent 54 percent of all health centers in rural areas, medically underserved areas, and health provider shortage areas. And in some areas, they are even a larger part of the healthcare system. In Alabama, Washington, D.C., Delaware, Louisiana, Mississippi, Montana, Rhode Island, and Wyoming, they are 100 percent of the health centers in rural areas, medically underserved areas, and health provider shortage areas. That is why Planned Parenthood is so critical.

I am delighted to yield to my colleague from California's 33rd District. Congressman LIEU represents communities in Los Angeles. He is an Air Force veteran and Reservist, president of the freshman class of Democrats, and, as a California State senator, and now as a Congressman, he has had an unparalleled record on women's issues.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Thank you, Representative CLARK, for your great work on this issue.

Madam Speaker, I rise to stand with Planned Parenthood.

Last month, as it became more and more clear that Republicans were willing to shut down the Federal Government to defund Planned Parenthood, I received a letter from a constituent of mine in Los Angeles. She gave me permission to read her letter. It says:

Dear Congressman Lieu,

I grew up in a small desert town that had a very high teen pregnancy and high school dropout rate. I made very poor choices as a young teenager, and I was drinking, partying, and ditching school at 15. During this time, I met a boy I cared for and started having sex. I knew that I didn't want to end up pregnant like a lot of young girls in my town, so I went to the one place I knew would help: Planned Parenthood. They made me feel comfortable there. They performed a thorough exam and gave me birth control pills. They also contacted me confidentially to tell me I had an STD and would need to take antibiotics. Without treatment, this STD could have made me permanently infertile.

I thank God that I straightened my act out and, by the end of high school, I was getting

straight A's. I went to a good college, graduated from medical school, and began my residency. I met a great guy, who is now my husband, and again went to Planned Parenthood for birth control bills, STD screening, and Pap smears. Several years later, I finally went off the birth control pills, and my husband and I got pregnant with our first of two healthy children.

I feel compelled to share my story because of everything that Planned Parenthood has done for me in my lifetime. Planned Parenthood allowed me to make good, healthy reproductive decisions and avoid ever having to make a decision as to whether or not to abort an unwanted pregnancy.

That letter is from one of many constituents and from millions of women across America that have benefited from Planned Parenthood.

The two bills on the floor today that are attacking Planned Parenthood are a direct attack on American women. In reality, a vote to defund Planned Parenthood is a vote to deny health care, education, and opportunity to millions of Americans like my constituent.

I stand with American women and with Planned Parenthood in opposition to these two bills, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Thank you, Congressman LIEU. We appreciate your coming. The story that you shared is repeated over and over with the millions of women that count on Planned Parenthood for their healthcare services.

I would now like to yield to my colleague from Tennessee's Ninth District. Congressman COHEN is a champion on women's issues and a lifelong supporter of Planned Parenthood.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you very much for the time, and thank you for scheduling this important hour, Special Order.

Madam Speaker, this issue is extremely important to women, to men, to the Constitution, and to progress, and this week has been, unfortunately, very much an example of what the House has been doing throughout this session—messaging.

We are about to have a shutdown of government because of Planned Parenthood, and the cost to our economy and to people for a shutdown of the Federal Government is astronomical. The last shutdown, which I think was in 2013—it might have been 2011—cost hundreds of billions of dollars to the economy. The stock market fell, people lost jobs, lost income, and lost services all because of Planned Parenthood.

□ 1900

The bottom line is that Planned Parenthood is an outstanding organization that serves women in this Nation, in my State, and in my city—mostly low-income women and a lot of women of color.

There, they get their basic female healthcare services whether it is cervical cancer exams, breast cancer exams, sexually transmitted disease tests, family planning programs.

It is not about abortion. A very small part of it is abortion. It is not called ''Planned Abortion.'' It is called ''Planned Parenthood.''

Madam Speaker, most people are in need of those services. To cut them out, as they talked about, and to give them to community health centers is not the answer. That doesn't work as it is going to disadvantage a lot of women.

What we have had this week is a bill—the most recent bill—did anybody discuss the fact that this second bill didn't go to committee? I guess it is called the ''unborn baby bill,'' whatever it is. Has that been discussed?

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. No.

Mr. COHEN. That is the amazing thing. This bill that has come up—that will come up tomorrow, I guess—never went to committee. In fact, it was kind of just sprung on us on Monday, and they didn't even get the language straight until maybe Tuesday.

Madam Speaker, in the Congress, we generally have committee meetings. You have a hearing on a bill almost always—that is what committees are for, is to have hearings—sometimes by a subcommittee and then, later, by a full committee—and a markup, sometimes by the subcommittee, always at least by the full committee. Then it goes to the Rules Committee, and then it comes to the floor.

When this Congress came about, the majority party made a big deal about how they were going to come in and change the way things were done and how there was going to be regular order.

Bills weren't going to be brought to the floor without any notice; committees would do their work; amendments would be offered; and people would get an opportunity to testify from the public.

This bill was given no markup in committee, no hearing in committee, no opportunity for the public to voice any concerns as to whether they were for it or against it, and no Congresspeople on the committee had a chance to voice their concerns.

In essence, it was sprung on the public. The bill will have a new definition of ''abortion''—unknown before in Federal law. That is a pretty major thing—with no hearing, no notice, no opportunity to address the issue, no opportunity to maybe bring in somebody who is an expert to say: You might have missed this. You might have missed that. This is the way it ought to be. No.

Madam Speaker, this week in Congress, the Republican side has basically said: We don't want to hear from the public. We don't want to hear from doctors. We don't want to hear from women. We don't want to hear from them on another bill we had up today. We don't want to hear from judges on something that affects the Federal courts, where the judges, in reviewing it, voted by 85 percent ''bad idea''—no judges, no lawyers, no doctors, no women, no public—because that side of the House knows how to do everything.

They know how to define ''abortion.'' They know how to run the courts. They know how to run women's lives. Choice and reproduction should be a decision between a woman, her family, her conscience, and her doctor, not what this side wants.

What this side wants is to repeal Roe v. Wade. They want to do away with a woman's right to abortion. That is what this is about. They pick these other issues to talk about, but that is what they really want. If that happens, it is going to be no different than alcohol prohibition in the twenties and marijuana today.

Alcohol was illegal. So what happened? People got alcohol and they drank, but they drank because organized crime supplied it for them—no taxes, lots of organized crime, lots of killings between organized crime.

Marijuana. Do people have problems getting marijuana? People don't have problems getting marijuana. It is everywhere. It was at George Bush's school. It is everywhere. It is not hard to get, but it gives the cartels a way to sell it. It happens.

Madam Speaker, when abortion was illegal in this country, wealthy women could afford to go to Mexico or wherever it was legal and get abortions. Poor people went to get abortions, but they had to go to somebody who maybe didn't have a clean area in which to do the procedure or the experience or the ability. Poor women went to back alleys and oftentimes had health detriments because of it and sometimes lost their lives.

So abortion is not going to be outlawed in this Congress, I don't think, but that is what they would like to do. Even if it is outlawed, it is still going to happen. If it happens, it is going to happen for the rich, and the poor are going to get the worst services.

You can't take your morality and tell the American public, when they want some service, some opportunity, some freedom, that they can't have it, because they will find it. It will just be through a roundabout way.

Madam Speaker, I thank Ms. CLARK for having this Special Order. I am going to always support Roe v. Wade and support Planned Parenthood. It does a lot for the women in my district. As I said, it is one of the best organizations in our country, and I believe that.

They help women with services they otherwise couldn't get. In a lot of States like mine, where the Affordable Care Act has not been extended through the expansion of Medicaid, it is even more difficult for poor women to get medical services and even life-saving services.

So thank you. We will continue to message and continue to fight and hope the American public realizes that what is going on here is shutting them out—no voice, no message—simply activity.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his words and for his commitment

to women and their access to health care and for pointing out the confounding thing about defunding Planned Parenthood, which is that we are not even talking about abortion, as we have already restricted that Federal funding.

Madam Speaker, we are talking about access to health care to underserved women, to low-income women, who are trying to get general wellness checkups, who are trying to have cancer screenings, who are trying to access health care.

It is Planned Parenthood that fills that void in our underserved populations, in our rural areas. That is where they make a critical difference.

You are absolutely right in that the messaging that this is somehow about something else is completely hiding the fact that we are bringing bills to the floor without committee hearings, that we are not being transparent, and that we are misleading the American public about what this debate is about.

I am delighted that we also have another champion for working families and a great voice for the communities he serves.

I yield to my colleague from California's 36th District, Congressman RUIZ.

Mr. RUIZ. I thank the gentlewoman.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of a woman's right to choose, women's health, and Planned Parenthood.

You see, before I ran for Congress, I spent 9 years as an emergency medicine physician. A few years ago, a 55-year-old woman came into my emergency room with a gynecological hemorrhage.

After we stopped the bleeding in the ER, we admitted her for diagnosis and treatment. Sadly, as I suspected, she had advanced cervical cancer, and 5 months later, she died, leaving her family behind.

Until recently, cervical cancer was the leading cause of cancer deaths for women in the United States. However, over the past 40 years, we have dramatically reduced the number of deaths from cervical cancer.

According to the CDC, ''This decline largely is the result of many women getting regular Pap tests, which can find cervical pre-cancer before it turns into cancer.''

Madam Speaker, that is what is at stake in this debate.

In fact, 97 percent of Planned Parenthood's services are not abortion related. Planned Parenthood provides many health and wellness services, including STI testing, contraceptives, and cancer screenings to over 2 million women and men each year.

Opponents of Planned Parenthood's want to turn this into a debate about abortion, but it is not. Let's be clear. Defunding Planned Parenthood won't reduce the number of abortions at all.

This is a debate about cervical cancer. This is a debate about breast cancer. This is a debate about how many women we are going to allow to go undiagnosed and untreated. This is a debate about how many women we are going to allow to show up in emergency rooms like mine, with terminal cancer, too late to be saved.

In California alone, Planned Parenthood health centers have provided over 93,000 Pap tests for cervical cancer and 97,000 breast exams to help prevent death from breast cancer.

Madam Speaker, Planned Parenthood saves lives.

Here is who actually loses if Planned Parenthood loses its funding: Women in geographically underserved areas lose; uninsured and underinsured women lose; women on Medicaid lose; and low-income women lose.

Planned Parenthood fills that access gap and provides essential health services to those who need it the most. Cutting their funding will have a long-term, devastating effect on the overall health of women in our communities, worsening health outcomes and health disparities for women across our Nation.

To me, this isn't a political debate, because I have seen firsthand what happens when women don't have access to preventative care. Women die; children are left without their mothers; and families are torn apart.

It is for these reasons that I oppose this misguided, mean-spirited, politically driven measure, and it is for these reasons that I stand with Planned Parenthood.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman from California for sharing his experience as a medical doctor and as someone who stands with Planned Parenthood.

Thank you for joining us.

Congressman RUIZ raises an interesting point about looking at our system of health care.

Part of the proposal from the Republicans is that this is easy, that we can simply take the money from Planned Parenthood and give it to community health centers, but there is simply not the capacity in the system to handle these extra patients.

Currently, more than half of Medicaid providers are not offering appointments to new Medicaid patients, but two-thirds of the States report difficulty in ensuring enough providers, including OB/GYN care.

Madam Speaker, this hurts low-income women especially hard because 60 percent of Planned Parenthood patients access care through Medicaid and/or Title X, and 35 percent of women view their OB/GYN as their main source of care.

So what we are talking about here is not abortion, but women's health care, preventative measures that save lives.

We know that over 90 percent of the services Planned Parenthood provides are preventative. We know that they serve underserved areas.

We know that there isn't enough capacity to see these patients in other settings and that eliminating funding for Planned Parenthood would mean over 390,000 patients would no longer receive health care.

If all of this sounds crazy to you, you are not alone. It is why I came down here tonight, and I thank my colleagues who joined me.

It is time that we reveal the falsehoods of this argument and defeat these efforts—these radical efforts—that are threatening to shut down our government in order to defund Planned Parenthood, which carries so much of our healthcare system for women in this country and especially for low-income women.

It is time we stand up, debunk the lies and the mysteries that we are being told, and let women have the healthcare access that they need and deserve.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

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.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1090. An act to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide eligibility for broadcasting facilities to receive certain disaster assistance, and for other purposes.

S. 1580. An act to allow additional appointing authorities to select individuals from competitive service certificates.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1090. An act to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide eligibility for broadcasting facilities to receive certain disaster assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

S. 1580. An act to allow additional appointing authorities to select individuals from competitive service certificates; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 18, 2015, at 9 a.m.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

> ''I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.''

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 114th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

DARIN LAHOOD, Eighteenth District of Illinois.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2803. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing two United States Navy officers, Captain Shoshana S. Chatfield and Captain Cathal S. O'Connor, to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2804. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Louisiana: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [EPA-R06-2015-0070 RCRA; FRL-9933-79-Region 6] received September 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2805. 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; State of Kansas Regional Haze State Implementation Plan Revision and 2014 Five-Year Progress Report [EPA-R07-OAR-2015-0299; FRL-9933-84-Region 7] received September 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2806. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Control of NOx Emissions From Large Stationary Internal Combustion Engines [EPA-R07-OAR-2015-0520; FRL-9934-00-Region 7] received September 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2807. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to Sec. 804 of the PLO Commitments Compliance Act of 1989 [Title VIII, Foreign Relations Authorization Act, FY 1990 and 1991 (Pub. L. 101-246)], and Secs. 603-604 (Middle East Peace Commitments Act of 2002) and 699 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, FY 2003 (Pub. L. 107-228); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2808. A letter from the Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's FY 2017 budget request for the Office of Inspector General of the Railroad Retirement Board, in accordance with Sec. 7(f) of the Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2809. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pennsylvania Regulatory Program [SATS No.: PA-159-FOR; Docket No.: OSM-2010-0017; S1D1S SS08011000 SX064A000 156S180110; S2D2S SS08011000 SX064A000 15XS501520] received September 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2810. 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; Exchange of Flatfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 141021887-5172-02] (RIN: 0648-XE023) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2811. 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; Atka Mackerel in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 141021887-5172-02] (RIN: 0648-XD996) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2812. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; 2015 Atlantic Bluefish Specifications [Docket No.: 150126074-5655-02] (RIN: 0648-XD742) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2813. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries off West Coast States; Highly Migratory Fisheries; California Swordfish Drift Gillnet Fishery; Vessel Monitoring System Requirements [Docket No.: 140528460-5498-03] (RIN: 0648-BE25) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2814. 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 Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Trimester Total Allowable Catch Area Closure for the Common Pool Fishery [Docket No.: 150105004-5355-01] (RIN: 0648-XE073) received September 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2815. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fisheries; 2015 Bigeye Tuna Longline Fishery Closure in the Eastern Pacific Ocean [Docket No.: 130717632-4285-02] (RIN: 0648-XE085) received September 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2816. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coral, Coral Reefs, and Live/Hard Bottom Habitats of the South Atlantic Region; Amendment 8; Correction [Docket No.: 140214145-5582-02] (RIN: 0648-BD81) received September 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2817. 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 Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery; Closure of the Mid-Atlantic Access Area to General Category Individual Fishing Quota Scallop Vessels [Docket No.: 141125999-5362-02] (RIN: 0648-XE084) received September 11, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2818. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [Docket No.: 120328229-4949-02] (RIN: 0648-XE079) received August 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2819. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Regulations. Areas of the National Park System, Lake Meredith National Recreation Area, Off-Road Motor Vehicles [NPS-LAMR-18708; PPWONRADE2, PMP00EI05.YP0000] (RIN: 1024-AD86) received September 9, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2820. A letter from the Senior Attorney, Office of Hearings and Appeals, Departmental Cases Hearings Division, Office of the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hearing Process Concerning Acknowledgement of American Indian Tribes [156A2100DD/AAKC001030/A0A501010.999900 253G] (RIN: 1094-AA54) received September 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2821. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Cleveland National Air Show; Lake Erie and

Cleveland Harbor, Cleveland, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0718] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2822. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's temporary rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0282; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-168-AD; Amendment 39-18242; AD 2015-17-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2823. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0282; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-168-AD; Amendment 39-18242; AD 2015-17-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2824. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; REIMS AVIATION S.A. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3398; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-031-AD; Amendment 39-18232; AD 2015-16-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2825. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and E Airspace; Santa Rosa, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3325; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AWP-15] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2826. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Kelso, WA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1133; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ANM-8] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2827. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Previously Eurocopter France) (Airbus Helicopters) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0364; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-041-AD; Amendment 39-18234; AD 2015-17-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2828. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Restricted Areas R-3804A, R-3804B, and R-3804C; Fort Polk, LA [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0639; Airspace Docket No.: 13-ASW-20] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2829. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Toledo, WA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1135; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ANM-9] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2830. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Santa Rosa, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1481; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AWP-1] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2831. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of VOR Federal Airways; Northeastern United States [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1650; Airspace Docket No.: 14-AEA-8] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2832. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada (Bell) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0643; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-059-AD; Amendment 39-18235; AD 2015-17-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2833. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0492; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-232-AD; Amendment 39-18237; AD 2015-17-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2834. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace, and Amendment of Class D Airspace; Ogden, Hill AFB, UT [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0691; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ANM-6] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2835. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace, and Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Ogden-Hinckley Airport, UT [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0671; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ANM-5] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2836. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31032; Amdt. No.: 3656] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2837. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31031; Amdt. No.: 3655] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2838. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Service's final regulations and removal of temporary regulations — Integrated Hedging Transactions of Qualifying Debt [TD 9736] (RIN: 1545-BK98) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2839. A letter from the United States Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting notification of the President's ongoing negotiations in the World Trade Organization aimed at eliminating tariffs on a wide range of environmental goods, in accordance with Sec. 107(b)(1) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (Trade Priorities Act of 2015); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2840. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's temporary regulations — Administration of Multiemployer Plan Participant Vote on an Approved Suspension of Benefits Under MPRA [TD 9735] (RIN: 1545-BM89) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2841. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final and temporary regulations — United States Property Held by Controlled Foreign Corporations in Transactions Involving Partnerships; Rents and Royalties Derived in the Active Conduct of a Trade or Business [TD 9733] (RIN: 1545-BJ49) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2842. A letter from the Chairman and Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's 2015 report for the FY ending September 30, 2014, pursuant to Sec. 7(b)(6) of the Railroad Retirement Act and Sec. 12(1) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; jointly to the Committees on 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. WESTMORELAND:

H.R. 3531. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to include claims relating to a response under the Comprehensive Response, Compensation, and Liability Act among those claims for which the Federal Tort Claims Act provides a remedy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLIQUIN (for himself, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. MESSER):

H.R. 3532. A bill to amend the fresh fruit and vegetable program under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to include canned, dried, frozen, or pureed fruits

and vegetables; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HANNA (for himself and Mr. COOPER):

H.R. 3533. A bill to reduce Federal, State, and local costs of providing high-quality drinking water to millions of people in the United States residing in rural communities by facilitating greater use of cost-effective alternative systems, including well water systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. GUINTA (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 3534. A bill to reduce the national debt and eliminate waste in Government spending, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 3535. A bill to promote and ensure delivery of high quality special education and related services to students with visual disabilities or who are deaf or hard of hearing or deaf-blind through instructional methodologies meeting their unique learning needs; to enhance accountability for the provision of such services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. LEWIS):

H.R. 3536. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe a motor vehicle safety standard requiring commercial motor vehicles to be equipped with a forward collision avoidance and mitigation braking system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DOLD, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. HANNA, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LANCE, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. KATKO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. JOLLY):

H.R. 3537. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to clarify how controlled substance analogues are to be regulated, and for other purposes; 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 Mr. PITTENGER:

H.R. 3538. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to maintain and operate at least one Doppler weather radar site within 55 miles of each city in the United States that has a population of more than 700,000 individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 3539. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for clinical testing expenses for qualified infectious disease drugs and rapid diagnostic tests; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 3540. A bill to amend the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 to make improvements to the food safety education program carried out under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 3541. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to modify the goals of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Open Market Committee; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 3542. A bill to provide support for prekindergarten education through an Early Education Trust Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LEE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. NADLER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 3543. A bill to improve Federal sentencing and corrections practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Energy and Commerce, and Homeland Security, 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. HAHN (for herself, Mr. FOSTER, and Ms. ESTY):

H.R. 3544. A bill to help keep law enforcement officers and communities safer by making grants to purchase body worn cameras for use by State, local, and tribal law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 3545. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for replacement costs associated with certain imported corrosive drywall, and to amend the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to allow use of community development block grant amounts for repairs to housing constructed using such corrosive drywall, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JONES (for himself, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California):

H.R. 3546. A bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to clarify provisions enacted by the Captive Wildlife Safety Act, to further the conservation of certain wildlife species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 3547. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a task force on Agent Orange exposure; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. PAULSEN):

H.R. 3548. A bill to increase transparency of agencies by requiring a report describing any proposed conference; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. KLINE (for himself, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, and Mr. PAULSEN):

H.R. 3549. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to waive the requirement of certain veterans to make copayments for hospital care and medical services in the case of an error by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H.R. 3550. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income amounts received on account of claims based on certain unlawful discrimination and to allow income averaging for backpay and frontpay awards received on account of such claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 3551. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require additional reporting on crime and harm that occurs during student participation in programs of study abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 3552. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide equitable treatment for residents of Puerto Rico with respect to the refundable portion of the child tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 3553. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make residents of Puerto Rico eligible for the earned income tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. KAPTUR, and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 3554. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to create a pilot program to award grants to units of general local government and community-based organizations to create jobs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida (for herself, Ms. ADAMS, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr.

GRIJALVA, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California):

H.R. 3555. A bill to provide tax relief for American workers and businesses, to put workers back on the job while rebuilding and modernizing America, and to provide pathways back to work for Americans looking for jobs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Small Business, Education and the Workforce, the Judiciary, Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, House Administration, Oversight and Government Reform, and 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. GIBSON (for himself, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. DOLD, Mr. HANNA, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H. Res. 424. A resolution expressing the commitment of the House of Representatives to conservative environmental stewardship; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. MULLIN):

H. Res. 425. A resolution expressing support for designation of September 2015 as ''National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. HIGGINS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. FARR, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. HAHN, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HARDY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. COSTA, Ms. BASS, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. TITUS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. TORRES, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. NADLER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BEYER, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Ms. SINEMA):

H. Res. 426. A resolution recognizing Hispanic Heritage Month and celebrating the heritage and culture of Latinos in the United States and the immense contributions of Latinos to the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. FUDGE (for herself, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. RENACCI, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GIBBS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. HOYER, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H. Res. 427. A resolution honoring the life, accomplishments, and legacy of Congressman Louis Stokes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H. Res. 428. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to protect House employees from employment discrimination on the basis of actual or perceived sexual orientation and gender identity; to the Committee on Ethics.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. GABBARD, and Ms. GRAHAM):

H. Res. 429. A resolution congratulating Captain Kristen Griest and First Lieutenant Shaye Haver on their graduation from Ranger School; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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. WESTMORELAND:

H.R. 3531.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POLIQUIN:

H.R. 3532.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 empowers Congress to ''regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 3533.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GUINTA:

H.R. 3534.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, which states: 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 any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3535.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 (relating to the power of Congress 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).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 3536.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 3537.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H.R. 3538.

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;

Article 1, 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 or Officer thereof.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 3539.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(a) Article I, Section 1, to exercise the legislative powers vested in Congress as granted in the Constitution; and

(b) Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which gives Congress the authority ''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. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 3540.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 3541.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 3542.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of article I of the Constitution and Amendment XVI of the Constitution.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 3543.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 3544.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

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

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 3545.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution which reads: ''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 and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 3546.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution: ''The Congress shall have the power. . . . To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes:''

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 3547.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 1: 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.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 3548.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. KLINE:

H.R. 3549.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation provides the Secretary of Veterans Affairs the authority to waive a copayment requirement if the Department of Veterans Affairs is the cause of an error that delays sending a bill to a veteran. Additionally, the bill requires the Department of Veterans Affairs to notify a veteran of how to get a waiver and establish a payment plan before they can collect payment when they does not bill a veteran in a timely manner. Specific authority is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 14, and 16), which grants Congress the power to raise and support Armies; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 3550.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 3551.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 3552.

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 lay and collect taxes and to provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 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. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 3553.

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 lay and collect taxes and to provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 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 Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 3554.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause and provisions to provide for the general welfare.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 3555.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause and provisions to provide for the general welfare.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 38: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 167: Mr. YODER and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 169: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 205: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 206: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 213: Mrs. LOVE, Ms. ADAMS, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 242: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 244: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 267: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 270: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 344: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 390: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 483: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 546: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 581: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 592: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 600: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 604: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 664: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 702: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 733: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 765: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 767: Mr. ASHFORD.
H.R. 775: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. TAKAI, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 793: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 814: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 815: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 863: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 868: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 885: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 921: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 927: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 928: Mr. DONOVAN.
H.R. 985: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 1061: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 1145: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 1150: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 1151: Ms. GRAHAM.
H.R. 1153: Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 1202: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1211: Mr. VEASEY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1218: Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 1232: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 1258: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 1270: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. HILL, Mr. SESSIONS, and Ms. MCSALLY.
H.R. 1292: Ms. GABBARD and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1338: Mrs. ROBY.
H.R. 1343: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 1369: Mr. FLORES and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 1399: Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 1401: Mr. DELANEY and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 1413: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 1428: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 1475: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 1519: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 1528: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 1550: Mr. ASHFORD and Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 1559: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 1566: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 1567: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 1588: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 1604: Ms. ADAMS.
H.R. 1610: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 1624: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 1671: Mr. BYRNE and Ms. MCSALLY.
H.R. 1683: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 1706: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1715: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 1736: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1784: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 1786: Mr. WALZ, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. HULTGREN, and Ms. PLASKETT.
H.R. 1859: Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 1893: Mrs. LOVE and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 1901: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 1938: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 1988: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2014: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2030: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 2050: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 2083: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 2087: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BEYER, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 2096: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2205: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 2255: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan and Mr. YODER.
H.R. 2260: Miss RICE of New York and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 2264: Ms. MCSALLY and Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 2280: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2313: Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 2320: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2342: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. COOK, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 2355: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 2391: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2403: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 2442: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2519: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2567: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 2611: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2622: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 2640: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 2657: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 2671: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 2672: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 2673: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 2674: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 2713: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 2715: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 2764: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2775: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 2799: Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 2805: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 2849: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2858: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 2867: Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 2878: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 2903: Mr. BYRNE and Mr. BARR.
H.R. 2905: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 2911: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. REED, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 2915: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 2920: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 2940: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas and Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 2948: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 3011: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 3016: Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 3024: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 3036: Mr. KATKO, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 3040: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 3041: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3065: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3081: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 3084: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 3110: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 3126: Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. HURD of Texas.
H.R. 3134: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 3136: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 3166: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3177: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 3183: Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 3189: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 3220: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 3221: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 3222: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3248: Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 3268: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 3285: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 3286: Mr. NUNES and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 3309: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 3314: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 3338: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 3339: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 3340: Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 3355: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 3363: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 3371: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 3411: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 3423: Mr. DENHAM, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 3427: Ms. ADAMS and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 3439: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 3442: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 3443: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 3457: Mr. GIBSON, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 3473: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3476: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 3477: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 3495: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 3504: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 3511: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 3516: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. BABIN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 3517: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 3521: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 3523: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. VEASEY.
H.J. Res. 11: Mr. SANFORD.
H.J. Res. 50: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.J. Res. 59: Mr. ASHFORD.
H. Con. Res. 17: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. PETERSON.
H. Con. Res. 75: Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. WALKER, Mr. FLORES, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. KLINE, Mr. BARR, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. KING of Iowa.
H. Res. 12: Mr. HIMES and Mr. AMODEI.
H. Res. 82: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H. Res. 112: Ms. EDWARDS.
H. Res. 139: Mr. KLINE.
H. Res. 230: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H. Res. 277: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. BRAT, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ISSA, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. SALMON, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. ROSKAM.
H. Res. 289: Mr. YARMUTH.
H. Res. 293: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. MENG, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. TROTT, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. VARGAS.
H. Res. 294: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H. Res. 383: Mr. KING of New York.
H. Res. 385: Mr. GOHMERT.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

26. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Gregory D. Watson of Austin, TX, relative to urging Congress to propose, for ratification by special conventions held within the individual states, an amendment to the United States Constitution which would clarify that any agreement arrived at between the President of the United States and any foreign government or governments constitutes a ''treaty'' thereby necessitating a two-thirds affirmative vote of ''concurrence'' by the United States Senate as provided in Article II, Section 2, Clause 2 of the Constitution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2015 No. 134

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Today's opening prayer will be offered by the Reverend Camille Murray, pastor of Georgetown Presbyterian Church.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, we give You thanks for the many provisions of this day and for the simple and sustaining gifts which enrich our lives. We thank You for the beauty and bounty of this great Nation. We offer You praise for the heritage we share, the faith we cherish, and the freedoms we enjoy.

As Your grateful people, we ask that You would remind us of the callings You have placed upon our lives. We pray that we would be faithful to those callings and to those entrusted to our care. May those elected to lead be given a double portion of Your Spirit, that they may have vision and wisdom from above.

Gracious God, keep us pure in thought, honest in speech, and diligent in our pursuit of the common good, all for the glory of Your Holy 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The Senator from Minnesota.

WELCOMING THE GUEST CHAPLAIN

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I want to thank Camille Murray for our opening prayer this morning.

Reverend Murray currently serves in our Nation's Capital as the 20th senior pastor of the Georgetown Presbyterian Church. The church was founded in 1780, and Reverend Murray is the first woman pastor.

Reverend Murray grew up in my home State, in Mahtomedi, MN. She holds degrees from Vanderbilt University, Princeton Theological Seminary, Oxford University, and Wesley Seminary.

Reverend Murray's congregation is nonpartisan, with the belief that God transcends that which divides us.

We are so happy that she led us today in prayer.

Thank you very much.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Democrats have chosen to deny the Senate a final vote on the President's deal with Iran. They made their choice, but that doesn't mean the discussion is over.

Today we will have another opportunity to address the lifting of congressionally mandated sanctions as called for in the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. Today we will have an opportunity to vote on a question of policy: Should Iran be left with a threshold nuclear program, one now recognized by the P5+1, and receive billions of dollars in sanctions relief without any linkage whatsoever to other aspects of its foreign policy adventurism. That is the question before us.

I will discuss that vote in greater detail in just a moment but first a reminder of how we got to this point.

Here is what we know about the nuclear deal with Iran. It is President Obama's deal with Iran, not America's deal with Iran, because the President did everything possible to cut the American people out and to block their elected representatives from having a say.

He refused a treaty, because as Secretary Kerry noted quite candidly, he wasn't interested in negotiating something an elected Congress could support. He then had to be persuaded that resisting legislation to allow Congress an up-or-down vote on it—just as he had to be persuaded when Congress passed sanctions legislation that helped bring Iran to the table in the first place—would be futile. In other words, he didn't want the legislation that gave us an opportunity to respond to the President's deal with Iran. It had so many supporters, he knew the veto would be overridden. Then he finally convinced his party, which had voted unanimously for the legislation that gave Congress an opportunity to weigh in on the President's deal, to then deny the American people the up-or-down congressional vote Democrats had promised. Our Democratic friends went to extreme lengths to protect the President politically. Because they did, Democrats ensured that this would be not just Obama's deal with Iran but the Democratic Party's deal with Iran too.

It is a deal that allows Iran to grow stronger in any number of ways: diplomatically, militarily, in terms of trade, and in terms of its enrichment program. It is also a deal that achieves hardly any of the Obama administration's primary goals. Secretary Kerry once declared that an accounting of Iran's military-related nuclear activities ''will be part of a final'' deal. ''If there is going to be a deal,'' he promised, ''it will be done.'' But it isn't.

Secretary Moniz once declared that he expected we would have anytime, anywhere access to Iranian nuclear facilities. We will not.

President Obama once declared that ''the deal we'll accept is they end their nuclear program—it's very straightforward''—or perhaps not quite so

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

Printed on recycled paper.

straightforward because this deal will not end Iran's nuclear program.

Because the President made clear his desire to secure an agreement at any cost, it became easy for the Iranians to exploit concession after concession after concession. It became possible for the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism to secure a deal that allows it to enrich uranium, to maintain thousands of centrifuges, and to become a recognized nuclear-threshold state, forever on the edge of developing a weapon. Iran was even able to secure a multibillion-dollar cash windfall that will allow it to strengthen terrorist groups such as Hezbollah and Hamas, along with Assad's bloody regime in Damascus—even the President basically admits as much.

The administration is now so invested in this deal that it is likely to veto any additional sanctions passed by Congress, even those against terrorism.

Presidents are able to secure stronger, better, and more durable outcomes when they seek constructive cooperation on matters beyond the water's edge.

Republicans stood proudly for more international trade jobs just a few months ago. The President agreed with us on the policy. We all fought in the same corner as a result. It was disappointing to then hear the same President dismiss honest intellectual disagreements on the Iran deal as reflexive opposition to him personally. What nonsense.

The President made a choice to turn this into a partisan campaign instead of a serious debate. He tried to cut out the American people and Congress at every single opportunity. Because he did, he has left his country and his party with an Executive deal that has hardly any durability or popular backing. Because he handled it this way, he has left his country and his party with an Executive deal that has hardly any durability or any public support. The American people aren't sold on it. A strong bipartisan majority of the House has rejected it. A strong bipartisan majority of the Senate rejects it too.

The deal can and likely will be revisited by the next Commander in Chief, but its negative consequences promise to live on regardless and far beyond one President's last few months in office.

Those who follow in the White House and in Congress will have to deal with an Iran enriched by billions of dollars to invest in conventional weapons upgrades and further support to terrorist groups. Many of us will be here in the future, when we have the need to work with the next President to decide how best to deal with Iran's ambitions and the future of this nuclear program.

One reason Iran was able to negotiate so successfully was because of Russian support for a deal that would be antithetical to America's interests. No surprise then that just days after the deal was accounted, the commander of Iran's Quds Force reportedly flew to Moscow to secure Russian support for their mutual ally in Syria. No surprise then that as soon as the President had seemingly succeeded in securing the votes for a veto override, we heard that Russia was constructing a forward operating base to help prop up Assad. Iran's negotiating partner, Russia, will undoubtedly use its presence in Syria to attempt to leverage the Western powers to weaken sanctions crafted in response to the invasion of Crimea. That, my colleagues, is diplomatic linkage. Russia pursued it successfully; the Obama administration did not.

The administration attempted to negotiate this deal with a singular focus on ending Iran's nuclear program. Now we already know it failed in that regard, but that myopia also has other consequences as well, leading the administration to ignore many issues that should have been linked to the negotiations in the first place—everything from Iran's support for terrorism to its aggressive behavior across the Middle East, to its harassment of shipping vessels in the Persian Gulf—but not just those issues. The administration failed to negotiate to ensure the release of American citizens being held in Iranian custody. The administration failed to negotiate to ensure Iran's recognition of Israel's right to exist. But we can do something to link the freedom of American citizens being held in Iranian custody and the recognition of Israel to sanctions relief—something the administration should have done. We can say it has to be corrected before sanctions are lifted and billions more flow into Iranian coffers to be used for terrorism. That is what today's vote is about.

When it comes to American citizens being held in Iranian custody, the Senate voted unanimously just a few months ago to call for Iranian leaders to release our American citizens. One is a journalist in prison for spreading ''propaganda against the state.'' Another is a pastor who dared to attend a Christian gathering.

When it comes to Israel, Iran employs invective against Israel at every turn. It has already demonstrated both the will and the capability to strike out against the West and through proxies and cyber attacks at allies like Israel and Saudi Arabia.

What this deal will not do is alter Iran's behavior. What it will do is give Iran an even greater ability to follow through on these threats. So we cannot allow Iran to be empowered as a nuclear threshold state armed with billions in sanctions relief without at least providing some protection—some protection to Israel first, without at least demanding the release of Americans who have languished in Iranian custody for years first.

Let's at least agree on that. I understand there is strong division in the Senate—a bipartisan majority opposed, partisan minority in favor—over the broader Iranian deal. But at the very least, at the very least, we should be able to come together over the vote we will take today. So I would urge all of my colleagues to vote for it.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN AND GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Senate has already spoken and made it absolutely clear that the agreement with Iran will stand. Remember, an agreement to stop Iran from having a nuclear weapon is what it is all about. The issue has been decided. Instead of focusing on the critical issue of funding our government, Senator MCCONNELL has decided to waste an entire week on something that has already been decided, twice.

First, we are voting on the McConnell amendment, which would keep the President from being able to suspend or waive sanctions on Iran unless Iran frees all Americans and formally recognizes the State of Israel. All Senators, Democrats and Republicans, want all the Americans held by Iran or who have disappeared in Iran to come back home to their families as quickly as possible. We believe that Iran should recognize the State of Israel. We believe the other countries in that area should join along. We are very happy with the arrangement between Egypt and Israel which has been going on for many, many years and has been very good for some degree of stability in the area.

What Republican colleagues are doing now is very, very cynical. They are taking serious issues and turning them into pawns on a political chess board. Here is what Senator STABENOW said yesterday. Remember, she is the Senator from Michigan. She has a person from Michigan who has been held in Iran for some time now. Here is what she said yesterday:

> The Senate Republican leader is . . . playing politics with Amir's life. The imprisonment of this veteran—this American hero—is being used by the Senate majority leader in a transparent attempt to score some cheap political points . . . and it's appalling. No American should ever be used in this way.

Elaborating, she told me that his family wants us to stay out of it, progress is being made. Please stay out of it. That is what his sister said. This cynical tactic is a waste of the Senate's time. We should be focused on preventing a government shutdown. Senator MCCONNELL has decided that the Senate should vote not once, not twice, but a third time on the resolution of disapproval, which has already failed, as I mentioned before, on two separate occasions.

The results will be the same today. Yet Senate Republicans appear to be

stuck and unable to move forward even in the face of a looming government shutdown. There are just a few legislative days until the government runs out of funding. Democrats have seen this coming for months and Republicans should have seen it also. Maybe they did but just ignored it.

That is why we have called for bipartisan budget negotiations. We are running out of time. That is an understatement. Last week, the Republican leader told this body:

> We only have so much floor time in the Senate. We are going to try to use it on serious proposals that have a chance of becoming law.

I am sure he should read that to himself again today, yesterday, and maybe tomorrow. But after having made the statement, instead of voting on this key priority—that is, funding the government—we are spending time on cynical show votes even though everyone knows the result. Despite the fact that a shutdown looms in a matter of days, the Republican leader is turning the world's greatest deliberative body into the ''show-vote'' Senate.

Ensuring that the government has the funds it needs to operate is the basic responsibility of the Senate. That Republicans have let this crisis build instead of joining Democrats at the bargaining table is an embarrassment to this institution. The Republican leader and I don't see eye to eye on all political issues, but we both support a clean bill to stop a government shutdown. That is what he wants. A clean bill is the only way to prevent a government shutdown, no riders, no tricky things in it at all.

Just yesterday, the Republican Leader said, the sequester-level spending caps should be lifted. Thank goodness he said that. I agree with him. I agree with Senator MCCAIN and Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM, who have talked about this on the Republican side. We all know how this ends. The Senate will pass a clean continuing resolution. I hope that is the ending we all see because that is what we should see.

When I say a clean bill, I mean no policy riders, no procedural loopholes, just a clean funding bill devoid of tricks. So what are we waiting for? Why are we dragging the country to the brink of another shutdown when the solution is staring us in the face? There is nothing to gain from delaying the inevitable and much to lose. The reality of the Senate is that the longer we wait, the more difficult the path forward will be. In the past, Republicans' inability to govern responsibly has amplified the voice of government shutdown advocates like the junior Senator from Texas. Every moment the Republican leader wastes increases the likelihood that one Senator's objection can raise enough procedural problems to force the entire government to shut down. I am not making this up, it happened 2 years ago.

Captains of chaos want nothing more than for the Republican leader to twiddle his thumbs. Every day we wait increases the leverage of those who want to shut down the government. We have seen this drama before. It happened 2 years ago. The Republican leader will need to file cloture at least twice if any single member of the caucus objects.

So if the Republican leader wants to avoid a government shutdown, he should start the process of bringing a bill to the floor by Thursday at the absolute latest. Time really is running out. Next week, Pope Francis will address Congress. We expect half a million people to come for the Pope's visit to Capitol Hill. The President of China will make his visit the very next day to the Nation's capital. It will be his first visit.

So there will be 3 or 4 days in session next week at the most. We are ready to move forward. There is no reason to wait any longer. It is time for Republicans to skip the manufactured drama, pass a clean funding bill today, and get something done around here for the American people. For months, Democrats have been clear about our priorities: First, any appropriations measure cannot be hijacked for ideological or special-interest riders. Second, any funding increase for the Pentagon must be matched by at least a dollar-for-dollar increase for domestic programs, including domestic anti-terror programs.

These are commonsense principles that should form the basis of any budget agreement, but Republicans have refused to negotiate. They are now focused on scoring political points at the expense of the American people. We voted twice. Why waste this time again on another vote? There will only be a few days of session next week.

When we return the following Monday, we will have just 3 days before the government funding expires. That is October 1. We should act now, pass a clean continuing resolution preventing a government shutdown, and then responsibly negotiate a compromise. It should be a short-term CR. Any other decision is a waste of precious time that we do not have.

HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE

Mr. REID. Finally, the number of Americans without health insurance dropped dramatically last year. All the press yesterday and this morning are reporting this, but this comes as no surprise. The good news happened as the Affordable Care Act's major coverage provisions took effect. This is further evidence the Affordable Care Act is working. The share of people without coverage dropped in every State in the Union in 2014. That is the first time in the history of the Census reports that every State has improved.

States that expanded Medicaid under the Affordable Care Act did better than those that did not. States that adopted the new law's Medicaid expansion had a 3.5-percentage-point drop in their uninsured rate. That is about 1½ times the 2.3-percentage-point decline in States that did not expand the program. Overall, the national uninsured rate dropped by 2.9 percentage points.

Now, all these numbers mean that the uninsured rate is now at the lowest in the history of our country—the lowest ever. Once again, the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, is working.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

HIRE MORE HEROES ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.J. Res. 61, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 61) amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Pending:

> McConnell amendment No. 2640, of a perfecting nature.
>
> McConnell amendment No. 2656 (to amendment No. 2640), to prohibit the President from waiving, suspending, reducing, providing relief from, or otherwise limiting the application of sanctions pursuant to an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran.
>
> McConnell amendment No. 2657 (to amendment No. 2656), to change the enactment date.
>
> McConnell amendment No. 2658 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2640), to change the enactment date.
>
> McConnell amendment No. 2659 (to amendment No. 2658), of a perfecting nature.
>
> McConnell motion to commit the joint resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations, with instructions, McConnell amendment No. 2660, to prohibit the President from waiving, suspending, reducing, providing relief from, or otherwise limiting the application of sanctions pursuant to an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran.
>
> McConnell amendment No. 2661 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 2660), of a perfecting nature.
>
> McConnell amendment No. 2662 (to amendment No. 2661), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 11 a.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, my calculation is there are about 36 minutes remaining before the vote. I ask unanimous consent on the Democratic side that I be given 3 minutes, Senator CARDIN 5 minutes, Senator MENENDEZ of New Jersey 5 minutes, Senator CARPER of Delaware 5 minutes—Senator CARPER 3 minutes, and Senator KAINE 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator please restate those.

Mr. DURBIN. Yes, 3 minutes for myself, 5 minutes for Senator CARDIN of

Maryland, 5 minutes for Senator MENENDEZ of New Jersey, 3 minutes for Senator CARPER, 2 minutes for Senator KAINE.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, we listened to the comments of Senator MCCONNELL, the Republican leader. He has given us a ''litany of horribles'' when it comes to the conduct of the nation of Iran. He has given us fair warning that this is a country that we cannot trust because of past conduct. I think the point that needs to be made at this moment is I don't disagree with his premise or his conclusion. But I ask him and all others in his similar political position: How can Iran with a nuclear weapon be a better thing for this world, for the Middle East, or for Israel?

I think the answer is obvious. That is why the President, in league with our major allies and some not so frequent allies, has brokered an agreement to send in international inspectors to destroy the centrifuges which are building these nuclear weapons, to put a concrete core in the reactor that produces the plutonium, and to continue the inspection of Iran nonstop so that they do not develop a nuclear weapon.

That to me is an ultimate positive outcome. Does it cure all of the horribles that have been listed by the Senator from Kentucky? Of course not. But how can he imagine that Iran with its record would be in a better position—or that we would be in a better position—if Iran had a nuclear weapon? I do not think so. That, I think, is the issue before us. I have to harken back to the statement made yesterday by my colleague from Michigan. She is in contact with the family of one of the prisoners being held there. They are concerned, I am concerned, that dramatizing these four prisoners as part of our political debate on the floor, which is what the Republicans have done with their amendment is a risky process. We want these prisoners to come home safely. We voted that way overwhelmingly.

Playing them as part of a floor strategy by the Republicans is risky. I wish we would not take the risk at their possible expense. So I would urge my colleagues to join me in voting against the cloture motion that is going to come before us at 11 o'clock to move forward on this particular amendment.

I will close by saying, the press reports last night explained why we are here wasting a week in the Senate: Because of the Republican presidential debate and because of the fact that even some of the Republican presidential candidates reserved a vial of venom to be used against the leader here, the majority leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House.

It is clear they are under immense pressure to show their Republican manhood. That is what this exercise is all about.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, the next vote we are going to take on the Iran agreement will fundamentally change the resolution before us. It is out of compliance with the review act. The Iran review act gives Congress three options: approve the agreement, disapprove the agreement or take no action. This amendment would provide conditional approval of the Iran agreement.

Let me make clear to our colleagues that the framework of the agreement is to provide Iran sanctions relief in exchange for stopping Iran from becoming a nuclear weapons state. That is the yardstick. It provides for inspections and enforcement, preserving our options if Iran participates in terrorism, human rights, and ballistic missile violations, and the bottom line is whether Iran is in better or worse shape to acquire a nuclear weapon under this agreement.

I reached my judgment on it, as did 100 Senators. I opposed the agreement, but this amendment takes us in a different direction. This amendment says that if Iran recognizes Israel and releases four hostages, that sanctions relief will be granted to Iran. I hope Iran does recognize Israel, but I must tell you I would have no confidence in their statement or trust in their statement if they issued a statement recognizing Israel.

Senator STABENOW has already talked about whether this is the most effective way to bring back our hostages. One can challenge that. So this conditional approval gives up any of the disapproval resolution on the nuclear part of the agreement. That makes absolutely no sense whatsoever.

Let me remind our colleagues that this is September 17. This is the 60th day of the congressional review, the last day of the congressional review. Quite frankly, this vote is a political exercise, and this issue is way too important for us to be engaged in a political issue on the review.

We have worked very hard over 60 days to get information. The committee has worked very hard. We are very proud of the record of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in this regard. We shouldn't be participating in this political battle. It is clear this Iran agreement will be implemented.

Now it is time for this body to stop taking show votes and instead pivot to the serious work of addressing the problems with the deal. This means making sure we are working with the Government of Israel on a security package that will now enable Israel to defend against conventional and terrorist threats from Iran; it means making sure we are working with our partners in the Gulf Cooperation Council to make sure we are collectively prepared to counter destabilizing any Iranian activities; it means making sure we are prepared to counter Iranian terrorism, ballistic missile proliferation, and human rights abuses; it means making sure we are working effectively with our European allies to prepare for Iran potentially cheating on the deal.

Let's turn to the serious work we have in front of us and recognize that we all need to be together to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear weapons State. We stand for Israel's security, we stand for the return of our hostages, but let's also make sure we have the strongest possible decision to make sure we prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear weapons State. Let's work together.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise as an opponent of the Iran nuclear agreement, and I have set forth at length—both on the Senate floor and in a speech at Seton Hall University School of Diplomacy and International Relations—my reasons why, but I am also an opponent to the McConnell amendment that would support the deal if Iran recognizes Israel and releases American hostages.

I have said on this floor—and will say again—that I have a problem with the underlying nuclear agreement. As much as I wish to see the hostages released—and have voted in a resolution that the Senate passed calling for Iran to do so—and have them come home to their families, and as much as I would like Israel to be recognized by Iran as a sovereign, independent nation, I am not certain I would want to give my imprimatur to the agreement even under those conditions, which this amendment would do. This, in essence, makes—if adopted—a conditional agreement. We in the Senate would be voting to say the agreement can move forward if the hostages are released and if Iran recognizes the State of Israel as a sovereign and independent state.

I must say I want the hostages back, as does everyone in this Chamber. I want Israel to be recognized as a sovereign and independent state, although I believe that any such recognition by Iran at this point in time would be temporal, at best, and can only be meaningful by actions, not just simply by such a declaration.

So at the end of the day, for all the reasons I have heard my colleagues on this floor talk about the consequences of the nuclear deal, surely you cannot be of the thought that as desirous as the releasing of the hostages is or the desire to have Israel recognized by Iran as a sovereign state, that that would then give you a clear sailing for the underlying nuclear agreement. That, in essence, is what this amendment would provide for.

We have many concerns as we move forward with Iran. We already see that. Even as this agreement is being moved forward, Iran has given its OK to Russia to overfly Iran and then Iraq, where we have spent so many lives and national treasure, to send military hardware into Syria to prop up the Assad

regime—which Iran has also been a patron of—and at same time to maybe very well establish a military base for Russia. So there are going to be a lot of concerns, notwithstanding this agreement that we have with Iran, but I, for one, do not want to give any idea that we would support this agreement—as someone who opposes it—simply because the hostages would be released and Iran would recognize Israel.

Some might believe that will never happen, so therefore the agreement wouldn't move forward, but if the agreement is as good as so many of my colleagues have said it is for Iran, then it might not be a price they would find too high to pay in order to have the agreement move forward.

In any event, whether Iran thinks it is a good agreement for them and would do so, I simply do not want to support the underlying agreement by virtue of a sleight of hand on something that is desirable and, independently, this body would be united on—getting all of the hostages back and doing everything necessary to achieve that and at the same time making sure Israel is truly, truly recognized, not only in words but in deed. That is why I will be voting against the amendment.

There are far more serious things, such as renewing the Iran Sanctions Act, in the days ahead that I think are critical. Many of the things Senator CARDIN has been talking about in his proposed legislation will be critical to having the type of response we want in Iran against its hegemonic interests in the region as well as its nuclear ambitions. For that, I will be voting against the amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, going back to the elections of last November, there are three takeaways—enduring takeaways—for me from that election: No. 1, people want us to work together; No. 2, they want us to get things done; No. 3, they want us to find ways to further strengthen the economic recovery of our country.

Today the Department of Labor released the most recent weekly information on filers of unemployment insurance in this country. They do it every Thursday. They have been doing this for years. Today the number is 264,000 people. It sounds like a lot—well, compared to what?

The week that Barack Obama and JOE BIDEN were inaugurated as President and Vice President, that number was not 264,000, it was 628,000. Anytime that number is over 400,000 we are losing jobs. Anytime the number is under 400,000 per week, we are adding jobs. That number has been under 300,000 for the last 28 straight weeks. I don't know that there has ever been a time when we have seen a number that low for that long.

We are strengthening the economic recovery. We ought to continue to do that. There are a number of things we ought to do on this floor to further strengthen the economic recovery. We need to avoid a budget shutdown. We need to put in place a responsible spending plan for the next year. Our country is under cyber attack 24/7—companies, businesses of all kinds and shapes. We need to have tax certainty. We need to put in place a tax plan for our country rather than stop and go. We need to fully fund a 6-year transportation plan. Those are just some of the things we can do to further strengthen the economic recovery.

Are we dealing with those? No, we are not. We are coming back again to vote—really—on the same thing we voted on before.

Let me just say, with all due respect, do I want the hostages released? You bet. Have I let the Iranian officials, senior officials whom I know, know that? You bet, every time I talk to them and meet with them.

The best way to make sure the hostages are released, the best way to hasten the day that Israel has a kind of relationship with Iran that they had not all that many years ago is to put in place and to fully implement the plan that is before us, one that will make it very difficult for the Iranians to develop a nuclear weapons program and ensure that if they do, we know about it.

My message to Zarif—the Foreign Minister of Iran who has been the lead point person on their negotiations for the last 2 years—this is my message to him and to the Iranian officials: No. 1, you could have a stronger economy; No. 2, you could have a nuclear weapons program. You cannot have both. There is a whole new generation of people who have grown up in that country, 78 million people. The average age is 25. Does the Revolutionary Guard like the agreement? No, they don't. They want to kill it.

How about the young people who have grown up in that country who like Americans, who want to have a better relationship with us, what do they want?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CARPER. They want us to take yes for an answer, and I would take no for an answer with the measure that is before us today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I just wish to say a few words about the vote we are about to take and about this process.

I do not favor this agreement. I have indicated I would vote against it. I would like to get to a final vote on the subject and not just have endless cloture votes. It has been offered on the Democratic side that we would go to a final vote if the margin was set at 60. We have a 60-vote threshold. I say take it. Let's get to a final vote. We have seen the end of this movie already. The President has the sufficient votes to sustain the veto. Therefore, this would simply be an exercise to send something to the President that he would veto and then have that veto sustained. I see no value in doing that. There is no value to our allies to see that there is a split in Congress or between Congress and the Executive on this issue.

The President is in his last term, he is not hurt politically by this, and there is no reason to do that. So I don't know why in the world we want to go through that exercise or insist on going through that exercise simply to force cloture.

I would like to send the disapproval motion to the President—that would be fine—but to not get to a final vote because we are insisting on doing that seems to me misguided. Let's agree and go to a final vote and set it at a 60-vote threshold. That would be fine. We know the end of this movie already.

With regard to the amendment itself, the text of it, we are talking about our desire to have the hostages who are in Iran released. Everyone would like that. Everyone would like to see Iran recognize Israel. But should a whole agreement be based on those two items? No. There are a lot of other things that need to be done as well.

As I said, I don't believe this was negotiated well. I think it could have been better. That is why I will vote against it if I have a chance.

But let's give the Members of this body that chance. Let's have a vote on the final product, the process that we set up with the Corker-Cardin legislation, and not insist on sending something to the President that would be sent back and that we know the result.

I want to register my support of having a final vote, regardless of where that vote threshold is.

With that, I yield back.

Mr. CARPER. Will the Senator from Arizona yield for a moment?

Mr. FLAKE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CARPER. First, let me thank Senator FLAKE for a very thoughtful statement. It reminds me a little bit of what Senator REID has been asking for by unanimous consent for a week or two; that is, to actually forgo cloture votes and that sort of thing. Let's just go to a final vote, but we want a 60-vote threshold. I think the expectation has been for months that there would be a 60-vote threshold.

If the Senator from Arizona is comfortable with forgoing all of this parliamentary procedure and to going to an up-or-down vote with a 60-vote threshold, I think that is the way to do it. That is the way we ought to do this. I applaud the Senator for what he said.

Mr. FLAKE. Thank you. I do think that this is a serious matter. This is an agreement that is important, that is going to last beyond this administration and beyond the next one. Congress should be on record on this issue with more than just a procedural vote. I understand the desire to have a vote by simple majority—that would be the preference—but if we cannot get there,

and this is a body of compromise, then let's have a vote, a final vote on the subject.

As to the matter of—let me just say, with these amendments, I will vote with my colleagues on this side of the aisle on a cloture vote to get to a final vote on these amendments, but if it comes to it, I will vote against those amendments, not that I don't want the hostages released or Israel recognized, but the entire agreement should not be based on those two items. There are other important aspects of the agreement, and to pick two as a way to go forward doesn't make sense to me. So I will vote with my party on cloture to move ahead to vote on the amendment, but if it comes to that, I will vote against those amendments.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I rise to speak today about President Obama's nuclear deal with Iran.

I have now cast multiple votes to proceed to an up-or-down vote on this nuclear deal. However, according to President Obama and his administration, Congress's review period ends today, even though there is still controversy about that.

I want to applaud the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee and the chairman—the ranking member, Senator CARDIN, who is here today, and Senator CORKER—for getting us to this point. In a unanimous vote in our committee, we got this bill, brought it to the Senate, and we had a 98-to-1 vote in a bipartisan effort to bring this before the American people. Today, we are here with a very small minority of Americans who actually support this deal.

This administration chose not to consider this as a treaty but as a nonbinding political agreement. That means in a little over a year, our next President can determine whether he or she will abide by this deal with Iran.

My question is this: What can we do now—right now—in the Senate, over the next 14 months, to continue to fight this President's nuclear deal with Iran? I speak today to confirm that I will continue this fight, individually, if necessary. In the next 14 months I am committed to finding ways we can mitigate the effects of this dangerous deal with Iran.

We need to ratchet up sanctions on Iran for terrorism and human rights violations and continue to be vigilant in both of those areas. We need to be prepared with sanctions that can be snapped back swiftly when, not if, Iran cheats, even if that cheating is only incremental. We need a strategy to deal with the increase in terrorism and aggression we will see from Iran after they get over a $60 billion payday from this deal. We need a plan to reassure our allies in the region and to counter the nuclear and conventional arms race this deal is sure to trigger.

I have been saying this for months, which is why I ensured the passage of an amendment in the State Department authorization bill that calls on the administration to produce such a strategy. I refuse to accept the world's deadliest weapons getting into the hands of this rogue regime.

Hearing this administration sell the Iran deal, I am so often reminded of President Clinton's deal in 1994. In 1994 President Clinton promised our country this nonbinding agreement with North Korea would make America and the world safer. Look at where we are today. Just 12 short years after Clinton's deal, North Korea completed its first nuclear detonation test. Today North Korea has a nuclear bomb, and it is cooperating with Iran on Iran's program. Just this week North Korea announced it is bolstering its nuclear arsenal and is prepared to use nuclear weapons against the United States of America.

I fear President Obama's deal with Iran will yield similar results. We cannot allow Iran to obtain a nuclear weapon—not now, not in 10 years, not ever. For the security of our children and our children's children, our country, our world, and our future, we absolutely have to make sure that Iran never becomes a nuclear weapons state.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORKER. 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. CORKER. Mr. President, today we have a series of votes that I know may be difficult for the American people, who may be looking on, to understand. In the Senate we have a procedure called cloture, which signifies whether Members are ready to end debate and move on to the vote on the substance of the bill we are now discussing.

We have been on this now for 2 weeks. We have had 12 hearings in the Foreign Relations Committee, with my distinguished friend Senator CARDIN as the ranking member, and we have had all kinds of debate on the floor. Almost every Senator in the Senate has spoken. Yet we find ourselves in this place where a bipartisan majority of Senators wish to send a vote of disapproval to the President and 42 Senators are keeping us from doing so.

If I could just walk through this, first of all, in a strong bipartisan, almost overwhelming manner—almost four times since 2010—this body has put sanctions in place against Iran to bring them to the negotiating table. I want to commend people on both sides of the aisle for making that happen. My friend, BOB MENENDEZ, and MARK KIRK on our side, together with all the rest of us helped to make those things happen.

When this body saw that the President, after we helped to bring Iran to the table, was going to negotiate a deal that cut us out—that, in essence, caused him to be able to go straight to the U.N. Security Council and cause a deal to be implemented—I worked with my friend Senator CARDIN, and others, and we put in place something called the Iran review act, which gave us this ability to have 60 days to look at the proposal, to go through it, and to voice our approval or disapproval. We have had that debate.

Unfortunately, because the President did not achieve what he said he was going to achieve—and by the way, if he had, there would be 100 Senators today voicing their approval. The President, when he began the negotiations, said he was going to end Iran's nuclear program. Unfortunately, from my perspective, he squandered—squandered—that opportunity.

We had a boot on the neck of Iran, a rogue nation. We had some of the greatest countries in the world involved in the negotiations to end their program. Instead, we capitulated and have agreed to the industrialization of their nuclear program. We have agreed to let them continue their research and development so they can do what they are doing in an even quicker manner. We have allowed them to continue their ability to deliver intercontinental ballistic missiles.

We all know they have no need for their program other than to develop a nuclear weapon. We know that. They have no practical need. So a strong bipartisan majority of this body wants to send to the President a resolution of disapproval. Yet today what is happening, I fear—for the third time—is that a minority—a partisan minority, I will say—of 42 Senators are going to block that from occurring.

Now, look, I understand procedures around here. I do. I understand the cloture vote. I knew that when we agreed to this bill. We agreed to it being dealt with under what is called ''normal procedures.'' We agreed to that. I just want to remind people, though, that back in the gulf war, this body decided it was going to support President Bush—the first President Bush, Bush 41—when he really didn't need to come to Congress. But he came to us for the authorization of the use of military force and that was passed on a 52–48 vote—52–48.

What we have happening today, though, is that we have 58 Senators here who disapprove of what the President has negotiated. They feel he squandered the opportunity given to him with our support. Instead of ending their program, he has allowed it to be industrialized. And so we have 58 Senators here who want to express themselves and to send to the President this resolution of disapproval. We have 42 Senators on a procedural vote who are keeping us from doing so—42 Senators.

In essence, they are saying, I guess, we haven't debated this enough. Almost every Senator has expressed

themselves. We have had 12 hearings in the Committee on Foreign Relations, with all kinds of classified briefings. The Committee on Armed Services had hearings, and the Select Committee on Intelligence had hearings.

I just want to say that I know many people spent a lot of time. I know the ranking member looked at this backwards and forwards before he came to his own conclusion. This, to me, really is taking on a tone of Members of this body protecting the President—protecting the President—from having to veto something this body would send to him, which is a resolution of disapproval.

So I am disappointed we are where we are. I am disappointed the Senate functions in the way it does today, where a majority of Senators who wish for something to happen cannot make it happen. In this particular case it is happening in a manner, in my belief, to really keep the President from having to veto this, which is what a majority of Senators in the Senate would like to see happen.

With that, I hope that at least a couple of Senators here will decide that we have discussed this long enough and that we will allow this body to vote on the actual underlying substance. That is, by the way, what the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act was about. On a 98-to-1 basis Senators in this body said they wanted the ability—98 of us; 1 Senator was missing or we would have had 99—to weigh in on this topic, and now that is not going to occur.

I believe my time is over. I understand the minority may have about 2 minutes left and then we will proceed to a vote. But I want to thank my good friend Senator CARDIN, who I think serves in a very distinguished way. I could not have a better partner. So I thank him for his comments as they are about to come and also for his cooperation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, Senator CORKER and I have been in agreement for 53 days of the 60-day review. And he is absolutely correct that 58 Senators disapprove of this agreement and don't think it should go forward. He and I are in agreement on that. We both believe we could have done better and we should reject the agreement, but 42 Senators believe we should go forward.

I thought the colloquy that took place just a few moments ago on the floor between Senator CARPER and Senator FLAKE was the way we should have completed this issue, then have a final vote with a 60-vote threshold. That is where I thought we were headed when we went into the August work period.

We have understood the process, and Americans know where every Member of the Senate stands on this agreement. Americans also understand the 60-vote threshold in the Senate. And they certainly understand the 67 votes necessary to override a veto. This agreement is moving forward. We all know that. We should all be talking about how to move forward on the agreement.

What I don't understand is the next vote. I don't understand why the majority leader decided to bring forward an amendment to change a resolution of disapproval into a resolution of conditional approval. To me, that is totally inconsistent with the review act, and it is counterproductive for those who either support or disapprove of the agreement. It is not fitting and not consistent with the work done during the first 53 days of the review, where we worked very hard in committee so that every Member of the Senate could get as much information available to make their individual judgments whether to vote for or against the agreement. And 58 voted for, 42 against.

This vote I don't understand, and I would urge my colleagues—befitting the Iran review and the Senate's responsibilities here, we should be voting no on the amendment that is offered by the majority leader.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I think I understand the frustration expressed by the ranking member. The ranking member knows I worked with him to ensure that when we had this debate, we stayed away from those issues that divide us. He knows I took multiple tough votes, as did others, to keep things in balance.

There are Members of this body who feel as if this amendment the Senator is talking about is one on which they would have liked to have expressed themselves. Since we are in a place where it appears that 42 Senators are going to keep us from actually being able to go forward with the vote on whether we agree or disagree—the Senator and I are in the same place on this. But since that has occurred, I think out of frustration and knowing there were a number of Members who wanted to express themselves on the way this next amendment is—I think that is the reason that has occurred.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator have an additional minute so he can yield to me.

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

Mr. CARDIN. If the Senator will yield, do the people who are suggesting that this amendment be voted on recognize that they are making this a conditional approval vote and therefore that if Iran were to recognize Israel, if this were to become law and if Iran were to recognize Israel and release the four hostages, that the agreement would go forward? Do they understand this is not one of the options provided under the Iran review act and it is inconsistent with the discussions I think we have always had as to what the votes would be on the floor of the U.S. Senate?

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, if I could respond through the Chair, I think what people understand is that 42 Senators are causing a filibuster to take place and that we are not ever going to be able to get to that vote of conscience all of us have wanted to make. And since they know that, they understand this deal is going to go forward, and therefore, in order—since these people really never had the opportunity to express themselves in this manner—there never was an amendment during the debate relative to the amendment we now have before us. I think since they know it is going to go forward, since in essence the filibuster is underway that keeps this final vote from occurring and a motion of disapproval from going to the President, there is a divergence off of that to express themselves in a different way.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute for the chairman of the committee.

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

Mr. CARDIN. If the chairman will yield, I understand the frustration. There is a lot of frustration on not getting votes when we want to get votes. But I remind the chairman that every request for a vote on the Iran review act came from the Republican side of the aisle. There were none from the Democratic side of the aisle. We had votes on Republican amendments. If you recall correctly, it was a Republican effort that ultimately led to no option other than to cut off further amendments by the majority leader.

Let me also suggest that on two occasions we have attempted to allow for a final vote with a 60-vote threshold so that we wouldn't have to use any filibuster. The Democratic leader consented to a motion to proceed without the necessary cloture vote because we don't want this to be procedure, and I think everyone wants to vote and has voted their conscience.

Mr. CORKER. If I could, and I very much appreciate—first of all, I could not work with a more thoughtful, diligent Member of the U.S. Senate than the ranking member.

I think what the Senator's side needs to understand—and I have tried to articulate this—is that during these negotiations, we tried to set up a privileged motion where it was set up not unlike one, two, three agreements that we have. We understood that the minority leader—and I respect this—does not like privileged amendments, that the leaders like to control the floor, and in this case he wanted to be able to control his side. So we were not able to set this up as a privileged vote. As the Senator knows, we then agreed to do it under regular order—regular order—and the Senator and I agreed to those negotiations.

What the Senator would be asking our side to do to move to a 60-vote debate is actually raise the threshold from a simple majority, which is the

way regular order works. The Senator would ask us to raise the threshold to a 60-vote threshold, which is above and beyond regular order. So the Senator can understand how people don't understand why we would agree to raising that threshold.

So, look, we understand what is getting ready to happen. The Senator and I have a lot of business to do relative to Syria, relative to Iraq, relative to refugees and others.

I am disappointed that the Senate functions in the way it does. As I mentioned, back under the gulf war, back in 1991, instead of a filibuster, Members allowed us to vote on a—I wasn't here then, and I don't think the Senator was here then—on a 52-to-48 basis, people moved beyond the filibuster and allowed the majority to express themselves.

I hope at some point in time the Senate will move to a place where we allow the majority to express themselves. This is not happening on a significant vote of conscience. I am disappointed in that, but I understand what the outcome is going to be, and I look forward to working with the Senator on other issues.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 2656.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Roy Blunt, John Thune, Deb Fischer, John Barrasso, Roger F. Wicker, Michael B. Enzi, Shelley Moore Capito, Orrin G. Hatch, Rob Portman, Mike Crapo, Richard C. Shelby, Pat Roberts, Thad Cochran, Mike Rounds, David Perdue.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 2656, offered by the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL, to H.J. Res. 61, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 266 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Burr	Collins
Ayotte	Capito	Corker
Barrasso	Cassidy	Cornyn
Blunt	Coats	Cotton
Boozman	Cochran	Crapo
Cruz	Isakson	Roberts
Daines	Johnson	Rounds
Enzi	Kirk	Sasse
Ernst	Lankford	Scott
Fischer	Lee	Sessions
Flake	Manchin	Shelby
Gardner	McCain	Sullivan
Graham	McConnell	Thune
Grassley	Moran	Tillis
Hatch	Murkowski	Toomey
Heller	Perdue	Vitter
Hoeven	Portman	Wicker
Inhofe	Risch	

NAYS—45

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Markey	Stabenow
Casey	McCaskill	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Udall
Donnelly	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Mikulski	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Franken	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Paul	Rubio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 45.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

CLOTURE MOTION WITHDRAWN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the cloture motion on H.J. Res. 61.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATOR COLLINS' 6,000TH VOTE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Colleagues, before the next vote, Senator ANGUS KING and I wish to make a couple of observations for a few moments.

Former Maine Senator Margaret Chase Smith was once known for a nearly unbeatable attendance record. She hadn't missed a single rollcall vote in more than 13 years of service, but that came to an end one day in 1968 when Senator Smith narrowly missed casting her 2,942d consecutive vote. She had been recovering from surgery hundreds of miles away from here. So it was understandable. Yet I am not sure if surgery, a Tsunami or the most wicked Maine nor'easter could stop a woman who occupies Margaret Chase Smith's seat today because not only is the senior Senator from Maine a fierce admirer of her pioneering predecessor, she is also nearly unstoppable once she puts her mind to something, and we have all experienced that.

Since assuming her seat in 1997, one of those somethings that she is so fixated on has been to never miss a single vote. She blew past her idol's record nearly a decade ago. The senior Senator then marched on to 3,000 consecutive votes, 4,000, 5,000, and the next vote will be her 6,000th vote in a row. Only two other Senators have ever achieved a longer unbroken streak. Former Senator Proxmire took 10,252 consecutive votes, and our colleague, the senior Senator from Iowa, has voted more than 7,440 times in a row. This means our colleague from Maine hasn't missed a single vote during her entire Senate tenure. She has not had one sick day in more than 18 years. It is really remarkable, and so are the tales of what it took to get here. One time she twisted her ankle as she tore down a corridor, sprinting back to the Capitol from a ready-to-depart plane. Just ask her about the logistics of planning a wedding and honeymoon around the recess calendar.

Our colleague is willing to do just about anything to ensure that she is here in this Chamber representing the people of Maine.

I ask the entire Senate to join me in congratulating her as she celebrates this notable milestone.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, it is no surprise to me that SUSAN COLLINS is such a hard worker. She started as a young woman, digging potatoes for 30 cents a barrel at a neighbor's farm in Caribou, ME.

I have learned a lot about her over these years. I have served with her now for almost two full decades. Hard work and diligence is her byword. We have worked on some things together that have been extremely important for the country. Some of the things I won't bring up because they might not sit well with some of my Republican friends, but she is a person who is truly an independent Senator. I admire the work she has done. She, of course, has a good education.

I started out really thinking the world of her when she was first elected because I learned where she was trained. One of my favorite Senators whom I have served with here in the Senate has been Bill Cohen from Maine. He was a terrific Senator and a fine man. I am convinced that one of the reasons she is as good as she is is because of what she learned in Senator Cohen's office.

I served under him. He was chairman of the Aging Committee. I served with him on other matters. He and I were both in the House of Representatives. We shared lockers, in that little room that they give us back there, for many years. I so admired him. I knew when she came here, her having worked there, that she would be good, and she has been really good.

I am also impressed with her ability to work with our Independent Senator, ANGUS KING. They have worked so well together. They don't always agree on issues, but they are always agreeable on every issue. I admire both of them, and I am so proud to join in lending my voice to congratulate this good woman, the senior Senator from the State of Maine.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I know it is not the usual protocol to follow the two leaders who have spoken,

but I wish to exercise a personal privilege of being the senior woman in the Senate and say that on behalf of all the women in the Senate, we congratulate Senator COLLINS on this enormous and significant milestone. She is certainly in the tradition of a very esteemed predecessor from the State of Maine, Margaret Chase Smith, who was, herself, a historic figure.

Senator Smith was known for her devotion to Maine, her advocacy for her constituents, her fierce independence, and for always being at the forefront of being an advocate for what is right. Senator COLLINS continues to do that.

We want to congratulate her because she is a fierce fighter for Maine. She is absolutely independent. For her, it is not about the other side of the aisle; for her, it is not about aisles, it is about building bridges.

I believe that if Margaret Chase Smith were alive today, she would walk over and give Senator COLLINS a great big hug and say: Keep at it. Keep at it. We say to Senator COLLINS: Keep at it for many more votes and for many more good years to come.

I yield the floor.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Madam President, I rise to congratulate my colleague, my esteemed colleague, my esteemed senior colleague for this accomplishment. I think it is important to realize—we all know the logistical challenges of making every single vote. What she has done is symbolic of her service to this country and to the State of Maine. It is not just making every vote. It is symbolic of an intense, fierce commitment to this body and to this institution and to the country. I am delighted that the majority leader and the minority leader have recognized her today.

I had the occasion to sit next to her at a function in Maine when the vote record came out. It comes out about quarterly or every 6 months. I looked at mine. I had it in my hand. I leaned over to her and I said: Look, I have a 98.6-percent attendance record of voting in the Senate. She leaned back and said: You will never catch me. It is true.

Of course, as has been mentioned, she sits in the seat of Margaret Chase Smith, one of Maine's important leaders of the mid-20th century, one of the most important Members of this body. Every day that Margaret Chase Smith appeared on the Senate floor, she had in her lapel a red rose. So in order to recognize Senator COLLINS today, I wish to present her with a rose symbolic of her kinship to Senator Margaret Chase Smith.

Senator COLLINS, what an accomplishment. Thank you on behalf of the people of Maine and the people of this country.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, quickly, before the next vote, there will be no more votes this week.

The next vote will be on cloture on the motion to proceed to H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, on Tuesday morning. The Senate will be in session on Monday to debate the pain-capable bill, and I hope all Members will be here to join in that discussion.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 2640.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Roy Blunt, John Thune, Deb Fischer, John Barrasso, Roger F. Wicker, Michael B. Enzi, Shelley Moore Capito, Orrin G. Hatch, Rob Portman, Mike Crapo, Richard C. Shelby, Pat Roberts, Thad Cochran, Mike Rounds, David Perdue.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 2640, offered by the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL, to H.J. Res. 61, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 267 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Alexander	Ernst	Moran
Ayotte	Fischer	Murkowski
Barrasso	Flake	Perdue
Blunt	Gardner	Portman
Boozman	Graham	Risch
Burr	Grassley	Roberts
Capito	Hatch	Rounds
Cardin	Heller	Sasse
Cassidy	Hoeven	Schumer
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Sessions
Collins	Johnson	Shelby
Corker	Kirk	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Crapo	Manchin	Toomey
Cruz	McCain	Vitter
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Menendez	

NAYS—42

Baldwin	Franken	Murphy
Bennet	Gillibrand	Murray
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Nelson
Booker	Heitkamp	Peters
Boxer	Hirono	Reed
Brown	Kaine	Reid
Cantwell	King	Sanders
Carper	Klobuchar	Schatz
Casey	Leahy	Shaheen
Coons	Markey	Stabenow
Donnelly	McCaskill	
Durbin	Merkley	
Feinstein	Mikulski	
Tester	Warner	Whitehouse
Udall	Warren	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Paul	Rubio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 56, the nays are 42.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, by twice denying this Chamber the opportunity for a simple up-or-down vote on the President's nuclear deal with Iran, our Democratic colleagues have all but assured that a bad deal—an executive agreement that many of them have also criticized—will go into effect without the American people having their say on this deal.

It is clear from public opinion polls and actually from counting noses here and in the House that a bipartisan majority of both Houses opposes this bad deal, but by using procedural blockades, our Democratic friends have prevented that up-or-down vote and the accountability that should go along with it. For what? For what? To protect the President.

As the majority leader has pointed out, the President is proud of this deal. This is about his legacy. He thinks this deal is perfect. So why are our friends on the other side of the aisle trying to protect the President from vetoing a piece of legislation he is proud of?

Well, during the debate, these very same colleagues who have filibustered this bill have stressed that although they support the President's deal, they remain deeply devoted supporters of the State of Israel. They say they remain deeply concerned about the plight of American citizens held hostage by an Iranian regime. But just a moment ago, these very same colleagues, when they had an opportunity to prove it, well, let's just say their actions speak louder than their words.

The vote we just had should have been a straightforward vote. The legislation the Democrats have filibustered would have prohibited the President from providing any sanctions relief to the Iranian regime until two things happen: No. 1, the Iranian regime acknowledges Israel as a sovereign state, and No. 2, the regime releases U.S. prisoners it currently holds. But with only one exception, every Senator on the Democratic side of the aisle voted against both of those provisions. Well, to be sure, they are consistent about one thing: shielding the President, who is desperate to protect his legacy, from having to make tough decisions.

I don't see the President particularly shy about making a decision, even when it is not authorized by the law, when it exceeds his authority under the Constitution. This President has been the most reckless of any President I have read about or seen in my lifetime when it comes to observing the limitations and constraints based on the law and the Constitution.

To say the blockade of these important bills is a disappointment is an understatement.

I know that many of us will continue to work to promote the bilateral relationship with Israel—between the United States and Israel—over any sort of association with the world's foremost state sponsor of terrorism. Many of us—myself included—will continue to call on the administration to bring our citizens home safely from Iran. We are not giving up. We are not going to quit.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

This Chamber does have a lot of important work ahead of us. For the remainder of my time, I would like to discuss how we can come together to protect the most vulnerable among us; that is, our unborn.

Earlier this summer, horrific videos were released depicting Planned Parenthood executives discussing the harvesting of organs from unborn babies. The most recent video was released just a few days ago. In these videos, the blatant disregard for human life was underscored by a cavalier attitude on full display by Planned Parenthood executives. They flippantly and callously discussed the selling of body parts from babies who never had a chance for life.

Without a doubt, these videos show a dark, ugly side to our humanity. How people could become so desensitized that they do not recoil in shock at these videos and what they depict is beyond me. All I can conclude is that people somehow have ignored the right to life and the potential for life these babies represent, under handy catch phrases like ''choice.'' These videos rightly shock the conscience of many in our country, stirring even supporters of Planned Parenthood to publicly denounce them as ''disturbing.'' And yes they are, but they are more than that.

As our Nation unites behind this very basic understanding of our moral mandate to defend those who cannot defend themselves, we will have a unique opportunity to make an important stride to support an agenda that promotes life over death. Next week the Senate will consider a piece of legislation called the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act—legislation I cosponsored along with I believe 45 cosponsors in the Senate—that would prohibit nationwide nearly all abortions after a pregnancy has reached 5 months.

Many States, including my State, have a ban on abortions once the baby becomes viable outside the womb. A friend of mine who is a neonatologist has told me privately what anybody can find on the Internet or anywhere else, which is that roughly at about 20 weeks, the baby becomes viable outside of the womb. So this legislation will prohibit abortions after that baby becomes viable, which under this legislation is 5 months. At 5 months, an unborn child's fingerprints and taste buds are developing. It is at this stage that many doctors and experts believe an unborn child can experience pain. Banning nearly all abortions after 5 months—at the point unborn children can feel pain—should be an obvious moral imperative for all of us.

I understand that the issue of abortion divides our country and that some believe abortion should be available on demand at all points during a pregnancy. Well, we took an important step here in the Congress just a few years ago in banning the barbaric practice of partial-birth abortion—the actual delivery of a child alive and then literally killing the child as part of an abortion once they are born alive. Regardless of whether you are pro-choice or pro-life, hopefully we can come together and draw a line—a very clear line—at viability of that baby.

I would like to point out how vital this legislation is for those who, like me, believe we ought to be advancing a culture of life in this country. Very simply, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act would save the lives of thousands of unborn children a year. That is why this legislation has garnered the support of groups such as National Right to Life and the Susan B. Anthony List.

This Chamber is long overdue in taking a hard look at the practices depicted by Planned Parenthood in these videos and examining our own conscience and our Nation's policies that affect the unborn.

It is important to point out that, contrary to what some in our country would believe, the United States has been one of the most liberal and most permissive countries in the world with regard to abortion. As a matter of fact, the commonsense consensus of most democracies, most civilized countries around the world, is that abortion after 5 months is unequivocally wrong. There are actually only seven countries in the world that allow abortions after 5 months, after viability of the fetus. Sadly, the United States is one of those seven. We should not be proud of the fact that we are right there alongside of China, North Korea, and Vietnam. Virtually almost all other civilized countries in the world—even if they allow elective access to abortion, they draw an important line at viability, at 5 months. America can and must do better than this. Every life is a precious gift of God, and we must protect those who cannot protect themselves.

At the same time the Senate will be considering this legislation, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act—which, by the way, the House has already passed—the House will be voting on two additional pieces of legislation, I believe perhaps as early as tomorrow, one that would provide that children born alive during the process of abortion be protected—this is the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and I believe that will pass the House of Representatives and be available for the Senate to take up later—and also a defund Planned Parenthood bill introduced by Representative BLACK, which would put a 1-year moratorium on funding to Planned Parenthood while the investigation of their practices depicted on those videos is completed.

Right now there are four congressional investigations underway—the Senate Judiciary Committee, the House Energy and Commerce Committee, the House Judiciary Committee, and the House Oversight and Government Affairs Reform Committee. Those investigations are meticulous, they will be thorough, and we will be able to find out, No. 1, whether Planned Parenthood and their affiliates are complying with existing law, which prohibits profiteering from the sale of baby body parts, and whether the mothers, who presumably grant consent, actually know exactly what is happening to their unborn babies; that is, being sold for research and other purposes.

Just this year in the 114th Congress, we have also passed other important pro-life legislation: the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, where we preserved the Hyde amendment, which prohibits and has prohibited since 1976 the use of tax dollars to fund abortions, with some exceptions, and then the Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015, which reiterated the law of the land since 1976, the Hyde amendment—named for Henry Hyde, former Congressman from Illinois—that applies these types of protections to funding for community health centers.

These videos have perhaps reawakened the conscience of many of us and made some of us who were not aware of these barbaric practices depicted in these videos—made it crystal clear to us that there are things we need to do in response, particularly for those who believe every human life ought to be treated with dignity and respect.

There should be no hesitation from either side of the aisle to ensure we are doing our very best to protect precious human life, so in addition to the ongoing investigations I mentioned, in addition to the legislation we have already passed to make sure tax dollars are not used to fund abortions, we must also respond with legislation like that which the House will pass either later this week or next week that I mentioned a moment ago and legislation like the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act which would fundamentally protect the rights of unborn children. Next week this Chamber will have the opportunity to make this the law of the land.

Mr. REID. Madam President, today marks the last day of the 60-day Congressional review period that was established in the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015, which the President signed into law. As has been noted numerous times, by supporting that legislation the Senate voted to consider three possible outcomes: no action at all, a resolution of approval,

or a resolution of disapproval. Republicans brought a resolution of disapproval before the Senate and it failed. In fact, it failed on three separate occasions. Thus, the agreement will go into force. This issue has been decided.

However, numerous Republicans have claimed on the Senate floor that because this historic international nuclear agreement with Iran is not a treaty, and because Congress did not expressly approve the agreement, the deal will not carry into the next presidential administration. That could not be further from the truth.

Let's set the record straight: history has proven that international agreements are an essential element of diplomacy and have longevity far beyond a single administration.

Examples of recent nonproliferation agreements in place through more than one administration include: the Helsinki Final Act, the Vienna Document, the Proliferation Security Initiative, and the Missile Technology Control Regime.

It is absolutely clear that the Iran agreement can remain in force beyond the Obama administration, as have many other important executive agreements. The Senate has spoken on this issue and the Iran agreement will stand.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I concur with the statement of Democratic Leader REID.

The P5+1 agreement is an executive agreement that can remain in effect beyond this administration. In fact, portions of the agreement last 20 and 25 years, and others are forever binding on Iran.

The United States has concluded other international agreements, such as the Helsinki Final Act and the Missile Technology Control Regime, that have endured. The Comprehensive Joint Plan of Action between the P5+1 and Iran is no different.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, on July 14, President Obama announced a landmark agreement between key world powers and Iran, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, JCPOA, that removes Iran's path towards a nuclear weapon. This is a truly historic agreement that rolls back Iran's nuclear infrastructure, places severe limits and inspection on any such future work, and commits Iran to never build a nuclear weapon.

And while Iran's behavior in the region remains deeply troubling, particularly in terms of threats to Israel, this agreement ensures that such belligerence will not occur with a nuclear threat.

Per the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, the announcement of the agreement set in motion a congressional review period which ended today.

In the past week, the majority leader has tried three times to pass a resolution of disapproval and three times it failed. During these debates, I have listened to many of my Republican colleagues make some outlandish claims with regard to the Iran deal. And now, instead of accepting this fact, some in this body have taken their displeasure a step further by claiming that because the JCPOA is not a treaty, it will no longer be in force in a new administration.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

Throughout our history, the United States has entered into executive agreements, like the JCPOA, without congressional approval on a wide range of subjects, including nonproliferation, international security, and bilateral cooperation.

When President Nixon negotiated the Shanghai Communique in 1972 with China, which led to the normalization of relations with a country that was as mistrusted then as Iran is now, did anyone try and claim that it would no longer be valid once Nixon left office?

I also do not recall this argument being made just a couple of years ago when President Obama negotiated the Framework for Elimination of Syrian Chemical Weapons, another example of an executive agreement. And of course there are many other examples, including the Algiers Accords, numerous status of forces agreements, and the establishment of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Claiming now that the JCPOA ends when President Obama leaves office is a terrible break from congressional tradition and threatens to undermine American international credibility. Who would negotiate with the United States if they believed such agreements would be abrogated with a new President?

These statements are truly reckless. Let it be clear once and for all that this agreement can and will extend beyond the current administration.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, today is the final day of the 60-day congressional review period that was established in the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015. By supporting that legislation the Senate voted to consider three possible outcomes: no action, a resolution of approval, or a resolution of disapproval. Republicans brought a resolution of disapproval before the Senate and it failed not once, not twice, but three times. The agreement memorializes the commitments of the countries whose governments signed it. It will now go into force, and it is the solemn responsibility of each of the signatories to the agreement to fulfill their commitments.

However, many Republicans, as if singing from the same sheet of music, have suggested that because this nuclear agreement with Iran is not a formal treaty, and because Congress did not expressly approve the agreement as opposed to defeating successive attempts to disapprove it, the deal will not continue into the next presidential administration. That is false.

There is a long history of international agreements signed by Republican and Democratic presidents that have longevity far beyond a single administration. If that were not the case, if the only way to negotiate commitments between countries was through the formal treaty process, our diplomacy would be in dire straits today. In fact, most international agreements are not treaties, yet they govern international relations on a wide range of critically important issues, from trade to public health to taxation to navigation, the list goes on and on.

If those who are now suggesting otherwise were correct, agreements signed one year, often after protracted negotiations to resolve matters of great complexity, would automatically become null and void soon thereafter. What would be the point? I doubt there is a Republican or Democratic administration in the history of this country that would subscribe to such an unworkable and illogical notion.

We asked the Department of State for examples of recent non-proliferation agreements that have carried on through more than one administration. It did not take long to get an answer. They include: the Helsinki Final Act, the Vienna Document, the Proliferation Security Initiative, and the Missile Technology Control Regime.

There are countless other examples of international agreements negotiated throughout our history, by Presidents of both parties that have never received formal congressional approval. They continue in effect unless explicitly repudiated. To suggest that they automatically expire, or are no longer in effect, after the end of the administration that negotiated the agreement, would cause incalculable disruption to our international relations and global security.

In this case, that would mean that on January 21, 2017, Iran could immediately restart its nuclear weapons program and refuse international inspections. It is absolutely clear that the Iran agreement can and is designed to remain in force beyond the Obama administration. The Senate has also spoken on this issue. For these reasons, and historical precedent, it will continue in effect.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, Congress has been reviewing the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action for the last 60 days. This was the process set up by the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015, which the President signed into law and 98 Senators supported. We have now come to the end of that process. A resolution of disapproval, to stop the deal from going forward, failed three times here in the Senate. I know my colleagues and our constituents have very strong feelings on this issue. This was a very tough vote for me and one that I took very, very seriously. But now this issue has been decided.

But that is not enough. Now Republicans are saying that since the Iran agreement isn't technically a treaty, and because the Senate did not explicitly approve it, the deal doesn't carry

forward into the next Administration. If history is any indication, we know international agreements are a critical part of diplomacy and many have lived on well after the President who signed them leaves office. This is how America conducts its foreign policy with its allies—and its adversaries.

Many other agreements have lived on through more than one Administration. These includes the Helsinki Final Act, the Vienna Document, the Proliferation Security Initiative, and the Missile Technology Control Regime.

It is clear that the Iran agreement can and should remain in force beyond the Obama administration, just like other important agreements that have come before it. The Senate has spoken on this issue. The Iran deal blocks the paths for Iran to get a nuclear bomb and is the best available option on the table. It can and should remain in force through the next Administration.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I would like to echo the comments of the Democratic leader. As of today, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action goes into effect. As the leader said, it is also my assessment that this agreement is an enduring agreement that will extend beyond the end of the Obama administration. The leader cites a number of critical nonproliferation agreements that both Republican and Democratic administrations have agreed to over the decade and they have endured the test of time and change of administrations.

Let's also remember that while this agreement's congressional review period is complete, there is much that needs to be done by Iran before any sanctions relief is provided to them. Iran must, as verified by the IAEA, demonstrate that it has implemented the necessary steps with respect to No. 1, the Arak heavy water research reactor; No. 2, its overall enrichment capacity; No. 3, its centrifuge research and development; No. 4, the Fordow fuel enrichment plant; No. 5, its uranium stocks and fuel; No. 6, its centrifuge manufacturing; No. 7, completing the modalities and facilities-specific arrangements to allow the IAEA to implement all transparency measures and the Additional Protocol and Modified Code 3.1; No. 8, its centrifuge component manufacturing transparency; and No. 9, addressing the past and present issues of concern relating to PMD.

I also want to reiterate one point that I have made previously: while rejecting the resolution of disapproval and other similar efforts was important for the future of this deal, it is effective, unrelenting implementation of the JCPOA that will be the real test, and it is where I hope the critics of this agreement will focus their attention. Holding Iran's feet to the fire under this agreement is the critical piece at this point, and it is critical that both the President and the Congress ensure that efforts to monitor and sustain the provisions of the agreement are unstinting. This will demand constant attention and ample funding for an extended period. In this vein, I would note that the State Department has appointed Ambassador Stephen Mull as Lead Coordinator for Iran Nuclear Implementation. Ambassador Mull is a professional with a long resume. I look forward to working with him moving forward.

I thank the Democratic leader for his comments and I appreciate working with him and my colleagues as we look toward the implementation phase of this agreement—both in the near term and beyond January 2017.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I want to concur with the statement of the distinguished Democratic Leader on the long-term durability of the Iran agreement.

Assuming Iran complies with the agreement and takes the key steps necessary to substantially reduce its stockpiles of enriched uranium, scale back its centrifuges, make changes to the Arak reactor to render it inoperable and unable to produce weapons-grade plutonium, and takes the many other steps necessary to qualify eventually for sanctions relief next year—and then continues thereafter to comply with their obligations—this agreement can and should last for many years.

Today is the last day of the 60-day congressional review period established in the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, which the President signed into law. As the leader noted, by supporting that legislation the Senate voted to consider three possible outcomes: no action at all, a resolution of approval, or a resolution of disapproval. Republicans brought a resolution of disapproval before the Senate and it failed. In fact, it has now failed on three separate occasions.

In recent days, many of my Republican colleagues have claimed on this floor that because this historic international nuclear agreement with Iran is not a treaty and because Congress did not expressly approve the agreement, it will not carry into the next Presidential administration. That is not true. While it is true that the next President could decide—even in the face of continued compliance by Iran and strong objections from our allies in the P5+1—explicitly to withdraw from the agreement, I don't expect that to happen. And unless and until that happens, the terms of the agreement and the obligations of the U.S. Government—and all other governments that are party to the agreement, including Iran's—to comply do not end when this administration ends in January 2017. Leader REID has outlined in his statement numerous similar agreements that have stood the test of time, from administration to administration, over the years. I commend Leader REID for his statement, and agree wholeheartedly with him.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I rise today to express my dismay over the votes that took place earlier today on the Senate floor. The resolution of disapproval of the Iran nuclear agreement has now been voted on three times in the Senate, and it has failed to advance three times.

Likewise, the House has failed in its own efforts to move a resolution of disapproval. The fact of the matter is that the nuclear agreement with Iran is a done deal, and the President now has every right to move ahead with its implementation, period.

Yet we were on the Senate floor this morning, voting on a highly charged Iran amendment that the majority leader introduced. Unfortunately, the amendment was yet another political attempt to undermine the agreement. This amendment would prevent the President from providing sanctions relief to Iran-thereby scuttling the entire agreement—unless Iran does two things: recognize the State of Israel and release four Americans wrongfully imprisoned in Iran.

I voted no on cloture on this amendment, and I want to take a moment to explain why. To be clear, my vote does not mean that I endorse Iran's position on Israel nor does it mean that I don't care about the American prisoners in Iran. Just because I support this diplomatic agreement does not mean I support Iran's reprehensible policies.

In fact, I want nothing more than for Iran to recognize Israel as a sovereign state. I have always stood by Israel, and its security and future well-being are foremost in my mind. For those of us who are personally connected to Israel and care for her deeply, this vote is nothing more than an attempt to embarrass us and score political points.

It should be obvious to the American people that, of course, we all stand with Israel—Democrats and Republicans. Since 2008, we have provided more than $25 billion to support Israel's defense. At $3.1 billion per year, Israel is the largest annual recipient of U.S. military assistance, which can be used to purchase U.S. defense equipment and services. We've also provided $3 billion specifically for missile defense systems, such as the Iron Dome, David's Sling, and Arrow. In fiscal year 2015 alone the Congress provided $351 million for Iron Dome—twice the president's budget request.

We all want Iran to recognize Israel and stop threatening its existence. We all want Iran's support for terrorist proxies on Israel's doorstep to cease. We all are disturbed by the Ayatollah's calls for Israel's destruction. But the way to truly have Israel's back is not through this amendment.

On the prisoners currently held in Iran, it must be said and reiterated: No American, let alone any member of Congress, wants any of our citizens wrongfully imprisoned in Iran. These detainees deserve to be brought home, safe and sound, to their loved ones. But, again, a partisan amendment does not make that happen.

The vote today was nothing more than an attempt to extract a political

price for our previous vote in support of the nuclear agreement. Playing politics with one of the most important national security votes of our time does nothing to actually support Israel, nor does it do anything to free the prisoners. If my counterparts truly wanted to enhance Israel's security and free the Americans, they would stop trying to undermine the nuclear agreement with Iran-which I believe is our best opportunity to begin to turn a new page with Iran.

I stand ready and eager to work with my Republican counterparts to achieve our shared goals of supporting Israel and getting our prisoners out of Iran. But we have a far better chance of achieving that through bipartisan cooperation and working together to make sure the nuclear agreement is fully implemented.

It is time to move past the repeated attempts to overturn the nuclear agreement. It is extremely unfortunate we had to take the vote today, especially given all the other pressing matters before the Senate.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

GOLD KING MINE SPILL

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I want to speak today about a tragedy that hit the American people, the American West last month, and it is something that didn't get nearly as much attention as it should have. I am talking about what has been called the Gold King Mine spill. It happened on August 5. That was when the Environmental Protection Agency spilled 3 million gallons of toxic wastewater into a tributary of the Animas River in Colorado—3 million gallons.

This is water that contained toxic substances, such as arsenic and lead. The agency was doing some work on an old mine when water under high pressure started rushing out. This disturbing incident raises serious questions about how the EPA, the so-called Environmental Protection Agency, does business.

First of all, it raises significant questions about this agency's responsiveness. After the EPA had this accident, apparently it never occurred to them to immediately call the towns downstream and to let anyone know this toxic plume was headed their way. The Animas River connects to the San Juan River, which connects to the Colorado River and to Lake Powell. These are some of the most beautiful natural resources in all of America. It is the source of water for communities all along the way. They provide recreation, water for irrigation for crops and for homes.

This water that was polluted by the Environmental Protection Agency flows from Colorado to New Mexico and into Utah. It flows through the land of the Navajo Nation and the Southern Ute Indian Tribe. These waterways are a sacred part of the culture for Native Americans who live near them. So why didn't the EPA get on the phone? The Navajo Nation was not informed until a full day after the spill. It got the news from the State of New Mexico, not from the agency that caused the disaster—the EPA.

At first, EPA didn't even want to admit how bad the spill was. They said: Oh, it was a million gallons of wastewater. Days later they admitted they had actually spilled three times the amount they said at first. Four days after the spill, the EPA still hadn't reported to Navajo leaders the presence of arsenic in the water—arsenic. It still hasn't reported it. It took 5 days for the agency to set up a unified command center in Durango, CO.

Yesterday, I chaired a hearing of the Indian Affairs Committee that looked at how this disaster affected tribes along the route. The agency's explanation was disappointing—very disappointing. The disaster happened over 6 weeks ago. The EPA is still not giving out detailed answers about what went wrong.

This tragedy also raises questions about the EPA's basic competence. According to a preliminary review by the agency, the EPA failed to take basic precautions—failed to take basic precautions. The agency never even checked how high the water pressure was in the mine, but the report did say the EPA knew about this risk—the risk of a blowout—14 months earlier, before it actually happened. They knew about it. They knew the risk and never bothered to figure out what the worst-case scenario would be and what they would do if water actually started rushing out. But that is what happened, and they knew it could.

The people who live along these rivers are frustrated by this agency's incompetence, but they are also frightened. People are afraid of what the long-term health effects might be for them and for their children. Farmers and ranchers are being devastated by the disaster. They are uncertain about whether the agency will be compensating them for their losses—losses that are the result of the EPA's own incompetence.

At our hearing yesterday we heard from Gilbert Harrison. He is a Marine Corps veteran, and he has a 20-acre farm on the Navajo reservation. He grows corn, alfalfa, watermelons, and other crops. He estimates he is going to lose 40 to 50 percent of some of his crops because he couldn't use the water to irrigate. The farmer told our committee yesterday:

> This spill caused by the U.S. EPA created a lot of chaos, confrontation, confusion, and losses among the farming community.

This was a man-made disaster, and the Obama administration's EPA inflicted it upon Americans in these communities. I have spoken with tribal leaders who say the EPA has mishandled the spill, and the EPA's mishandling of the spill has seriously damaged their trust—the tribe's trust—of this agency. And I don't blame them.

Finally, the EPA's failure in this incident raises lots of questions about the agency's priorities. After all, the Obama Environmental Protection Agency has expanded its authority—expanded and seized control over one area after another. Look at its destructive new rules on waters of the United States. This agency has declared that only Washington can be trusted to protect America's rivers and streams.

That is what the Environmental Protection Agency says: Only they can be trusted to protect America's rivers and streams. How then do they justify grabbing all of this new power when they can't even protect rivers from themselves? They caused this problem. Look at this photo I have in the Chamber. Does this look like the work of a bureaucracy that should be in charge of protecting America's precious waterways? Look at that before-and-after: beautiful blue water running through, then this—sludge, dirty, polluted, and toxic. The EPA caused this. Does this look like the work of a bureaucracy that should be in charge of protecting our national precious water?

The Obama administration has focused on its radical climate change agenda and has neglected its most basic responsibilities. This photo should not give anyone confidence that the Obama administration is up to the job. They are not.

Do we really think that Washington should have more control over rivers like this when they caused something like this? Does anybody in America believe that? Washington did this. The EPA did this. Washington poisoned this river this way. The Environmental Protection Agency—the so-called Environmental Protection Agency—must be held accountable.

When any private company is accused of violating the Clean Water Act, the EPA aggressively pursues civil fines against that company and any of the individuals involved as well. Even criminal prosecution occurs. If this were a 3-million-gallon toxic spill caused by private citizens, the EPA would act aggressively against those people. The EPA would never accept the kind of feeble, half apologies and explanations we have heard so far from this administration and from the Director of the EPA who testified yesterday. There is clearly a double standard between the way the EPA treats itself and the way it treats everyone else.

The EPA failed—it failed—to do the proper planning before it caused this disaster. I believe it has also failed to do the proper work before writing regulations, such as its waters of the United States rule and its so-called Clean Power Plan.

With this spill, the agency's careless approach has done terrible damage to

Americans living along the Animas River and other waterways. Its reckless and irresponsible regulations will have a devastating effect on the jobs and the lives of millions of Americans all across the country.

At our hearing yesterday the EPA administrator continued to try to downplay the impact of its actions—downplay the impact of its actions. The agency needs to step back and rethink its priorities. This disaster happened because the EPA is inept at its job. There should be no more trying to deflect attention from the failure of the EPA—no more trying to grab additional power that it can use to do more damage.

The Environmental Protection Agency has been out of control for far too long. It is time for Congress and President Obama to hold the EPA accountable for its failures, and it is time to rein in this runaway bureaucracy before it does more damage to our communities, to our economy, and to our country.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

STRATEGY AGAINST ISIL

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I rise today to discuss our strategy against ISIL.

Yesterday at our Armed Services Committee, we held a hearing on this topic. Instead of reassuring me that our mission was on the right path, the testimony provided further evidence that the administration must change their approach. I agree with the President's stated goal of degrading and destroying ISIL, but the steps we have taken thus far will not achieve ISIL's defeat. Indeed, the root of the problem seems to be that our strategy does not connect with events on the ground. There is no better example of this than our plan to train and equip the so-called moderate Syrian troops.

At the end of last year, Congress approved the President's request of $500 million for the purpose of building a force of moderate Syrian fighters. Testifying in September of last year, then-Secretary of Defense Hagel laid out the administration's plan to build a force of about 5,000 fighters in 1 year. General Dempsey, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, added his assessment that about 12,000 fighters would need to be trained for the force to have an effect on the battlefield.

Initial results were expected within 8 to 12 months. At that time, many Members, including myself, questioned whether those goals were attainable and whether this assumption—that we could fight a war without taking on significant risk because local partners would provide ground forces—was even realistic.

Let's consider where we are today, about 10 months later. According to public reports, the program produced about 60 fighters, and, upon their return to Syria, they were attacked by Al Qaeda-affiliated forces.

General Austin testified yesterday before our committee. In response to my questioning, he said that only four or five of those fighters remain. Again, we expected 5,000, and 4 or 5 remain. I wish I could say the complete failure of this strategy comes as a surprise. Unfortunately, I cannot. While ISIL has lost some territory in northeastern Syria, it has expanded its control in the western half of that country.

Iraq is a similar story. Recruits for U.S. training programs remain below expectations, with U.S. forces training just over half the number of Iraqis expected, and progress on the battlefield is uneven. It is plain to see why General Dempsey, our most senior uniformed military officer, has recently characterized the fight as ''tactically stalemated.''

The question is, What are we going to do? How will our approach change? What can we do to break that stalemate? What can we do to begin rolling back this tremendous threat?

I attended yesterday's hearing with those questions in mind, and I was extremely disappointed to hear that no real change was in order. To be fair, press reports indicate that changes are being considered, such as deploying graduates of our training program in groups larger than 50 or in safer areas of the country.

But even if such minor adjustments are made, they will not alter the basic fact that the idea of a new Syrian force is a complete fantasy under our current approach.

Perhaps in recognition of this, another report has surfaced that suggests the administration is no longer attempting to build a moderate ground force in Syria. Instead, they will simply train Syrians to direct U.S. air strikes and then embed them within existing rebel brigades.

If our experience thus far indicates that very few moderate groups remain on the battlefield, we will either be providing air support to a contingent too small to make a difference or we will be providing it to groups that are too extreme to currently warrant any support from us.

Again, I support the President's goal to destroy ISIL, but I don't see how anyone can believe this program is going to accomplish it. Instead of providing a new direction, the message this administration is sending is that they will stay the course. I admit I share the complete confusion expressed by some of my colleagues yesterday when we learned of this situation.

This White House acknowledges that the training programs in Syria and Iraq—the linchpins of our strategy—have vastly underperformed. They express moral outrage at ISIL's barbarity, as well as grave concern for the plight of the 4 million refugees that have fled the country and sorrow for the 250,000 that have lost their lives. Our military characterizes the conflict as a stalemate. But, apparently, the administration feels no change is necessary. We are told the long-term trajectory is favorable, and ISIL's future, as General Dempsey put it, is ''increasingly dim.'' I appreciate the fact that patience is required when it comes to military operations, but at the same time, patience doesn't fill the fundamental gaps in this administration's strategy. And the idea that we can wait ISIL out seems to overlook the death, destruction, and collateral damage its continued presence inflicts on the neighboring countries or to at least suggest that it is tolerable.

I have visited the region several times. Our allies there cannot sustain the strain of this conflict for years on end. I have visited a Syrian refugee camp in Turkey. Those people cannot wait there forever. Lest we forget, colleagues, this conflict has been raging for 4 years. Sadly, the flood of refugees reaching Europe was entirely predictable.

And how long before a divided Iraq becomes irreparable? As long as ISIL exists and continues to exercise initiative on the battlefield, it will draw recruits, expand its global network, and inspire those ''lone wolf'' attacks. Its ability to execute attacks against Europe and the United States will improve as more foreign fighters pass through its ranks and then return to their home countries. These are the very reasons Congress supported taking military action against ISIL in the first place, but I certainly did not support the deployment of forces to establish a stalemate.

When our soldiers are put in harm's way, we shouldn't be content to just ''patiently'' leave them there, with no strategy to achieve our goals. As my colleague Senator MCCAIN—who has been a tireless advocate on this issue—has pointed out, there are a variety of options available to the President between the current approach and deploying large amounts of troops on the ground. With only a stalemate to show for the thousands of soldiers we have deployed, the 5,000 air strikes that we have conducted, and the past year we have spent training Syrians and Iraqis, I think these options deserve reconsideration.

The President has stated that ''all wars must end'' and that our country ''must move off a permanent war footing.'' I believe the best way to do so is by crafting a strategy that plans for victory.

Before I yield the floor, I want to note my appreciation of Secretary Carter and General Austin for their frank testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee. Both men have come before our panel and they have

provided honest assessments and also specific figures about the results of the Syria training program, for which they have received significant media scrutiny.

The point of a public hearing is to provide the American people and their representatives in Congress with the information they need to know so we can make informed policy decisions. I sincerely hope more witnesses follow their example and justly uphold the valuable tradition of congressional oversight by not shying away from discussing these very difficult topics.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. 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. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 20 minutes as in morning business and to share the time with the Senator from Ohio, Mr. PORTMAN.

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

REMEMBERING CONGRESSMAN LOUIS STOKES

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I am joined by my colleague on the floor today, both of us longtime friends of the now late Congressman Louis Stokes. Senator PORTMAN and I sat together at Congressman Stokes' funeral at Olivette Church in Cleveland just a couple of weeks ago. We both called Lou a friend. I wish to speak about him, and then I know Senator PORTMAN would like to speak about his friendship and his alliances and allegiances and work with Congressman Stokes.

He grew up in a Federal housing project in Cleveland. His father worked in a laundromat. His father passed away when Lou was 3, leaving his mother with two young sons to raise. A former sharecropper and descendant of slaves, she cleaned houses to support her sons and encouraged them to get an education.

Lou shined shoes to earn money for the family. He served in the Army during World War II—probably a pretty segregated Army. He served and went to college at Case Western at night on the GI bill.

From public housing, to public education, to public investment in our servicemembers, Congressman Stokes' life accomplishments show how government makes a difference in people's lives—something he passionately believed in—the partnership between government and communities, between the Federal Government and what we can do together as a country. In the 20th century, our country made great strides in that public investment and in expanding opportunity, paving the way for people like Congressman Stokes to become national and community leaders. What this country gave to Lou Stokes he gave back many times over.

The seeds for his career of service were sowed in many places, in many fields, but particularly, he used to say, in the Army when he was stationed in the Deep South during the days of segregation. He was appalled by the inequalities he witnessed, even for those wearing the uniform and serving our country. He said once:

> I remember being moved from Jefferson Barracks in St. Louis to Camp Stewart, Georgia, through Memphis. They stopped the train there to eat lunch. The first dining room was all white soldiers; the next dining room was German POWs. A black curtain separated the black soldiers from the German POWs. It was one of the first times it really hit me.

He would go on to dedicate his life to fighting those inequalities.

He and his brother Carl opened a law firm in Cleveland. The first cases were civil rights cases. Congressman Stokes took on cases both big and small, including the landmark stop-and-frisk Supreme Court case Terry v. Ohio. Again and again throughout his legal career, he fought for the interests of the powerless against the powerful—the same as he did in Congress.

In 1965 Louis and Carl Stokes represented the local NAACP in challenging Ohio's congressional map.

Around that time, Congressman Stokes' brother Carl was elected mayor of the city of Cleveland in a second attempt, and Cleveland then became the largest city in America which had elected a Black mayor.

The new district map created from the lawsuit I mentioned brought Ohio's first African-American majority district in 1968. Lou Stokes won that seat and became the first African American to represent Ohio in Congress. In only his second term in the House, he became the first African American in the Nation's history to serve on the House Appropriations Committee. He didn't use his success to seek glory for himself; he used his commanding position to expand opportunities not just in his own district in Cleveland—so important to those of us who live in Cleveland and those of us who represent Ohio—but he used his position to help African-American communities all over the country. He was immediately—and he earned it—more and more beloved in the Black communities in every city in Ohio, including from Mansfield, where I grew up, to Akron, to Columbus and Cincinnati, to Dayton and Toledo and the smaller cities.

He gave those who were too often ignored a voice in Washington, where it could make the most difference. He secured money for housing, urban development, health care, jobs programs, education, and for colleges primarily serving people of color.

He was a strong advocate for unions. He cared greatly about the trade union movement. He knew the trade union movement gave great opportunity to African Americans, especially in cities like Cleveland. He stood up for collective bargaining. He stood up for the rights of workers everywhere. And to give a permanent and powerful voice to people of color, he helped to form the Congressional Black Caucus.

Congressman Stokes' accomplishments are many. We honor him today with our words and with this resolution Senator PORTMAN and I are introducing. We should strive to honor and continue to honor him each day.

Here is how we do it, and I will close with this. On a Sunday night, 2 days before the 2008 elections, Senator Obama—a colleague of mine at the time in the Senate—was campaigning in Cleveland for President. It was two nights before the election.

As Senator PORTMAN and I remind our colleagues, Ohio is perhaps the Nation's No. 1 swing State. I know the Presiding Officer thinks they elect Presidents in her State, but we really do elect Presidents in the State of Ohio.

So then-Senator Obama came to Ohio the Sunday night before the election to a rally estimated at between 70,000 and 80,000 people. As Presidential candidates almost inevitably and invariably are at the end of campaigns, he was about an hour late. Bruce Springsteen took the stage. A number of us spoke at the rally.

Before Senator Obama arrived, I had the honor—and it became one of my greatest memories ever of public service—I stood beside and behind the grandstand and had a conversation of about 45 minutes to an hour with Congressman Stokes, who was retired at that point; Rev. Otis Moss, who delivered his eulogy a couple of weeks ago; and Mrs. Edwina Moss. I just listened to them for 45 minutes talk about what it meant to them that we were this close to electing an African-American President. They, frankly, didn't think it would happen in their lifetimes. They weren't even sure, the polls notwithstanding, that it was going to happen in 2008. The excitement and the sense of history and the awe and the depth of feeling Congressman Stokes and Edwina Moss and Reverend Moss exhibited during that 45 minutes—talking, reminiscing about memories, thinking of the future—to my wife Connie and me was something I will never forget.

Since then, Citizen Stokes—former Congressman—who cared so deeply about this, was so happy we passed the Affordable Care Act. He was so happy we did things such as the auto rescue to get our State's economy back and going again. He cared so much about voting rights. He was so troubled by the Supreme Court decisions. He was so hopeful that our country could get back on track in a bipartisan way to build this economy, to pass voting rights, to do all of the things he devoted his life to first as a young lawyer, then as a Congressman, and then as one of Ohio's most prominent citizens, to continue to speak out on these issues that matter to all of us.

We should honor his life and legacy by continuing Congressman Stokes' work for equality and justice in the lives of others. We honor him. We considered him a friend, and I know Senator PORTMAN did too.

I am thrilled to be able to stand on the floor and speak for a few moments about my friend, the late Congressman Stokes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Ohio for his remarks and for joining me here on the floor to talk about our former colleague and friend, Congressman Louis Stokes. He was an amazing guy. He was a true American success story and a true son of Ohio who dedicated his entire life to public service, whether he was in elected office or not.

I think my colleague Senator BROWN has done a really nice job speaking about his humble beginnings.

Lou Stokes grew up without the benefit of having a dad around. He grew up in a poor household but with a lot of pride. His mom pushed him to get an education and to be the best he could, as clearly she did with her other son, Louis's brother Carl.

After growing up in Cleveland, he spent a few years in the Army, which had a big impression on him. He then went to Cleveland-Marshall College of Law. He was a successful attorney and actually argued three cases before the U.S. Supreme Court. So he had a career in law that was distinguished even before getting into politics.

Senator BROWN talked about his brother Carl and the fact that when he was elected the mayor of Cleveland, it then became the largest city in America which had elected a Black mayor. Louis Stokes told me he saw that and that is what inspired him to think maybe he should get involved in public service in that way as well. So he ran for office. He got elected to the House of Representatives. He was the first African-American Congressperson from Ohio; that was in 1968. He would later become the first African American to sit on the Appropriations Committee. So a lot of firsts.

As Congressman, he served for 30 years. He became a very influential Member. Senator BROWN and I had a chance to serve with him there. He represented his district faithfully, but he also played a pivotal role in broader issues well beyond his district. His involvement in civil rights was mentioned, as well as certainly education and justice issues.

I was a proud cosponsor of a number of bills with him. We collaborated on one project in particular called the National Underground Railroad Freedom Center in Cincinnati, where he helped me tremendously. This was in my hometown, not in his town. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, he was critical to getting that freedom center up and going, which is a national center that resides today on the banks of the Ohio River.

We also wrote legislation to connect all the Underground Railroad sites around the country, many of which were in disrepair and in danger of being lost, and that is the Network to Freedom Act that continues today to get the Park Service involved in protecting these sites.

It was always a pleasure to work with him, and he was a loyal and trusted legislative partner.

He then went to the Squire Sanders law firm, and I was honored again to call him a colleague when I worked there after leaving government and before running for the Senate. So we had a chance to get to know each other better outside of the legislative branch. He had a great career, as Senator BROWN just said.

What I admired about him most was his interest and ability in getting to a result. He was not about giving fancy speeches or rhetoric. He was about coming up with solutions to help the people he represented in Cleveland, and I think in his heart well beyond Cleveland, and that is why he was so effective.

He didn't get sidetracked by the partisanship and political attacks. He kept focused, and he made a big difference. He had a meaningful impact on lives in his district and well beyond.

All you have to do is go through Cleveland to see his impact. It is hard not to see a landmark named after him or his brother Carl. Among those is the Louis Stokes Public Annex to the Cleveland Public Library, as well as the Louis Stokes Health Sciences Center at Case Western Reserve University.

I remember going to his retirement party from the Squires Sanders law firm. I had rushed there from another meeting and had gone through town, and as I arrived I said: Let's just name the town after Lou Stokes, because I was on Stokes Street and went by the Stokes library and the Stokes Health Center. So those were all assessments of the impact he had on his community.

He was a very strong family man, a loving husband to his beautiful wife Jay of more than 50 years, and he was very proud of his kids. Each of them in their own right has gone on to distinguished careers. His grandchildren spoke at the funeral where Senator BROWN and I were, and, boy, were they articulate. They were just really impressive. He had so much to be proud of.

I had the opportunity to visit him just before he passed, and the last thing he said to me is: I am so lucky, ROB. I am so lucky to have had a great family. That is what he talked about to me in our final moments together.

He was determined and he was successful, no question about it, but he did it in a gentlemanly way. He had a great smile, a good sense of humor. His laughter could light up a room, and it did. I was just very grateful to call him a friend and to have him as a respected colleague, to watch him as an effective leader. He has made an impression on me, and he has made an indelible impact on the State of Ohio. He will be missed as an effective leader, a great leader for Ohio, and a loyal friend.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). The Senator from Washington.

BUDGET DEADLINE

Mrs. MURRAY. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, right now we are on a course for yet another Republican government shutdown in just 13 days. We know what this looks like and how damaging it is because we saw it 2 years ago when tea party Republicans dug in their heels and tried to use shutdown threats to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

We know that during the 16-day shutdown that followed the tea party tantrum, workers across our country didn't know when they would get their next paycheck, businesses felt the sting of fewer customers, and families across our country lost even more trust that elected officials in our country could even get anything done. After all that—after all the damage families and communities felt—we also know that the 2013 government shutdown actually did nothing to stop the Affordable Care Act.

Once that shutdown ended, I was proud to work with the Republican Budget chairman, PAUL RYAN, to do what we shouldn't have needed a shutdown to get done, and that was negotiate a 2-year bipartisan budget deal that prevented another government shutdown. It restored critical investments in priorities like education, research, and defense jobs, and it showed families their government can get something done when both sides are willing to come to the table and compromise.

I was hopeful that after the economy-rattling exercise in futility and the bipartisan deal that came out of it, Republican leaders would have learned a few lessons. Well, 2 years later, as our bipartisan deal is set to expire, here we are with another Republican government shutdown around the corner.

What are the leaders doing about this? What is their plan to avoid a repeat of 2013? Are they working with Democrats to keep government open and negotiate a budget deal as we have been pushing them to do for months? Unfortunately, the answer is no. Instead, just days away from a looming fiscal deadline, Republicans are back as far into their partisan corner as they can get and are focused on their political pastime—attacking women's health.

Instead of spending the coming weeks working to avoid a budget crisis, which is what we should be doing, Republicans are unbelievably planning to vote on yet another restriction on women's health and rights. This is transparent pandering that is bad for

women, bad for our economy, and bad for our country.

People across the country are watching this, and they are appalled. This particular bill that is coming to the floor next week is an extreme, unconstitutional abortion ban, which would restrict a woman's constitutionally protected right to make her own choices about her own health and her own body. That bill would mean that if a young woman endures rape or incest, she would have to go to the police before getting the care she needs, and it would take away the right to choose from adult victims of incest entirely. Finally, that bill would allow politicians in Washington, DC, to get between a woman and her doctor by making it a crime for doctors to provide health care their patients need.

This kind of dangerous, extreme legislation might appeal to the tea party, but it is going nowhere. Voting on it certainly will not keep the government open and, just like the Republican attacks on the Affordable Care Act 2 years ago, this latest GOP effort to turn back the clock on women's health is a dead end.

A new report from the CBO shows that if Republicans get their way and Planned Parenthood loses funding, as many as 630,000 women will not be able to get birth control. Hundreds of thousands of women, many of whom do not have convenient access to health care clinics or providers besides Planned Parenthood, would experience reduced access to their health care.

It is appalling that in the 21st century, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are pushing to take health care away from women who need it.

Let me be very clear. Democrats are not going to allow Republican political pandering come before women's health and rights—not on our watch.

I want to be sure that families and communities across the country heard something that the majority leader did say yesterday. He said that ''inevitably'' Democrats and Republicans will have to work together to reach a bipartisan budget agreement.

Well, I think the workers and businesses who struggled through the last government shutdown are wondering what the holdup is. Why do we need another round of drama and brinksmanship before we can work together? Why do we need to see countdown clocks—once again—counting down the days until another shutdown? And why, once again, do women and their health care have to come under attack before Republicans can do the right thing?

I am certainly wondering, and I know my Democratic colleagues are too. I think it is clear that Republican leaders have a choice. As their leader said, they inevitably will have to work with Democrats, now or later. The only question is how much pain they are willing to put workers and businesses through before they drop the politics, stop pandering, and come to the table.

Democrats are ready to get to work, and I hope that, finally, Republican leaders are as well.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I would like to discuss my bill, S. 2035, the Federal Employee Fair Treatment Act.

I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE FAIR TREATMENT ACT

Mr. CARDIN. The legislation I have filed, S. 2035, the Federal Employee Fair Treatment Act, will help alleviate some of the fears of Federal workers when the Federal Government shuts down. I am pleased to have Senators REID, BALDWIN, CARPER, GILLIBRAND, HIRONO, KAINE, LEAHY, MIKULSKI, SHAHEEN, and WARNER as original cosponsors.

The bill is simple and straightforward. It requires that all Federal workers furloughed as a result of any lapse in appropriations that may begin as soon as October 1 will receive their pay retroactively as soon as it is practicable. It is the right thing to do. It is the fair thing to do. Federal workers don't want government shutdowns. They don't cause government shutdowns. They are dedicated public servants who simply want to do their jobs on behalf of the American people. They shouldn't suffer because some Republicans want to shut down the Federal Government in the misguided notion that it will somehow prevent Planned Parenthood from providing health care services to low-income women and their families. Two years ago, these same individuals thought that shutting down the government would prevent the Affordable Care Act from being implemented. They were wrong then, and they are wrong now.

As the Congressional Research Service has reported, in ''historical practice,'' Federal workers who have been furloughed as a result of a shutdown have received their pay retroactively ''as a result of legislation to that effect.''

The language in the Federal Employee Fair Treatment Act is similar to the language used to provide pay retroactively to workers furloughed in previous shutdowns.

I am pleased that it is supported by the American Federation of Government Employees, the National Treasury Employees Union, and the National Active and Retired Federal Employees Association.

The Federal Employee Fair Treatment Act includes a new provision that allows exempted employees, those who are required to work during a shutdown, to take authorized leave. They, too, would be paid retroactively as soon as possible after the lapse in appropriations ends. During previous shutdowns, exempted employees have been prohibited from taking leave for any reason, including planned surgery or major family events, such as a wedding, that may have been scheduled weeks or even months in advance, causing many of them to lose money on nonrefundable plane tickets, hotel deposits, et cetera.

I am using the process permissible under rule XIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to place S. 2035 directly on the legislative calendar. I am doing that to expedite consideration of the bill so that the hardworking middle-class Federal employees know they will be treated fairly if there is another shutdown. They shouldn't have to worry about whether they will be paid when a partisan gridlock prevents them from doing their jobs.

Since 2011, Federal workers have contributed $159 billion to deficit reduction. They have endured a 3-year pay freeze and two substandard pay increases since then, for a total of $137 billion. They lost another billion dollars in pay because of sequestration-related furloughs. Federal employees hired in 2013 and since 2014 are paying an extra $21 billion for their pensions. And each and every Federal worker is being asked to do more with less as agency budgets are frozen or cut. This is happening to hardworking, patriotic public servants, mostly middle class and struggling to get by like so many other Americans. Enough is enough.

Since the 1950s and 1960s, the U.S. population has increased by 76 percent and the private sector workforce has surged to 133 percent, but the size of the Federal workforce has risen just 11 percent. Relative to the private sector, the Federal workforce is less than one-half the size that it was in the 1950s and 1960s. The picture that emerges is one of a Federal civilian workforce, the size of which has significantly shrunk compared to the size of the U.S. population it serves, the private sector workforce, and the magnitude of Federal spending.

I would make the additional point that shutting down the government hurts veterans. Over 30 percent of the civilian Federal employees are veterans, as opposed to just 7.8 percent of the non-Federal workforce. In Texas, veterans comprise, for example, 37.5 percent of the civilian Federal workforce. In Kentucky it is 33.9 percent; in Florida it is 38.9 percent; in South Carolina it is 41.7 percent. Is this how we are going to honor the men and women who have stood in harm's way to defend our Nation, by telling them to stay home involuntarily and having them worry about whether they will be paid?

Preventing Federal workers from doing their jobs doesn't just harm them; it harms all Americans because Federal workers patrol our borders and make sure our air and water are clean and our food and drugs are safe. They support our men and women in uniform and care for our wounded warriors, they help our manufacturers compete abroad, they discover cures for life-

threatening diseases, they prosecute criminals and terrorists, they maintain and protect critical infrastructure, they explore the universe, they process passport applications, they make sure Social Security, Medicare, and other social safety net programs are functioning properly.

When Federal workers do their job, they are helping each and every American live a safer and more prosperous life. Our tasks here in Congress are simple: We need to keep the government open for business and keep Federal workers on the job. Later this year, we will need to raise the debt ceiling so we can continue to pay our bills and maintain the full faith and credit of the United States Government.

We need to return to regular order around here and negotiate a comprehensive budget deal to replace the sequestration, a budget that maintains critical Federal investments while spreading the burden of deficit reduction in a fair way and holding Federal workers and their families harmless after subjecting them to so much hardship over the past several months and years.

One of the great attributes of the American character is pragmatism. Unlike what some other Federal workers actually do, here in Congress balancing the budget is not rocket science. We know the various options. Former President Lyndon Johnson was fond of quoting the Prophet Isaiah: ''Come let us reason together.'' That is what we need to do. We can acknowledge and respect our differences, but at the end of the day the American people have entrusted us with governing, with being pragmatic. Let's do our job so Federal workers can continue to do their job on behalf of all Americans.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

228TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today marks the 228th anniversary of the signing of the Constitution. Two hundred twenty-eight years ago, 39 brave and wise men set their names to the document that has guided our government and our politics ever since. With each passing year, I am increasingly astounded by the genius of those who framed our Constitution.

The world was a very different place back in 1787. There was no electricity, no railroads, no air conditioning. Crossing the Atlantic Ocean took months, and news traveled slowly on horseback. Our Nation, which today covers the continent, comprised only 13 States with a combined population of 4 million people. That is roughly the current population of Oklahoma today.

Despite these vastly different circumstances, the Framers created a system that has endured for over 200 years and has become an example to the world of stability and strength. They did so by enshrining in the Constitution certain fundamental principles about government and the source of rights, coupled with an objective, honest view of the failings of human nature.

The Framers recognized that our rights come from God, not government, and that it is the role of government to secure, not create, rights. They recognized that government unrestrained is a threat to liberty and that in order to protect citizens from government's constant tendency to expand its sphere, ambition must be made to counteract ambition. Parchment barriers, as Madison famously intoned, will never suffice.

Thus, the Framers created the separation of powers: federalism, checks and balances; an independent judiciary; a bicameral legislature; and an executive that, while unified, lacked the power of the purse. Each branch of government would have to share power with the others, just as States and the Federal Government would have to share power as well. By preventing any one branch or any one level of government from being able to act unilaterally in its affairs, the Constitution ensured that no one individual or group would be able to run roughshod over any other. And just as important, the Constitution ensured that no major policy change could occur without substantial support from large numbers of Americans at all levels of government and society.

The genius of the Constitution lies in its insight that prosperity requires stability. Temporary majorities come and go. Their favored policies may or may not be wise. Some years ago there was a great concern that the Earth was cooling. Now there is worry in the same quarters that it is warming. Policies that may have seemed wise at one point in time later reveal themselves to be foolish, even dangerous. By dividing power among branches, States, and Washington, our Constitution helps avert sudden, large mistakes even as it enables more modest improvements supported by broad coalitions.

The Constitution's division of powers also protects against the natural inclination toward self-aggrandizement. This inclination occurs both at the governmentwide level and at the individual level. An unchecked Federal Government bent upon remedying all of society's ills will tend naturally to swallow the States, each of which has far fewer resources than the Federal leviathan. At the individual level, officeholders competing for power and prestige battle against each other as they try to enact their visions into law. Our constitutional system ensures that the Federal Government does not altogether consume the States by limiting and enumerating the Federal Government's powers and by promising that all powers not delegated to the Federal Government are reserved to the States. The Constitution also forces rival officeholders to work together in its design to prevent any one person from unilaterally making, changing or eliminating laws.

Madison famously said that ''if men were angels, no further government would be necessary.'' He further posited that ''if angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary.''

Well, as everybody knows, we are not angels, and we need controls on government to keep it in its proper sphere. The Constitution provides these controls by dividing and diffusing power and by forcing those who seek change to work with others who may not share their views.

Unfortunately, there are some who view the Constitution as an obstacle to overcome, a barrier to supposed progress. These individuals find fault with the fact that the Constitution makes change difficult and requires broad, long-lasting consensus in order to enact major reform. Surely the exigencies of the day, they argue, weren't by passing or even ignoring the separation of powers, federalism, and other elements of our constitutional structure. Although some of these individuals may be well-intentioned, they are fundamentally disguised.

The fact is that the Constitution is not an obstacle. It is a guide—a guide for how we should approach our contemporary problems, for how we should think about our roles as citizens and legislators, for how we should conduct ourselves as we debate the problems of the day.

The Constitution limits government in order to preserve freedom. It makes each branch the equal of the others and the States the equal of Washington, DC. It provides a check on all government action. It divides power among multiple sources because no one individual or office can be trusted with all authority, and it requires cooperation at all levels and all stages to ensure that changes in law are thoroughly vetted rather than rammed through by temporary majorities. These are the principles that should guide us as we seek solutions to our Nation's challenges.

These principles apply in any number of situations. A law that coerces States into coordinating or expanding programs against their will by threatening to cut off all funding for noncompliance makes States the subordinates, not equals, of the Federal Government. Executive action that purports to suspend vast swathes of our Nation's immigration laws does not honor Congress as a coequal branch, nor do statements threatening that if Congress does not act, the President will. The Constitution does not give the President a blank check. It requires him to work with Congress—a coequal

branch—to move the ball forward. Executive hubris is the antithesis of fidelity to the Constitution. More in line with what the Constitution teaches is a willingness to reach out to include fellow officeholders. A President who works all levers of government to find broad agreement understands the lessons of the Constitution. President Reagan did this with tax reform and entitlement reform. President Bush did it with education reform and financial sector reform.

Legislation that preserves the separation of powers, rather than delegating vast lawmaking authority to an unelected bureaucracy, also honors the Constitution's teachings, and so do regulations that stay within the bounds of agency authority. When agencies exceed their statutory mandate, they actually do violence to the Constitution's careful system of checks and balances. They assume power that is not theirs to take and remove decisions from the give-and-take of the democratic process. This is particularly problematic when the obvious purpose of the agency action is to bypass Congress.

EPA's recent carbon rules are but one example. When the administration found itself unable to pass cap and trade, even through a Democratic Congress, it turned to administrative fiat. It mattered not that the Clean Air Act provides no authority for the administration's exceptional harsh rules—rules that will depress economic growth and cause energy costs to soar, I might add. What mattered was the goal of reducing carbon emissions.

But the Constitution does not give the President power to right all wrongs, it requires him to work with Congress so the two bodies together can address our Nation's problems. Cooperation, the Constitution teaches, yields better results than imprudent unilateral action.

More generally, all laws that expand the government risk ignore the lesson of the Constitution. When we vote to expand government, we set ourselves against the very purpose of the Constitution to restrain the powers of the Federal Government. True, the Constitution created a more robust government to remedy the defects in the Articles of Confederation, but in creating a more robust government it placed check upon check upon check on that government. A government that can compel citizens to purchase products they do not want or to provide products repugnant to their most deeply held religious beliefs is a danger to liberty. Whenever we carve out new space for the Federal Government, we must be exceedingly careful not to upset the careful balance of the Constitution.

The Constitution also provides more subtle lessons on how we should conduct ourselves as Senators and elected officials. The overarching genius of the Constitution, as I have said, is its recognition that flourishing requires stability. Unchecked majorities are dangerous, not only because they tend to invade minority rights but also because in their enthusiasm for change, they may enact policies that cooler reflection would reveal to be unwise.

The ongoing debacle of ObamaCare is an example of this inaction. Flush with the Presidency, a majority in the House and their first filibuster-proof majority in the Senate in over 30 years, Democrats enacted fundamental changes to American health care that have forced millions of Americans off their own plans, caused premiums to skyrocket, and further insinuated government into decisions that should be made between doctors and patients.

Had my colleagues on the other side of the aisle paid greater heed to what the Constitution has to teach, they might not have rushed so headlong into these problems. The Constitution teaches the virtue of prudence and incremental reform. Rather than seeking fundamental changes, as President Obama promised during the 2008 campaign, Democrats should have focused on retaining those aspects of American health care that work well, including doctor choice, innovation, and quicker access for treatment, even while attempting to correct deficiencies.

A more modest package that sought to preserve what worked, rather than an anonymous bill so large no one had any time to actually read it, could have avoided many of the problems ObamaCare is now causing. It might even have retracted some Republican votes. Instead, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle chose a party-line vote using an obscure legislative procedure that became necessary only after the people of Massachusetts—Massachusetts—elected Scott Brown, to block the bill. They did so in such a rush, as Speaker PELOSI so memorably revealed, that they didn't know what was in their bill. My colleagues across the aisle, along with the rest of America, are now paying the price for their improvements.

My remarks on this Constitution Day have focused on the lessons the Constitution has to teach, as well as the dangers we risk when we ignore its wisdom. I wish to close by calling upon my colleagues to pay greater heed to the lessons of the Constitution when writing and voting on legislation. There is an unfortunate tendency, in my view, to think of the Constitution as the courts' domain, to leave it entirely up to the courts to decide whether a law is constitutional. We in Congress just write laws; it is up to the courts to do the constitutional stuff.

This tendency to leave things to the courts diminishes our role in the constitutional system and misses the many lessons the Constitution has to teach. The judiciary's role in assessing constitutionality is a narrow one. Courts have not asked whether any law is consistent with the Constitution's overall spirit or the principles that animate it. Rather, they ask whether it satisfies some legal role announced in a previous case. Is the regulated activity commerce? Is the punishment for noncompliance a tax or a penalty?

But fidelity to the Constitution is about much more than narrow, legal reasoning. Honoring the Constitution involves looking to the principles that undergird it—values such as individual liberty, separation of powers, federalism, respect for civil society, and democratic accountability. In determining whether a given course of action is wise, all of these things are important.

ObamaCare again provides an example. ObamaCare, in my view, is unconstitutional, not only because it exceeds Congress's power under the Constitution but also because it violates many of the enduring principles made manifest in the Constitution. It invades liberty by compelling individuals to purchase insurance against their will and undermines federalism by coercing State governments to expand Medicaid. It dilutes the separation of powers by transferring vast legislative authority to the Executive—and on and on.

The same is true of the President's order suspending immigration laws for up to 5 million illegal immigrants. It attempts to transmute legislative authority to determine who may lawfully enter our country into an unbounded Executive prerogative not to enforce the law, it end runs democratic accountability by ignoring the wishes of the people's duly elected representatives, and it undermines the respect for civil society by sanctioning conduct contrary to our laws.

Whether a law meets whatever legal test the Supreme Court has set forth does not end the inquiry for those of us who seek the Constitution as our guide. We would do well to revive what James Ceaser and others call political constitutionalism: the notion that it falls mostly to political actors such as ourselves making political decisions to protect and promote constitutional goals.

For some programs, such as ObamaCare, it means repealing the program root and branch and replacing it with one that is both more effective and more in line with our constitutional values. For other programs that have become more embedded in the fabric of American society, advancing the cause of constitutionalism will involve more incremental reform. All of our entitlement programs need improvement. We must think hard about how we can reform these programs to better serve those for whom they were intended.

James Madison called the Constitution a miracle. I think he was right on point. The Constitution is a miracle because it has endured for over 200 years. It is a miracle because of what it teaches about prudent government and the need to guard against human failings. It is a miracle because the lessons it provides are just as relevant today as they were 228 years ago. I have to say it is a miracle because well over 160 nations in this world have

tried to copy it and under none of those nations does it work as well as this country.

In some ways we are starting to lose the Constitution because of some of the actions and activities of those who want to win at any cost. May we ever look to the Constitution for guidance and pay it increased fidelity as we discharge our duties here in Washington and across this great land.

I thank the Chair.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, there has been a lot of talk around here about the Iran deal: It is over. We made our best effort. We have fully exposed exactly what is in this agreement. We had hours and hours, days and days, and weeks and weeks of debates over this. It has been on our plate ever since the beginning of the negotiations.

Some of us started to express alarm and concern about the direction of those negotiations and what was potentially being given away, but we weren't sure until, fortunately, thanks to the Corker bill, Congress had a chance to weigh in and the administration was required to give us the ability to look at every word of this agreement, the annexes and everything attached to it.

Sometime later on, we found out there were two secret side agreements which we weren't able to see, and that alone, in my opinion, should have been enough to vote against this agreement. How can one enter into any kind of a contractual relationship with a nation or a car dealer if the person you are negotiating with says: Well, there are a couple of secret matters over here that you can't have access to, but don't worry—it really won't mess things up. No one is going to sign an agreement like that except the President of the United States and apparently the Secretary of State.

We made a valiant effort to defeat this. Many of us poured our heart and soul into this not just for days, not just for weeks, not just for months, but for years. And, yes, the American people have learned a lot more about this, a lot more than what has been marketed by the White House in terms of how good this is for the future of America, our national security, and the future of the world.

In many ways, I think we have exposed—and I have listed at least 10—major issues that we conceded. There were goals that we wanted to achieve going into the negotiations, and we conceded on every single point.

In the interest of time, I will not go back over that. All I am here to do is to say that I guess I am not ready to give up. Earlier on the floor, I quoted Yogi Berra: ''It ain't over till it's over.'' Everybody said it is over, but the consequences of this are not over and the results of this are not over. We will be living this out for the duration of this agreement, and at the end of this agreement, Iran will have completed exactly the goal that it is trying to reach—in fact, they may complete it much earlier than that—and that is the legitimatization of their possession of nuclear weapons and nuclear weapon capability.

This is a country that says: We only need to develop this for medical isotopes; to fuel a reactor that is going to produce electricity for our people—despite all the Sun, wind, and the unlimited amount of oil and gas underneath their soil which could provide that much cheaper than any other form. So there is no justification for their going forward except to achieve that one goal which we know they have worked on for years. We know they have lied in terms of organizations that have been sanctioning this. And now we have simply given them a pathway to achieving this and a legitimatization of their achievement of this. Some say that all the consequences will be good because Iran will abide by every part of this agreement and throughout this process there is going to be a major change in Iran—the theocracy will be overthrown, and they will become a responsible neighbor and nation—and this is the pathway to achieving that—that is the vision of the President. That is the dream.

Frankly, I hope my assessment of this is wrong. For the sake of the future of the United States, for the sake of the future of Israel, and for the sake of the future of the world, I hope I am wrong. But there is nothing in this agreement and there is nothing that has been said or done by the Iranian regime that would give us any indication—any hint at all—of any kind of change in their behavior. In fact, as they deride our agreement, our negotiators, and embarrass our President day after day after day with ''Death to America'' and ''Extinction of Israel.'' What will be the consequences? As I said, I discussed at length what I think is wrong with this bill. I won't go over that again today. It is already in the RECORD. But there will be consequences that I don't think we have fully discussed, and I wish to lay out some of those.

For Iran, they will have liberation from all sanctions and will be back in business. They will become rich. They will become rich with the release of hundreds of billions of dollars, and they will be using that for any number of purposes.

Their oil industry is dominated by the Republican Guards. This is not Exxon Mobil, not Occidental Petroleum, it is not any of our international oil companies; this is the Republican Guards. A military organization that dominates that oil industry. They will be free to exploit one of the largest oil reserves in the world. Their national income will spike. State coffers will fill. And Iran's terrorist adventures and proxy wars will be well funded.

We all know about Iran's ambitions for dominance throughout the Middle East and to be recognized as a world nuclear power. They will have all the more money now to be able to feed their proxies fighting for them in Syria, in Yemen, in Lebanon, in Iraq, in a number of places throughout the Middle East, and their terrorist threats resonate across the globe.

After nearly a decade of international efforts to force Iran to give up on this dangerous and illegal nuclear activity, Iran now has a green light—a pathway built for them by U.S. concessions in this agreement—to reach nuclear weapons capability. We have entirely conceded to Iran the right to create fissile material that can only have one use: nuclear weapons.

Now let's look at the larger question: the region, and the strategic impact of this on the region. We haven't really had a great deal of discussion on the strategic consequences. I discussed it briefly during some of my time earlier this week and last week, but the Iranian continuing revolution and regional misbehavior will affect the Middle East and will affect the world. It is dangerous and it is irresponsible.

Former Secretaries of State Kissinger and Schultz—well regarded for their experience and well recognized as global experts, international experts—discussed this broader strategic point in an important joint article that was released last April. Former Secretaries Kissinger and Schultz explained that the then-outlined deal was so weak that Iran would inevitably expand its power, Sunni States will inevitably proliferate in their response, and the United States will get dragged into Middle East wars—except, this time, the wars may be nuclear.

Let me quote from their statement. The Secretaries explained:

> Previous thinking on nuclear strategy assumed the existence of stable state actors. . . .

Iran is anything but stable.

These are wise words from wise people who have had a lifetime of experience.

Unfortunately, their views seem to have been largely ignored, if not completely ignored, by this administration, because it didn't fit their purpose to complete a deal, no matter what. No matter what we had to give up, they wanted to complete this deal. In fact, the State Department's spokesman was quoted as disparaging the two Secretaries of State, Kissinger and Schultz, stating that their words were just ''big words and big thoughts'' and that the two were ''not living in the real world.'' Not living in the real world. I think that statement applies much more to the President and the Secretary of State than it does to former

Secretaries of State Kissinger and Schultz.

Let's look at proliferation. Some of us have discussed the obvious proliferation dangers flowing from an agreement that puts Iran on the path of nuclear weapons. Despite the reluctant words of acquiescence that have been wrung out of others in the region, who can possibly argue that Iran now will never be permitted to develop these nuclear weapons technologies without a response from others.

If I were the King of Saudi Arabia, if I were the Prime Minister or the President of any major country in the Middle East, I am not going to stand by and watch Iran achieve nuclear dominance. They are going to take their own action.

We have now basically shredded the nuclear nonproliferation treaty.

Let's look at Syria and the impact on Syria. America's appalling lack of effective response to the open wound that is Syria is one example of the paralysis born out of the single-minded obsession accommodating the Iranian regime. Iran is the principal prop for the brutal Syrian regime. Assad could not have remained in power these past 4 years of catastrophic disintegration of his country without Iran's support. I fear our negotiations with Iran have taken on such an overwhelming priority with an administration obsessed with legacy that it helped freeze us into inaction on Syria. The administration claims the nuclear negotiations were about Iran's nuclear misbehavior only and were never intended to address the rest of its regional brutality. That is true in some cases, but careful reading of the annexes and careful reading of the agreement—by doing so, we now know the administration went well beyond just discussing the nuclear capability issue. It did not address the hostages that were being held by the Iranian regime—the Americans. It did not address the ballistic missile development and proliferation. Those are two issues which had nothing to do with the agreement itself, according to the administration.

Negotiations between the Ayatollahs and the Great Satan—that is us, according to the Ayatollah—could not happen in a vacuum. Subjects not addressed by the negotiations nevertheless are affected by them, and our stupefying passivity on Syria proves the case.

Let's look at Russia. Our problems with Russia have only grown and multiplied as we tried to ignore Russian misbehavior during our joint negotiations with Iran. But worse, our obsession with getting a deal has unleashed a Russia-Iran axis. Their new cooperation creates yet another threat to American interests.

Just days after concluding this deal, the commander of Iran's elite Quds Force, General Suleimani, flew to Moscow—which he was sanctioned by the U.N. not to do, but he did anyway—reportedly to convince the Russians to step in to help shore up the crumbling Assad regime in Syria. It worked. The Russians are now in Syria in force, building barracks and bringing in trainers, tanks, and other heavy weapons. Iran and Russia together are Assad's best friends—maybe his savior.

By ignoring Syria, empowering and enriching Iran, and making Putin's Russia an actual negotiating partner, we have created the perfect storm. This is the price of dealing with the devil.

Lastly, let me speak about Israel because any discussion of consequences must return to what should be the core issue: the consequences for our only and best friend in the Middle East, Israel—the only democratic ally in the region. We cannot ignore the major risks that will follow through with the often-repeated threats of obliterating the State of Israel—a threat repeated by the Supreme Leader in no uncertain terms just this week. Is this hyperbole or posturing as the administration claims? The Israelis don't think so, and I don't think so.

We have to assume that an extremist, violent state such as Iran, after decades of creating, arming, and guiding terrorist organizations devoted to Israel's destruction, will continue their assault one day, now we know, with nuclear weapons. One day, others may look back through the smoke and ashes created by this Iran deal and wonder how we could ever have been so blind. How could we ever have conceded to an agreement that violated every goal that the previous three Presidents and current President said we must not concede on—that is, it is totally unacceptable for Iran to have possession of nuclear weapons capability.

Two Democratic Presidents, two Republican Presidents, over three decades of time, have made that statement. It was the goal of the United States to do everything in its capability to prevent Iran from having a nuclear weapon, and we just signed an agreement that gave them the pathway to that nuclear weapon. Does it possibly delay their achievement of that? Yes. But does it reach the goal of preventing them from having it? No.

So after all the shouting and all the efforts and all the debate and all the examination of the agreements, we are told to give up. It is a done deal. The President used his ''Executive authority'' to deem this an agreement and not a treaty, which is a fallacy in itself. But now we are told we have to give it up. We have to move on. We have other things to do. You made your best effort. We won, you lost.

No, America lost. America lost, and we will be paying a price year after year after year as we watch the flow of money into Iran, the flow of oil out of Iran and money in return, supporting proxy wars throughout the Middle East, igniting a nuclear arms race in that tinder box of the region. We will regret the day—we will regret the day—the announcement was made that we have signed a deal with Iran.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I have come to make a unanimous consent request. I was going to tell the body why I was doing that and then make a unanimous consent request. But my colleague and friend from Texas, who is going to object to it, has a plane to catch, so I am going to make the unanimous consent request, let him object, let him explain why he objects, and then I will explain why I was for it. It won't change the thrust of this.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 139, 140, and 141; that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and on behalf of Senator GRASSLEY, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I would just briefly point out that during President Obama's term of office, the Senate has confirmed more judicial nominees than it had at this point in 2007. Our pace simply follows the standard set by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle established that year. In the Judiciary Committee, we have had more hearings and moved more nominees than we did last year.

In terms of the Executive Calendar, everyone knows that at the end of last year, during the lameduck session, our Democratic friends rammed through 11 Federal judges. Under regular order, these judges should have been considered at the beginning of this Congress. That is what happened in 2006 when 13 nominations were returned to the President. Had we not confirmed in the lameduck 11 judicial nominees during last year, we would roughly be on pace for judicial nominations this year compared to 2007.

So we are working at the usual pace, and on behalf of Chairman GRASSLEY, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I regret my colleague's objection. I hope they will change their minds. But once again I must rise to address the growing crisis of judicial vacancies in our Federal and district courts.

We all know it is the job of the Senate to responsibly keep up with the

need for confirmed judges. Unfortunately, my friends on the other side of the aisle slowed the judicial confirmation process to a crawl. They did their best to slow the pace of confirmation when the Senate was under Democratic leadership and now are sluggishly moving on nominations even more so in the Senate they control. It has resulted in a nearly 10 percent vacancy in judicial positions throughout the United States. There are 31 districts that are considered judicial emergencies, meaning they don't have enough judges to hear the caseload. The longer we wait to move judges through committee and to the floor, the worse the numbers will get.

Let me take the Western District of New York as an example to talk a bit about these vacancies and what they mean in practice. Western New York has the cities of Buffalo and Rochester and the surrounding areas. There is not a single active Federal district judge in the Western Federal District—not one. The district has one of the busiest caseloads in the country. It handles more criminal cases than Washington, DC, or Boston. It is on the Canadian border, making it particularly busy, and yet they don't have a single active Federal judge. The delays for civil trials are by far the worst in the country. It takes 5 years for a median case to go to trial. That is denial of justice, just about. It is un-American. If not for the efforts of two judges on senior status who are volunteering to hear cases in their retirement, the Western District of New York would be at a full standstill.

The lack of judges has real legal consequences. In the Western District of New York, Judge Skretny—on senior status—has admitted that he is encouraging all cases to settle in pretrial mediation in order to lower caseloads. Criminal trials are prioritized while civil trials languish in delay. The two retired judges, who are the only ones reading cases at the moment, are spending far less time on each individual case than they would under normal circumstances. And defendants may be inclined to settle, admit guilt, and take plea deals rather than wait out a lengthy trial process.

As many of my colleagues have said so eloquently, the harsh truth is that for these petitioners, companies, and communities, justice is being delayed and thus denied. And the same story line is playing out in courtrooms throughout the country. This is not how our judicial system is supposed to work, and it should be an easy problem to rectify.

Right now, there are 13 noncontroversial judges on the Executive Calendar, and 3 more were reported out of committee today. Of those, three are highly qualified judges from New York, including one from the Western District. I know these nominees. They are brilliant people, experienced jurists, and above all they are moderate. This Senator believes in moderation in the choosing of judges. Larry Vilardo and Ann Donnelly are two whom I have recommended, and LaShann DeArcy Hall was recommended by a good friend, the junior Senator from New York, Senator GILLIBRAND. They should all be confirmed, but we don't know when they will come up for a vote. All of these nominees exceed my standards for judicial nominees. In his or her own way, each brings excellence, moderation, and diversity to the Federal bench.

They are not the only outstanding nominees we have. We have judges pending from Missouri, California, and several other States—represented by Republican Senators as much as Democrats—which are experiencing the same judicial emergencies and heavy caseloads. These are nominees who have already moved out of committee, all with bipartisan support. I am not offending the traditional committee process by asking simply to move them off the floor and onto the bench where they belong.

I came to the floor last July to request that we move to confirm these nominees. Unfortunately, my request was blocked by my good friend the Senator from Iowa. In response to my request, I was basically told: The nominees are moving along just fine. Be patient.

Well, we are several months later and still we have no indication that these judicial nominees will ever be moved off the Executive Calendar for a vote.

I was told—and I am paraphrasing—that if one would only count all the judges Democrats confirmed at the end of the last Congress, the Republican record on judges wouldn't look so bad. With all due respect to my friend from Iowa, I don't believe he can take credit for our work like that. One cannot slice and dice the numbers to make the Republican record on judicial confirmations any better. Listen to this. The fact is that the Republican leadership has scheduled votes on only six Federal judges this whole Congress—six—less than one a month. There is no reason for that.

Even if we did give Republicans credit for the judges the Democrats approved at the end of last Congress, we would still be far behind the pace of confirmations in the past because by comparison, through the seventh year of President Bush's Presidency where there was a Republican President but Democrats controlled the Senate, 29 judges had been approved—6 compared to 29. How is that parity?

When Democrats controlled the Senate during the final 2 years of George W. Bush's Presidency, we confirmed 68 judges. When Republicans controlled the Senate during the 2 final years of President Clinton's Presidency, we confirmed 73 judges. How many confirmations have there been in these last 2 years when Republicans have controlled the Senate, having a Democratic President? Six. The comparison numbers are 73, 68, 6. Is that equal? Is that the same as they are always doing, as they say? Of course not.

The Republican majority is confirming judges at the slowest rate in more than 60 years, and as a result, the number of current vacancies has shot up nearly 50 percent and the number of judicial emergencies has increased 158 percent. In no world is that a reasonable pace, as I have been assured by my colleagues.

There are no values more American than the speedy application of justice and the right to petition the government for a redress of grievances. Frankly, neither of these can be achieved without judges on the bench. The equal and fair application of justice is necessarily tarnished by a courtroom without a judge. It is as simple as that.

So today I moved that we move to New York's pending judicial nominations, but the request was rejected. I hope my colleagues will think this through. It is a blemish on this Congress. It is a blemish on the idea that we are getting things done. It is a blemish when our Republican leader says this Congress is doing things at a better pace than in previous years.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

DR. MICHELLE COLBY AND JONATHAN MCENTEE

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, literally every month of this year, I have come to the Senate floor to do something that one of our former colleagues, Ted Kaufman, who served as our Senator for 2 years after JOE BIDEN became Vice President—Ted used to come to the floor not on a monthly basis but even more frequently than that to talk about what was being done by any number of Federal employees across our country, to draw attention to the fact that these are not nameless, faceless bureaucrats, these are people who do important work for each of us in a variety of ways.

What I have tried to do in the last several months—I think most of this year—is to come to the floor to recognize the work not of the Federal employees at large but the work of a few of the many exemplary Department of Homeland Security employees and to thank them for their dedication to their mission and their service to our Nation, which is an important one. And the reason I have particular interest in this is that I have been the senior Democrat on homeland security the last couple of years, and I worked with Tom Coburn of Oklahoma. The two of us were privileged to lead the committee.

In June I spoke about several outstanding officers in the U.S. Coast

Guard, one of them a petty officer, a woman named Joscelyn Greenwell, who is stationed at Coast Guard Station Indian River Inlet in southern Delaware, which is just a little bit north of Bethany Beach and just south of Rehoboth. In July I had the opportunity to actually visit Petty Officer Greenwell and 30 of her colleagues to learn more about how she and her unit serve and how they protect the rest of us. It is not just Delawareans who seek recreation—fish, boat, and swim—in the inland bays in Delaware or in the Atlantic ocean; people from all over the country and actually all over the world do that, and we are grateful.

But the devotion of Petty Officer Greenwell and her colleagues to their mission is shared by thousands of men and women serving with the U.S. Coast Guard and throughout the Department of Homeland Security. The Coast Guard used to be part of Treasury, as I recall, but today it is, since the creation of the Department of Homeland Security, part of DHS.

Well, today I want to just take just a few minutes to recognize the service of and say thanks to two other exemplary public servants who work at the Department of Homeland Security, not in the Coast Guard, but in this case, in the Science and Technology Directorate. While many at the Department of Homeland Security put their lives on the line along our borders, at our ports of entry, and our airports or in response to disasters, some are working behind the scenes to secure our homeland against new threats or better respond to those we face today.

This is what happens every day at the Science and Technology Directorate. They give their all to provide frontline personnel the best tools and tactics that are available. Essentially, the role of the Department's Science and Technology employees is to keep our homeland security efforts a step ahead of the ever-evolving threats we face as a nation. They do this through state-of-the-art research and development issues performed by some of our Nation's top engineers, top scientists, top researchers.

The product of their work is deployed across the Department. From cyber security, to biological defense, to border security, Science and Technology's research, development, and science work is truly vital to all of us. Science and Technology employees work closely with the trade and travel industry and with many academic groups as well. They also work closely with other research and scientific agencies across all levels of government to meet the needs of first responders, to enhance strategy and analysis, and to bolster operations and capability.

Among the threats that science and technology seeks to address are the threats to our agricultural system. Agriculture is, of course, vital to our Nation's economic stability and our security. In Delaware, agriculture remains one of the key industries at the heart of the State's economic activity. I think of Delaware as a three- or four-legged stool—at least our economy sits on a three- or four-legged stool.

One of the strong legs, in Southern Delaware especially, is agriculture. In Sussex Country Delaware, we produce more chickens than any county in America. In Sussex County, Delaware—we only have three counties. The biggest—Sussex County is the third largest county in Delaware, but they produce more chickens in Sussex County than any county in America. We raise more soybeans in Sussex County, Delaware, and we feed it to the chickens, along with corn and other things. But biological and manmade threats to our food, whether it is poultry, avian influenza, and so forth, whether manmade threats to our food or animal agriculture system could have devastating impacts to our economy and to our day-to-day lives. It certainly poses a great threat to the Delmarva Peninsula and other places where we raise poultry—and turkeys for that matter. That is why the Department of Homeland Security has a number of employees at Science and Technology whose mission is to prevent and protect against threats to our agricultural infrastructure. In July, I held a hearing, alongside my colleague, Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee Chairman RON JOHNSON of Wisconsin. We held the hearing to examine the threat that avian influenza poses to public health and also to our poultry industry.

In recent months, parts of the poultry industry across our country have been grappling with the devastating outbreak of avian influenza. Although the spread of this disease has slowed, and most of the areas that were affected were in the central part of our country, including Wisconsin, including Iowa, many States have lost millions of chickens and turkeys to this disease. As a result, the economic losses our farmers and businesses are dealing with in those parts of the country are staggering.

The Presiding Officer probably does not know this—maybe he does—but there are roughly 300 chickens for every person in Delaware, as I said. I mentioned we raise more chickens in Sussex County than any county in America, but our poultry farmers create—ready for this—more than $2.7 billion in State economic activity each year and account for about 70 percent of our State's agricultural exports. We have cows we milk, dairy cattle, we have pigs, we raise a lot of lima beans and that kind of thing, but poultry is the 800-pound gorilla in the room in our economy.

Luckily for our poultry farmers in the Delmarva Peninsula and across the country, public servants like Dr. Michelle Colby are working at the Department of Homeland Security on cutting-edge research to protect against potential disease outbreaks like the avian influenza, the avian flu.

Here she is right now, Dr. Michelle Colby. I will talk a little bit about Michelle, if I may. She is the Branch Chief of Agriculture Defense at the Science and Technology Directorate. Her mission is to develop tools, including vaccines and diagnostics, to prevent livestock from natural and manmade disease threats. Michelle works closely with the Department of Agriculture to help develop and support research projects, track their progress, and stay ahead of existing and emerging threats.

She has also the critically important responsibility of making sure research and development programs across our Federal Government are well coordinated, not duplicated, and always ready to respond to disease outbreaks. A primary part of this woman's job is to make sure Science and Technology, where she works within DHS, uses the lessons learned from previous disease outbreaks to inform research and prevent or better control future outbreaks.

In fact, information gathered during the last few years as part of another project at Science and Technology is currently being used by Michelle's team to help the Department of Agriculture in its response to the avian influenza outbreak I just mentioned. Michelle and her team were also instrumental in helping combat another recent threat to our Nation's agricultural industry and to us, foot-and-mouth disease.

In May of 2012, they secured a conditional license to a Department of Homeland Security foot-and-mouth disease vaccine for use in cattle. This was the first foot-and-mouth disease vaccine ever licensed in the United States—ever licensed in the United States. The conditional license was renewed in May of last year and is now valid through I think May of next year. Michelle and her team's important work did not go unnoticed. They were finalists for the Partnership for Public Service to America Medal for their efforts.

According to her colleagues, Michelle is ''one of the most respected scientists in the area of Veterinary Science.'' Her colleagues tell me she never loses sight of her critical mission and that she is a dedicated public servant of the highest integrity. Michelle earned her bachelor of science degree in animal science from the University of Maryland Eastern Shore. That is on the Delmarva Peninsula. She is our neighbor just to the south of us. She has also a doctor of veterinary medicine degree from Virginia-Maryland Regional College of Veterinary Medicine. She also has a master of science in epidemiology from the University of Maryland College Park.

Interestingly enough, her graduate work focused on the Delmarva poultry industry. While some of the important work at—let me just say: Michelle, thank you for what you do, not just for Delmarva, not just for those who are

involved in the poultry industry but thank you for what you do for our country and all of us who, frankly, enjoy eating poultry and for all of us who are involved in exporting and selling poultry around the world.

It used to be that 1 out of every 100 chickens we raised in America we exported, then it was 5 out of 100, 10 out of 100, and now it is 20 out of 100. We are negotiating a new transpacific trade partnership with 11 other countries that will encompass about 40 percent of the world's markets. We want to make sure on Delmarva, and frankly in a lot of other places around this country, that we can use this trade agreement to sell that which we are really good at; that is, raising chickens.

While some of the important work at Science and Technology happens in the lab, some scientists and engineers there team up with other agencies within the Department of Homeland Security to get a firsthand look at how to enhance capabilities and operations on the frontlines. For Jonathan McEntee—known as Jon—Jon's Science and Technology work has taken him into the field of joint missions with the Coast Guard, with Customs and Border Protection, and with Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

Public service is nothing new to Jon. In fact, it runs in his family. Jon was born on a U.S. Air Force base, not in Dover, DE, but in the United Kingdom of all places, in a place called Lakenheath, United Kingdom. He is the proud son of a retired linguist and the grandson of a 50-year GE chemical engineer and World War II veteran. He continues his family's history of service to our country today through his work ensuring the security and economic prosperity of the United States in his role at Science and Technology.

Since 2007, the last several years, Jon has worked at the Borders and Maritime Security Division at Science and Technology within the Department of Homeland Security. It is called Security Advanced Research Projects Agency. This component is responsible for the research, for the development, for the testing and evaluation needs for the Department's land borders, ports of entry, and maritime mission environments.

Since becoming the division's Deputy Director in 2011, Jon has managed several projects, developing maritime, border, and cargo security initiatives. He is responsible for managing the congressional, financial, and technical oversight of operations, along with its 30 employees. On any given day, Jon is juggling 40 projects on a wide range of activities all across the Department.

According to his colleagues, Jon believes technology is the key to remaining competitive and relevant in an ever-changing global environment. So it is no surprise that he helped establish the technology innovation center within the Coast Guard, to help deliver technical capabilities for the Department's operators in a faster and more efficient process. Jon also helps in the efforts to build a more cohesive and unified Department of Homeland Security. They have a saying over there, ''One DHS.'' He is part of that.

He regularly represents Science and Technology on Department-level projects to help improve coordination and make the best use of science resources. Efforts like Jon's are supporting Secretary Jeh Johnson's Unity of Effort Initiative, an effort to help the Department operate more efficiently and effectively. That is something I think we can all get behind.

Colleagues say that Jon looks at solutions to problems not only from a security aspect but also while thinking about how they impact the overall economic interest of our country. He believes all solutions must have a positive return on investment over existing methods and practices. Jon is well known for his let's-find-a-way attitude and always encourages his colleagues to be a part of the solution rather than add to the problem. I like to say: ''No'' means find another way.

The work ethic he embodies and his leadership can be credited for his work building partnerships to promote our Nation's economic growth. Specifically, he helped facilitate a partnership that included Customs and Border Protection, Mexican and Canadian Customs, General Motors, the Ford Motor Company, Honda Manufacturing, Pacific Union, and Ferromex Rail to successfully conduct a cargo security technology demonstration that operates four U.S.-bound supply chain routes originating from Mexico and originating from Canada.

That achievement earned him wide praise, including the Department of Homeland Security and Technology Under Secretary's Award in 2014. Jon earned his master's in business administration from Salisbury University and a bachelor of science degree in finance from Frostburg State University. He and his wife Heather, an Air Force veteran, have three children: Sage, Myra, and Jack.

I just want to say to Sage, Myra and Jack: Thank you for sharing not just your mom but your dad as well with the people of our country. Thank you.

The efforts of Michelle and Jon provide just a glimpse into the important work being done by hundreds of thousands of individuals across the Department of Homeland Security every single day. These men and women are dedicated. They are exemplary public servants. They are unsung heroes who walk among us every day. More often than not, their good work goes unnoticed—not today. These are not nameless, faceless bureaucrats. These are people with great educations, a great desire to serve our country, and who every day make a difference for us in this country with the work they do.

Michelle and Jon, right here—Jon, thank you. For Michelle, whose picture was up here just a moment ago, we want to thank you for what you do. We want to thank as well the 200,000 men and woman you work with at the Department of Homeland Security. We are a safer country because of your service and I think we are a better country too. As we say in the Navy when people do especially good work, we say two words: One of them is ''Bravo'' and the other is ''Zulu.'' So, Michelle and Jon, Bravo Zulu. God bless you.

JOB CREATION

Mr. President, if you will bear with me, I wish to talk for a little bit about another important issue, if I could, and I don't see anybody else on the floor, so I will forge ahead.

I actually said this earlier today when we were having a discussion on the Iran agreement, but it bears repeating. When I go back to the elections of last November, I have three messages that are takeaways that I continue to come back to.

The first takeaway for me last November was this: The American people are sending us a message. They said they want us to work together. The second message is they want us to get stuff done, things that we need to get done for the good of our country, and they especially want us to get things done that will help strengthen our economic recovery.

On the good-news side, the Department of Labor reported today that the number of people who filed for unemployment insurance this past week—this number comes out of the Department of Labor every Thursday that is not a Federal holiday, and they have been doing this for years. The week Barack Obama and JOE BIDEN were inaugurated as President and Vice President—that week in January of 2009—628,000 people filed for unemployment insurance. Anytime that number is over 400,000 people filing for unemployment insurance in a week, we are losing jobs.

At the beginning of 2009, we were losing a lot of jobs. We lost 2.5 million jobs in this country in the last 6 months of 2008. We lost 2.5 million more jobs in this country in the first 6 months of 2009. And as we went through 2009, that number—628,000 people filing for unemployment insurance every week—frankly didn't come down a lot. After a year or so, it began to trend down. Finally, it went down to 600,000, eventually to 500,000, and finally it dipped below 500,000 after a couple of years. Several years ago, that number came down to 400,000.

The reason 400,000 is an important number in terms of people filing for unemployment insurance is when that number drops on a weekly basis below 400,000, we are starting to add jobs back—or at least our economy is. For the last 28 straight weeks, the number of folks filing for unemployment insurance in this country has been under 300,000. One of the reasons we are adding, in most months, 200,000 to 250,000 is

because not nearly as many people are losing their jobs, and that is a very good thing.

Even though the economy is arguably better than it was—I think the unemployment rate in this country in January of 2009 was heading toward 10 percent. The unemployment rate today is closer to 5 percent. Is that too high? Sure it is. Can we do better than that? We have to do better than that.

So one of the things I always focus on is trying to figure out how we—when I was Governor of Delaware and chairman of the National Governors Association, I always was interested in how we could create a more nurturing environment for job creation and job preservation. In the 8 years I was privileged to be Governor of Delaware, I am told that more jobs were created in those 8 years than any year maybe in Delaware history—any 8-year period in Delaware history. I didn't create a one of them. Governors don't create jobs. Mayors don't create jobs. Senators—however good we are—don't create jobs. Presidents don't create job. What we do is help create a nurturing environment for job creation.

What does that include? Access to capital. People starting businesses usually have to raise money. A world-class workforce with the kinds of skills that will help businesses be successful. Transportation to move people and business services where they need to go and when they need to go. Public safety. Reasonably priced energy. Reasonably priced health care. You name it. A lot of things go into creating a nurturing environment for job creation and job preservation.

(The remarks of Mr. CARPER pertaining to the introduction of S. 2051 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Still seeing no one else on the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

POPE FRANCIS'S ADDRESS TO CONGRESS AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, last year I had the opportunity to travel to the Vatican. During my visit, I had the chance to overlook St. Peter's Square from a Vatican balcony. As I took in the view of that historic square, the Sun glinted off the future. Across the square, I saw the rooftop of Pope Paul VI Audience Hall on the Vatican grounds covered with solar panels. It was clear from that view that the Vatican takes climate change very seriously and had long been preparing to have a profound impact on this generational issue that touches every living creature on the planet.

I was at the Vatican as the only U.S. representative in a group of high-level legislators from around the world who are all working to address climate change in their own countries. We met with Cardinal Pietro Parolin and Cardinal Peter Turkson, the Vatican leaders responsible for writing the initial draft of Pope Francis's historical environmental encyclical, and shared the impact of climate change in our own home countries with the two cardinals who were going to be writing that encyclical.

The conversation then turned to what was happening in the countries of the legislators who were visiting. The lawmaker from the Philippines discussed the destruction that Typhoon Haiyan brought to parts of her country. Legislators from South Africa and Mexico shared the challenges their countries and regions face from drought. The representatives from Europe pointed to the damage from extreme heat waves and rainfall. I relayed my concern with the rising levels, temperature, and acidity of the ocean and the impacts on coastal communities. Rising sea levels are eroding our shores in Massachusetts and New England and across our country, increasing the damage in New England of nor'easters. In recent years, ocean temperatures in our part of the Atlantic ocean have been the hottest ever recorded. In one case, off of Cape Cod, it was 21 degrees warmer than normal this January, in Massachusetts, off of our coastline.

But all of us who had gathered at the Vatican were in agreement that the world's poorest people are suffering the worst consequences of climate change—extreme poverty, famine, disease, and displacement—which is why it should be no surprise that Pope Francis, a Jesuit trained in chemistry who is devoted to the poor and ensuring a just and better future for all mankind, would be the only Pope to devote an entire encyclical to humanity's relationship with the environment. In releasing his encyclical and giving us his message to protect what he calls ''our common home,'' Pope Francis has also given us a common goal: We must act now to stop climate change. But make no mistake—this Pope is looking for leadership. Pope Francis is looking for results. He is looking for all of us to lead to solve this problem.

Next week, we will have the honor of hosting Pope Francis here in Washington, DC, and hearing him address a joint meeting of the United States House of Representatives and the Senate—unprecedented—and the entire Nation will be watching the Pope as he speaks because we all need to hear Pope Francis's message of love, of compassion, of justice and action. And we need to join in the conversation he is calling the world to engage in about protecting people and our planet.

The science of climate change has been clear for decades. Global temperatures are warming, glaciers are melting, and sea levels are rising. Extreme downpours and weather events are increasing. The ocean is becoming more dangerously acidic. Last year was the warmest year ever recorded. Today, NOAA announced that this summer was the hottest summer since 1880. Increasing temperatures increase the risk for bad air days, in turn increasing the risk of asthma attacks and worse for people who actually have lung disease. Global warming is also a public health crisis.

The economic and security costs are now dangerously evident. Climate change is aggravating tensions around the world, especially where food and water security are at the heart of the conflicts. It is spawning new crises that are displacing millions of people and creating an era of refugees. This will require action by our diplomats and aid organizations, but every nation must do its fair share.

Pope Francis's address to Congress next week will offer us the opportunity to examine our own policies, their impact on not only the people of our Nation but on the entire planet, and our duty as leaders and as human beings to take action.

Pope Francis has brought this moral imperative to act on climate change just as the nations of the world are working to forge an international agreement in Paris this December as the world gathers to deal with this issue. The United States must lead this effort. The United States must heed the message of Pope Francis. The United States must be the nation in Paris in December saying to the rest of the world that we can and must do something to solve this problem.

We know that clean energy will be at the heart of meeting any of the goals which we have to establish here and across the planet in order to cut pollution. We must continue to improve the fuel efficiency of the automobiles and trucks we drive here in the United States. We must deploy more wind and solar energy and renew tax breaks for those projects.

By making a commitment to reduce the pollution imperiling our planet, we can engage in job creation that is good for all of creation. The United States can be the leader in the technological revolution to reduce the pollution imperiling our planet, and then we can partner with other nations to share this technology and protect the most vulnerable around the world.

Pope Francis said in his encyclical, ''Today, in the view of the common good, there is an urgent need for politics and economics to enter into a frank dialogue in the service of life, especially life.'' We know that to agree on a course of action is no easy task in this Chamber, but if we harness the ambition of the Moon landing, the technological power of our workers, and the moral imperative of Pope Francis's message, we can leave the world a better place than we found it. We have done it before. We have the tools to do it again. Now we need to forge the political will in order to accomplish those goals.

We need more solar, we need more wind, and we need the batteries for the vehicles we drive in order to reduce the amount of polluting fossil fuels we send up into the atmosphere. We need to invest. We need to be the technological giants. We need to unleash the same kind of revolution in the energy sector as we did in the telecommunications sector in the 1990s. No one on the planet except the United States had a device like this on their person just 15 years ago. We invented telecommunications. We invented the way in which people not just here in America but all across the planet—Africa, Asia, South America—communicate with these wireless devices. We can do the same thing on energy. We can do the same thing with wind and solar. We can reinvent the kinds of vehicles we drive—cars, trucks, buses. We can do it. We have to have the will. We have to listen to the Pope. We have to play the role that the United States is expected to lead by the rest of the world in order to meet this moral imperative. And we can do it by creating millions of new jobs here in the United States. So that is our challenge.

The Pope is arriving next week. For me, as a boy who grew up going to the Immaculate Conception Grammar School, Malden Catholic, Boston College, and Boston College Law School—Catholic school every day for 19 years—this is just an incredible thrill, knowing that, in a way, when he is standing up on that podium, it is going to be a latter-day ''Sermon on the Mount'' that he delivers to us telling us what our job is today: to save this beautiful planet God has created while also avoiding the worst consequences for the poorest people on the planet if we do not solve the problem.

Let's work together in a bipartisan fashion in order to heed the message of Pope Francis.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 230, H.R. 36.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 230, H.R. 36, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 230, H.R. 36, to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Joni Ernst, Mike Lee, Mike Rounds, Chuck Grassley, Tim Scott, Patrick J. Toomey, John Boozman, David Perdue, Johnny Isakson, James M. Inhofe, James E. Risch, Steve Daines, Roy Blunt, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune, James Lankford.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF MICHAEL C. MCGOWAN TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

NOMINATION OF SIM FARAR TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

NOMINATION OF SIM FARAR TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM JOSEPH HYBL TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM JOSEPH HYBL TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 248, 301, 302, 303, and 304; that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc without intervening action or debate; that following disposition of the nominations, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations of Michael C. McGowan, of Delaware, to be United States Marshal for the District of Delaware, for the term of four years; Sim Farar, of California, to be a Member of the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy for a term expiring July 1, 2015; Sim Farar, of California, to be a Member of the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy for a term expiring July 1, 2018; William Joseph Hybl, of Colorado, to be a Member of the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy for a term expiring July 1, 2015; and William Joseph Hybl, of Colorado, to be a Member of the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy for a term expiring July 1, 2018?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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.

RECOGNIZING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF PASTOR CLINTON HOUSE AND DR. MARY L. HOUSE'S PASTORAL SERVICE WITH MOUNTAINTOP FAITH MINISTRIES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Pastor Clinton House and Dr. Mary L. House and their 25 years of pastoral service with Mountaintop Faith Ministries.

Pastor Clinton House and Dr. Mary House began their ministry work at a small church in North Las Vegas with 13 members. Over the years, Mountaintop Faith Ministries outgrew its humble beginnings. In 1993, the church's congregation grew so much they had to open the doors of the church and put chairs in the lobby and out to the street. The church continued to grow, and eventually, they began holding services in the auditorium of Durango High School to accommodate churchgoers. Today, Mountaintop Faith Ministries has a church complex and upwards of 3,500 members.

Mountaintop Faith Ministries has continuously given back to the Las Vegas community. The Sunday services have provided spiritual guidance for thousands, and the church also offers midweek Bible classes and business fairs, where owners can share their businesses with church members following services. One Resurrection Sunday, they held a ''dress down'' Sunday on the football field at Durango High School. This community event brought buses of homeless to worship

with them. After the service, church members provided food for the homeless, as well.

For the past 25 years, Pastor Clinton House and Dr. Mary House have touched the Las Vegas community through their dedicated work. I congratulate them on their many successes and wish them the best in their future endeavors.

228TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, we celebrate the 228th anniversary of the signing of the Constitution of the United States. Some elected officials talk about their love of ''the Constitution and the Bill of Rights''. That specific phrasing is interesting in that it somehow implies that the Constitution does not itself include the Bill of Rights, which of course it does. But it contains much more than those original 10 amendments. Each year, I remind Americans that we must celebrate not just the original Constitution of Washington, Hamilton, Madison, and the Founding generation but the whole Constitution, including its 27 amendments. This includes the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments, which many scholars have rightly described as our Nation's Second Founding.

The Senate commemorated the Sesquicentennial or the 150th anniversary of the Second Founding earlier this year when the Senate passed a resolution raising awareness about this series of amendments, which provided the country with a new birth of freedom. Ratified by President Lincoln and his generation after the Civil War, these Second Founding amendments transformed our original charter—most fundamentally—by elevating the principle of equality to a central place in our constitutional order.

This year, the Supreme Court once again upheld the Constitution's promise of equality when it ruled that the 14th Amendment of the Constitution protects the right of each American to marry the person they love, regardless of their sexual orientation or gender identity. Because of that ruling, LGBT children all across America will grow up knowing that they can love without fear, and that they are equal citizens of this great Nation.

Although the Constitution provides us with the promise of equality, we must never forget that it is up to all of us to advance and protect that intrinsic American value of equality. Each generation must do its part. This is true whether it is racial equality, gender equality, or equality based on a person's sexual orientation or gender identity. We have come a long way in each of those areas, but we continue to have work to do.

On racial equality, too many of our citizens continue to face racial discrimination in voting. As a result of the Supreme Court's dreadful ruling in Shelby County v. Holder, Americans across the country are now vulnerable to racially discriminatory voting laws that restrict the franchise without the full protections of the Voting Rights Act. On this 50th anniversary year of the March in Selma and of the Voting Rights Act, we must do all we can to restore and enhance the protections of that landmark legislation.

On gender equality, we continue to see women being paid less than men for doing the same job. We also continue to see partisan attacks on women's health care choices. From legislation blocking these choices to efforts defunding critical health services for women, we clearly have a long way to go to ensure gender equality.

And while LGBT Americans are now able to marry the person they love, they continue to experience discrimination in other aspects of their lives. Achieving full equality means that LGBT individuals should be able to provide for their families without fear that they will be fired from their jobs or denied housing. It means that a restaurant should not be able to refuse to serve an LGBT couple because the owner disapproves of that couple's relationship. New civil rights laws are needed to protect LGBT Americans so they can live their lives free from discrimination.

We must uphold this promise of equality for the vulnerable and the voiceless as well. We are a nation of immigrants with a long, proud history of opening our doors and welcoming people from around the world. After all, the Statue of Liberty has long proclaimed America's welcome: ''Give us your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free. . . . Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me, I lift my lamp beside the golden door.'' That is what America has long stood for and what we should continue to represent. Instead, I have seen ugly partisan rhetoric about changing the 14th Amendment of our Constitution to remove birthright citizenship specifically to target immigrants. We should be a nation that embraces and lifts our most vulnerable, not a nation that acts out of spite or malice.

We must also fight for the voices of all Americans and not just corporations or the wealthy few. Our country has flourished because we have worked hard to ensure that more, not fewer, Americans can take part in the democratic process. Instead, our campaign finance laws have been eviscerated by a Supreme Court that views money as speech and refuses to place any limits on the ability of the wealthy and special interests to drown out hard-working Americans. The Court has also irrationally limited the definition of ''corruption'' in our campaign finance laws to just bribery. But unlike a narrow majority of the Court, the public understands that corruption is not just bribery; rather, corruption is the idea that money buys access and influences our democracy for a wealthy few. This cannot be allowed in our democracy. The size of your bank account cannot and should not determine whether and how the government responds to your needs. We must act to restore the First Amendment and to preserve those protections to ensure that all voices can be heard in the democratic process.

Constitution Day is an occasion to celebrate our founding charter and the historic democracy it has caused and fostered. It is also a time to reflect on what we are doing as citizens to uphold the promises that the Constitution has provided. I encourage all Americans to mark this day by reading the whole Constitution and celebrating how it reflects the great progress we have made to become a more inclusive and stronger democracy.

REMEMBERING EDWARD W. BROOKE III

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, on March 11, 2015, at Washington National Cathedral, a memorial service was held for former Massachusetts Senator Edward W. Brooke III. Ed was one of the first African Americans to serve in combat during World War II. He was the first African American to be elected a State attorney general, and the first elected to the U.S. Senate by popular vote. In 2004, he was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom by President George W. Bush. In honor of his extraordinary life and service to our Nation, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remarks made at Senator Edward W. Brooke III's memorial service by Secretary of State John F. Kerry; Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON; Milton C. Davis and Edward W. Brooke IV.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SECRETARY OF STATE JOHN F. KERRY

Good morning. It's a privilege to share some thoughts about Ed Brooke.

I want you to think back half a century. Imagine a room in the 1960s where all the leading Massachusetts politicians are gathered—Kennedy, McCormack, O'Neill, Volpe, Brooke. Among them, one figure stands out as the courageous representative of an embattled minority; Ed Brooke; alone; undaunted; the only Episcopalian.

Imagine another room, the chamber of the U.S. Senate. Shortly after noon on January 10, 1967, a man of consummate dignity strides down the center aisle; Legislators rise and applaud; the gallery cheers. The first African-American popularly-elected to the Senate takes his seat. In that moment, Ed Brooke was not just a pioneer; he was an advance scout probing the soul of our country. Twenty-six years would pass before a second African-American would be elected.

Imagine a young man raised in Washington, joining the army immediately after Pearl Harbor, later deploying to Italy as part of a segregated infantry battalion. There, Lieutenant Brooke watched in anguish as his buddies were sent each morning to attack a heavily-fortified German position in the Apennines.

The young soldier soon became convinced that his men were being used as cannon fodder by racist commanders. He proposed a

shift in tactics, an operation staged later in the day, when the enemy would be sleeping. The answer came back: ''The colonel would never send a boy to do a man's job.'' Brooke persisted and the operation he organized went ahead, catching the enemy by surprise and driving them from the mountain. His battalion suffered 1300 casualties and won 27 medals; its reward was to be dismantled and its personnel scattered to places where many could neither sit at a lunch counter nor vote. We must never forget that—as much as Ike, Patton and Marshall—Ed Brooke and the African-Americans who joined him in fighting Fascism were part of the greatest generation and we owe them an incalculable debt.

But this was just the beginning of Ed Brooke's journey.

As a legislator, Senator Brooke was always on the cutting edge—championing a woman's right to choose; taking on the tobacco industry when smoking was still considered cool; initiating a program to help minority businesspeople create jobs; guaranteeing women equal access to credit; and authoring an amendment that, to this day, enables tens of thousands of people each year to qualify for public housing and thereby escape shelters or the streets.

When President Nixon asked the Senate to confirm a Supreme Court nominee whose supporters argued—and I'm not making this up—that mediocrity deserved representation—Ed Brooke looked his party's leadership in the eye and said no—and did the same on two other Nixon nominees.

He also differed from the President by being right about the Vietnam War and voting to end it—a position that mattered a lot to many of his constituents, including me.

And when ideologues tried to gut the Civil Rights and Voting Rights laws: Ed Brooke used every instrument in the legislative tool box to stop them—declaring that liberties that took a century or more to secure must never again be denied. A vow that, as President Obama reminded us in Selma on Saturday, remains as timely now as ever.

For all of his career, Ed Brooke was his own man. As Attorney General, he was relentless in cracking down on corruption—which in Massachusetts in the early 1960s provided what we might call ''a target-rich environment.'' His electoral triumphs were astonishing in a state that was only 2 percent black, where school desegregation was an explosive issue, and where the face of prejudice might appear either ugly with anger or thinly masked by code words. In one early race he narrowly lost, his opponent, Kevin White, claimed to see no hidden message in campaign bumper stickers that read simply: ''Vote White.''

Repeatedly, Brooke was urged by the political establishment not to run for higher office—to instead bide his time until Massachusetts was [quote-unquote] ''ready.'' Indeed, in 1962, when he ran for Attorney General, his opponent was the formidable Elliott Richardson, a man with deep connections to what were—socially and financially—the upper echelons of the Commonwealth. But Ed Brooke didn't back down, and because he didn't, a straight line can be drawn between his electoral victories and that of another African-American—this time in the national arena—some four decades later.

I was in high school when Ed Brooke first ran for statewide office, attracting so many Democratic voters to the Republican primary that our party had to work for months afterward reregistering them.

I had met Ed but didn't really know him until after I arrived in Washington. In my early years in the Senate, he would come by occasionally and talk about the job or the events of the day. Whenever I saw him, I was struck by his warmth and kindness and his interest in what I was doing. He was a charismatic man with a genuine laugh and a resonant voice and a ready willingness to answer my questions. One topic we discussed was the parallels. After all, we had both gone from college to war to law school to a prosecutor's office to spend many years as the ''junior'' Senator from Massachusetts. We had each won and lost elections and guess what—we both agreed that winning was better.

Believe me, few public statements are harder to deliver than a concession speech after a closely-contested—even bitter—race. In 1978, I was indelibly struck by how Ed's remarks set a new standard for grace amid pain. He congratulated his opponent and paid tribute to allies who would, he said, carry on his work. He was flanked by one source of strength, his mother—and alluded to a second in saying: ''When I was down in the valley, I didn't cry—I cried out—and you gave me the strength to move on.''

Early on, this proud son introduced me to Helen Brooke who, during my years in the Senate, embraced me as much as anyone in the city. Mother Brooke loved her family and her church; she loved to have a good time and she taught her son how to be a successful politician. ''Always thank people,'' she said, ''and make them feel special.'' That advice stuck. As one colleague observed, ''When Ed Brooke looked at you, you felt he was not only thinking about you and only you, but that he probably hadn't thought about anyone else in weeks.''

Fifteen years ago, the state courthouse—just across from my own district office in Boston—was named after Ed Brooke—a tribute to the man and a regular reminder to all of his love for the practice of law. In Massachusetts, three charter schools are dedicated to his memory; and many of their students made the journey from the land of the seven-foot snowdrifts to be here with us today; there are also many students from Dunbar—his high school alma mater.

Senator Brooke shunned the title of trailblazer, but that's exactly what he was. He inspired thousands of young people—of every race—to enter public service. Some criticized him for not being more outspoken or for not being enough this or enough that—trying to mold him to their expectations—but he was always true to himself. He fought ceaselessly and with determination for the poor, for minorities, for women, and for what he felt was right. He was the embodiment of a style of legislating that valued substance over rhetoric and public needs over political agendas. Bipartisanship, to him, was never a four letter word.

So we are privileged to be here—family, friends, admirers—in celebration and thanksgiving, for this remarkable man. In recent years, as Ed Brooke received the highest civilian honors our nation can bestow—the Congressional Gold Medal and the Presidential Medal of Freedom—he reminded us that the work to which he had dedicated his own best efforts—remains unfinished.

Ed Brooke understood the ebb and flow of life. He endured great loss and enjoyed exuberant triumphs, saw the valleys and the mountain tops, and would be the first to tell us that he lived a full and blessed life. For him and for that—we will always be grateful.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSWOMAN ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

Anne, family, colleagues, public officials, friends all of Senator Edward William Brooke. You do not grow up desiring to be a United States Senator if you were born in the District of Columbia in 1919; not if you lived in one of the District's African American communities, LeDroit Park; not if you went to our segregated public schools and graduated from Dunbar High School, and the Senator's class of 1936 is in the church today, and from Howard University; not even if you became a World War II hero and won the Bronze Star, leading your segregated unit in a broad daylight attack on an enemy bunker; and certainly not if your hometown had no elected self-government, much less senators.

Edward William Brooke was nurtured in a loving, closely knit, aspiring African American community in the District of Columbia. But it did not groom him to think of himself as a public official.

Senator Brooke owed much to a childhood spent in our city where children were raised to believe segregation did not for a moment mean you were inferior. But the man that became a natural politician, charismatic, charming, brilliant, and utterly approachable, invented himself and went on to become not only a public official, but a historic figure.

The Senate has always had its share of self-made men and women. Edward Brooke was a self-made senator. Many had thought of Barack Obama as a man ahead of his time, until the President came to the Capitol in 2009 to present the Congressional Gold Medal to Senator Brooke. After receiving the medal, Senator Brooke regaled us with remarks that must have been written in his head and his heart, because without so much as a note, he accepted the medal in a voice that resonated as it must have when he spoke in the Senate about the Brooke Amendment to the Fair Housing Act, which limited to 25% the portion of income a family must pay in rent for public housing.

Don't ask me how a black man without guide posts became one of the most popular politicians ever in Massachusetts, a state where only 2% of the population was black. I cannot explain the conundrum that was Edward Brooke. But I experienced the warmth and the talent that made him successful as a public man and dear as a friend. And I can tell you this: Edward Brooke never forgot where he came from, the city that nurtured his uniqueness. Without hesitation, he volunteered to talk with senators in his Republican Party when the Senate and the House both passed the D.C. House Voting Rights Act. He succeeded. The vote for the District was lost to an amendment that would have wiped out all of the District's gun laws in return for a vote in the People's House.

Senator Brooke's place in American history was sealed and delivered long before he died in January. His place as the first African American elected to the Senate with the popular vote and his extraordinary record as a senator are even more remarkable when you consider his origins here in the District of Columbia, which had no local government at all. The residents of his hometown continue to struggle for equal rights as American citizens and for statehood. But nothing could inspire our citizens more than a native son, born in a city without a vote or a local public official, who rose to cast votes in the Senate of the United States.

Thank you.

REMARKS OF MILTON C. DAVIS, THE 29TH GENERAL PRESIDENT OF THE ALPHA PHI ALPHA FRATERNITY

''God of justice, save the people from the clash of race and creed, From the strife of class and faction, make our nation free indeed; Keep her faith in simple manhood strong as when her life began, Till it find its full fruition in the brotherhood of man!''

This is a stanza from a favorite hymn of Edward Brooke which he often quoted in the speeches he delivered across the country and the world. This stanza summarized his theme of life; his mission in life. Long before I ever met him in person, I came to know him

through the pages of the history of Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, the world's first African American collegiate fraternity founded in 1906. This Alpha history book depicted a plethora of role models and heroes, the likes of W. E. B. Dubois, Thurgood Marshall, Martin Luther King, Jr., Jesse Owens and scores more, whose life and work inspires and advances a race of people and a nation. None stood out more dramatically than the life and achievements of Edward William Brooke. He was my hero; dignified, a scholar, charismatic, accomplished and fearless. Regular history books have yet to give him the credit he has earned.

Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity is in its 109th year of existence and for 77 of those 109 years, Edward William Brooke stood in the circle of our brotherhood. When Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity undertook the awesome twenty-seven year task of building the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial on the National Mall here in Washington DC., Edward William Brooke was first to come forward with significant resources and the use of his influence to help guide that process.

He was an active, contributing and esteemed member until his death.

The law served as his instrument, tool and weapon with which he sought to advance the cause of justice in the face of prejudice, discrimination and segregation which surrounded him as he grew up in the nation's capital not far from this place.

He fought against the tyranny of the Axis powers as a commissioned officer in the U.S. Army during World War II assigned to the segregated 366th all black infantry regiment where he earned a Bronze Star for valor on the battle field.

Edward Brooke also served as an advocate for black soldiers who were charged with offenses in his regiment even though he was not then a trained, licensed attorney.

Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, using its members who were lawyers in the 1940s and 1950s filed several major lawsuits seeking to dismantle segregation and battle racism in America. Among those cases filed and financed by the national fraternity was the case of Elmer Henderson vs. The United States; the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Southern Railway. The case challenged the Commerce Commission regulation which allowed segregation and discrimination in railroad dining cars in interstate commerce. In the dining car, black passengers were only allowed to occupy two tables nearest the kitchen and when occupied by black travelers a curtain had to be drawn to hide their presence from white passengers. If white passengers needed the two tables assigned to black passengers, the black passengers had to wait until the white passengers vacated the tables assigned to blacks.

Edward Brooke was recruited to join the Alpha legal team headed by then General President of Alpha Belford Lawson in filing briefs before the U.S. Supreme Court attacking these racial barriers and on June 5, 1950, four years before Brown v. the Board of Education major decision, after an eight year battle through the lower courts, the U.S. Supreme Court struck down the regulation which allowed segregation and discrimination in railroad dining cars due in part to the heroic efforts of Edward Brooke. Edward Brooke was a champion for equality and fairness, his standard and measure of a person was the world's standard of excellence. He wanted only to be judged by the content of his character and his abilities rather than his racial background.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who was initiated into Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity by Edward Brooke while King was a graduate student at Boston University stated the proposition that—Life's most persistent and urgent question is ''What are you doing for others?''

Edward W. Brooke became an acknowledged national treasure by using his time, talent, influence, power and intellect demonstrating his commitment to uplifting others and assuring that in matters of fair housing, voting rights, education and justice that the promise of America to equality under law became more of a practical reality rather than just a lofty ideal.

In one of his campaigns, a Boston political writer wrote ''Brooke was a carpetbagger from the South, a Republican in a Democratic State, a black in a white state, a Protestant in a Catholic state and he is poor. Edward Brooke replied: I pleaded guilty to all indictments and I continued to persevere in my campaign. Brooke won; America won.

That's what heroes do: They look reality in the face and persevere!

The Poet Robert Louis Stevenson aptly sums up my journey of friendship and brotherhood with Senator Edward W. Brooke with these words:

He has achieved success;
Who has lived well, laughed often, and loved much;
Who has enjoyed the trust and respect of intelligent men and women and the love of little children;
Who has filled his niche and accomplished his task;
Who has left the world better than he found it;
Who has always looked for the best in others;
And given them the best he had;
Whose life was an inspiration;
Whose memory a benediction.

REMARKS BY EDWARD W. BROOKE IV

On behalf of my family I would like to thank the distinguished speakers who preceded me for their thoughtful and deeply moving tributes. As they have so eloquently stated, and as most of you well know: my father lived one of The Great American Lives. It was my privilege to know him and to be a part of his life. It is my honor to be his son, and to be here with all of you today, in appreciation of a man whom I love so dearly.

The moments of the past are not gone from us, nor we from them. The light of each moment shines on through eternity as the light of distant stars travels through space and time to reach our eyes and touch our minds. And so the brilliant light of his great life shines on for us, that we may better find our way in the dark unknown.

When I was but a child, not so long ago, my father would always say, ''Waste not; want not.'' Usually he would do this as he walked around turning off the lights in vacant rooms or pointing out the unused excess ketchup on my dinner-plate. I thought I understood what he meant. Though when I now consider the familiar saying in the full context of his life, it reveals a far more powerful truth: That if we never waste the opportunity to help each other live better lives, none among us would ever have to want for a life that could not be attained.

In this generous spirit, and leading by example, my father constantly strived toward the realization of a better world—a world in which the apparent differences between individuals would never again be mistaken as cause to deny justice, humanity, or dignity, nor to justify violence, exploitation, or disrespect. We must continue to work as he did, with faith in the possibility of the best imaginable outcome, and the assurance that fearfulness and cynicism cannot withstand the immeasurable kindness of which we are capable.

My father was a truly tender, sweet, and lovely man. He forgave my many errors and patiently helped me to learn from them. He taught me to read, to speak, and to think, to love and be loved. For all of this and so much more, I am forever grateful—grateful to him, and to his mother Helen and father Edward for raising up a man so entirely and strikingly unafraid to be the best possible version of himself; grateful to the ancestors who, surviving hardship and desolation, held intact the sacred vitality of which my father's life is a profound expression; and grateful to my mother, whose inspiring and unconditional love made our lives together so beautiful.

We know that he will always be with us, and pray for him eternal peace.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN F. LEHMAN

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize a true American patriot, a fellow naval aviator, and a close personal friend, former Secretary of Navy, the Honorable John F. Lehman.

Secretary Lehman served his country for over 30 years both in uniform in the United States Navy and as Secretary of the Navy during the Reagan Administration, from 1981–1987. His leadership and dedication to our country and to the Navy set a high mark unsurpassed to this day. It was Secretary Lehman who championed a ''600-ship'' Navy after the devastating post-Vietnam war cutbacks. He knew how important this naval investment was to rebuilding our global military and strategic power. Together with President Reagan, he offered the vision of strength that would ultimately bring an end to the Soviet Union. His tenure stands as a lesson of history that peace comes through strength and commitment, not weakness and retreat.

Secretary Lehman's impact on the country and our national security has not ended with the conclusion of his tour in the Pentagon. He continues to offer essential and trusted advice to decision makers throughout our national leadership. I am proud to call Secretary Lehman my friend, and I am honored to recognize him today. For these and many other reasons, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the citation in honor of Secretary Lehman's recently awarded National Defense Industrial Association Gold Medal.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOLD MEDAL FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE IS PRESENTED TO THE HONORABLE JOHN F. LEHMAN

For a lifetime of extraordinary leadership and dedication to a strong national security of the United States of America, the Honorable John F. Lehman is hereby recognized for his superb service to our country, both in and out of uniform, and in both the United States Air Force and the United States Navy, serving with great distinction for over three decades in a succession of demanding leadership positions of ever-increasing authority and responsibility, including serving as the 65th Secretary of the Navy for six years, beginning at the age of 38. Never one to hold himself apart from those he leads, Secretary Lehman continued to concurrently serve as a Naval Aviator while serving

as Secretary of the Navy. Throughout his illustrious career, Secretary Lehman has excelled in numerous top level positions supporting both the national security and foreign policy of the United States, including as a staff member to Dr. Henry Kissinger on the National Security Council, as a delegate to the Force Reductions Negotiations in Vienna, as Deputy Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and as a member of the 9/11 Commission. A lasting hallmark of Secretary Lehman's commitment to national security was his out-front leadership for the ''600–ship Navy.'' This plan was integral to President Reagan's goal of winning the Cold War against the Soviet Union and to rebuilding the Navy's fleet of ships following post-Vietnam War cutbacks. Secretary Lehman also developed a critical strategic concept known as the ''Lehman Doctrine.'' His plan, which called for a military response to any Russian invasion in Europe by invading the Soviet Far East, was an innovative strategic concept essential to our conventional deterrence of the Soviet Union. Even after so many accomplishments in public service, Secretary Lehman has continued to offer his advice and support to national security leaders to this day. In addition to his national security credentials, Secretary Lehman holds a B.S. degree from St. Joseph's University, B.A. and M.A. degrees from Cambridge University, and a Ph.D. from the University of Pennsylvania. He has enjoyed great success in business as a founding partner and Chairman of J.F. Lehman & Company, as the president of an aerospace consulting firm, and he is currently a director on a variety of corporate boards. He has authored numerous books, including 'On Seas of Glory', 'Command of the Seas', and 'Making War', and continues to write for the National Review on American Seapower for the 21st Century. Secretary Lehman serves as a member of a number of influential American think tanks to include serving as the Chair of Foreign Policy Research Institute's National Security Program. His visionary leadership, wise counsel and unparalleled service over the last 40 years in government and business have contributed immeasurably to sustaining a strong and successful U.S. national security posture. Secretary Lehman's extraordinary devotion to duty, clarity of purpose, and record of remarkable achievements are in keeping with the highest traditions of public and private service and reflect great credit upon him, the men and women in uniform, and the United States of America.

Given this day September 18, 2015 by:

ARNOLD L. PUNARO,
Major General, USMC (RET), Chairman of the Board.

CRAIG R. MCKINLEY,
General, USAF (RET), President & CEO.

CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I wish to commemorate in the RECORD the anniversary of the signing of the U.S. Constitution.

On this day in 1787, the delegates to the Constitutional Convention met for the last time to sign the U.S. Constitution. In the pursuit to form a more perfect union, the Framers of the Constitution created a document that not only solidified our fledgling Nation but inspired others across the globe to strive for liberty, too. Organizations such as Lions Clubs International, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Georgia Federation of Republican Women, and others deserve a great deal of gratitude for their efforts to bring attention to this important day. In recognition of this momentous occasion in American history and in honor of Constitution Day, I encourage all Georgians and all Americans to read, study, and learn the contents of the U.S. Constitution.

I appreciate the efforts of our educators, elected officials, community leaders, and parents who teach our youth about the foundations of justice, strength and equality upon which our great Nation was built. I never cease to be amazed at how the principles of the Constitution play out in our daily lives as Americans.

Today is an appropriate occasion for we the people of the United States, as well as the people's elected representatives in Congress, to renew our commitment to the principles of the U.S. Constitution. The Constitution's values—liberty, separation of powers, consent of the governed, and the principle that no one is above the law—are just as true and just as relevant today as they were when they were set to parchment more than two centuries ago.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH AND HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTIONS WEEK

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, earlier this week I introduced two bipartisan resolutions that were adopted by unanimous consent: S. Res. 254, recognizing September 15 to October 15 as Hispanic Heritage Month, and S. Res. 255, designating the week of September 14, 2015 as National Hispanic-Serving Institutions Week.

These resolutions celebrate the immense contributions of Hispanic Americans to our great Nation and honor the critical work of more than 400 nonprofit Hispanic-Serving Institutions for their important role in educating and empowering Hispanic youth.

Latinos have a long and decorated history in the United States, full of extraordinary contributions to America's past, present, and future. Latinos have proudly served, helped build, and defended our country for hundreds of years, honorably serving in every action since before the founding of the Nation.

Hispanics fought alongside patriots in the American Revolution and rallied in the Civil War, serving bravely in both the Union and Confederate armies. Latinos rode in Teddy Roosevelt's Rough Riders during the Spanish-American War, received Congressional Medals of Honor in both World Wars, and made the ultimate sacrifice for our country in Korea and Vietnam. As of July 31, 2015, more than 164,000 Hispanic Americans are actively serving with distinction in the United States Armed Forces.

Just as Latinos have defended our Nation, we have also helped shape and build it. That is why I also wish to recognize the exemplary institutions that are making vital investments in the next generation of Latino leaders.

Hispanic-Serving Institutions are colleges or universities where total Hispanic enrollment constitutes a minimum of 25 percent of the student body, and they serve more than half of all Latino students in the United States. As a product of a Hispanic-Serving Institution in my home State of New Jersey, my experience is a living testimony of the important role that HSIs play in expanding opportunities for Latino students in 21 States across the U.S. and in Puerto Rico.

With these resolutions, we celebrate the contributions of all Latinos and the institutions that serve and enrich the Latino community in the United States. I look forward to celebrating the heritage and culture of Hispanic Americans who have and will continue to positively influence and enrich our Nation—not only during this special month and week, but throughout the year.

RECOGNIZING GROWTH DISORDER AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, on behalf of every child currently living with a growth disorder I wish to recognize this week—September 13–19, 2015—as Growth Disorder Awareness Week.

A child's growth is a strong indicator of that child's overall health status. According to the Pictures of Standard Syndromes and Undiagnosed Malformations, POSSUM, database, more than 600 serious diseases and health conditions can cause growth failure. These diseases range from nutritional disturbances and hormone imbalances to far more serious conditions that affect the kidneys or even lead to brain tumors. While these conditions affect a child's growth progress, a stunning 48 percent of children with the most common growth disorders go undiagnosed. To make matters worse, the longer a child with growth failure goes undiagnosed, the greater the potential for long-term health issues and higher costs of treatment. Early detection and diagnosis are, therefore, critical to ensuring a healthy future for these children.

This week, as we recognize Growth Awareness Week, I applaud the MAGIC Foundation for the tremendous work they do to further public awareness of growth failure and to improve the lives and health of the children whom they affect.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL LOBSTER DAY

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, this August the Senate unanimously passed a resolution designating September 25, 2015, as National Lobster Day. I was proud to cosponsor that resolution with my fellow Mainer, Senator ANGUS KING, and to be joined by our New England colleagues, Senators SHAHEEN and

AYOTTE of New Hampshire, REED and WHITEHOUSE of Rhode Island, and MURPHY and BLUMENTHAL of Connecticut.

That day has arrived and will be celebrated with a special event at the Maine Maritime Museum in the City of Bath. For more than a half-century, this outstanding museum has honored our State's seafaring heritage and the important role Maine plays today in global maritime activities.

Lobster fishing is central to that heritage. Since colonial times, it has served as an economic engine and a family tradition in New England, helping to support the livelihoods of thousands of families. Throughout the region, more than 120 million pounds of lobster are caught each year, making it one of our most valuable commodities.

More than 70 percent of this harvest is hauled in by Maine's 6,000 commercial license holders. Lobster is the backbone of Maine's prolific fishing industry, which produces more than $1 billion in economic activity and supports 26,000 year-round jobs in such affiliated enterprises as boatbuilding and maintenance, trap-making, bait, fuel and other supplies. The Maine lobster industry is built upon thousands of owner-operated family businesses, where the generations work together, supporting themselves and sustaining their communities.

The hard-working men and women of the Maine lobster industry are the original conservationists. For more than 150 years, they have led the way in managing this precious resource through size restrictions and trap limits, and they are at the forefront of efforts to protect whales and other marine mammals. The economic activity they generate helps to preserve the working waterfronts that are essential to coastal communities.

The lobster industry represents the very essence of Maine—a deep respect for the environment and a dedication to hard work. I congratulate the men and women of the Maine lobster industry for upholding this centuries-old heritage and thank the Maine Maritime Museum for celebrating it.

REMEMBERING CHIEF JUSTICE WILLIAM HUBBS REHNQUIST

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, Thursday, September 3, was the 10th anniversary of the death of William Hubbs Rehnquist, the former Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court. Rehnquist was an absolutely outstanding chief, one of the most influential Justices in the 225-year history of the Court. And the 10 years since his unfortunate passing have only served to increase the level of respect and admiration many have for him. This reverence is richly deserved, as Rehnquist spent over three decades—nearly two decades as Chief Justice—valiantly attempting to return the Court to this country's first principles, federalism being a primary one, in order to salvage our fundamental liberties. This is a goal the current Court would do well to remember and embrace.

Of course, I am slightly biased in this matter. I clerked for Rehnquist, after all, and therefore spent an entire year learning at his side, while simultaneously embarrassing myself in his doubles tennis matches. But what is amazing about Rehnquist is how much esteem he was held in by those who often disagreed with him. Indeed, the respect he enjoyed from his colleagues was unparalleled. To give just one of many examples, Walter Dellinger, a former Solicitor General in the Clinton administration, wrote that ''Rehnquist was a great leader and effective administrator of the Supreme Court and the national judiciary. He ran a tight ship. . . . Every justice with whom I have spoken in recent years has noted that the court was functioning well under his leadership.'' Rehnquist didn't just treat his fellow lawyers well, either. He knew everyone's name who worked in the Court—from Justices, to police officers, to janitors—and he treated them all fairly and with dignity. Outside the Court, where he regularly strolled with his clerks, he would often graciously take pictures of tourists, who had no idea they had just asked our country's top judicial officer to assist with their family snapshot. These days, in the era of selfies, the tourists probably would not notice him at all. And Rehnquist would be fine with that. Humility was one of his defining characteristics.

In remembrance of Chief Justice Rehnquist's passing, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a memorial article I wrote for the Harvard Law Review 10 years ago. This is not nearly as much as Rehnquist deserves, but it is more than a man like Rehnquist would ever request for himself. We miss you, Chief.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Harvard Law Review, Nov., 2005]

IN MEMORIAM: WILLIAM H. REHNQUIST

(By R. Ted Cruz)

THE EDITORS OF THE HARVARD LAW REVIEW RESPECTFULLY DEDICATE THIS ISSUE TO CHIEF JUSTICE WILLIAM H. REHNQUIST

A doll, a headdress, and a ship captain's wheel. All three enjoyed prominent placement in the Chief Justice's private chambers. Each was a gift from his law clerks, and each symbolized a different aspect of William Hubbs Rehnquist's tenure as Chief Justice of the United States.

Appointed to the Court in 1971, then-Justice Rehnquist found himself on a Court very much out of step with the rest of the nation. Five months after he arrived, in June of 1972, the Court issued Furman v. Georgia, striking down the death penalty across the country. Despite the fact that capital punishment is referenced explicitly in the text of Constitution, the Court concluded that it was nonetheless unconstitutional and with the stroke of a pen threw out the laws of virtually every state. Predicated upon what were termed ''evolving standards of decency,'' Furman asserted that five Justices were better arbiters of what was ''decent'' than the hundreds of millions of voters who had elected the legislatures that had widely adopted the death penalty.

Justice Rehnquist, of course, dissented. And four years later, the Court retreated from its decree that no state could ''decently'' choose to impose the death penalty. But Furman was emblematic. In the 1960s and 1970s, the Court consistently elevated the rights of criminal defendants, and, repeatedly, Justice Rehnquist dissented, often alone.

As in criminal law, so too across the gamut, especially concerning federalism and the Religion Clauses. For his first decade and beyond, Justice Rehnquist earned his ''Lone Ranger'' nickname. Thus, the first gift from the clerks—a twelve-inch adjustable Lone Ranger doll, which sat for some three decades on the bookshelf in his back office.

But the fiery dissents of the 1970s were not to be Justice Rehnquist's entire legacy. In 1986, President Reagan made him Chief. Thus, the second gift—an elaborate Indian feather headdress, which sat next to the Lone Ranger doll on the bookshelf.

Beside both the doll and the headdress lay one of the most startling graphical representations of the different role Chief Justice Rehnquist was to play. Starting at the ceiling, his bound opinions from each Term stretched across the shelves. For the first fifteen years, each Term's bound volume is consistently three to four inches wide. Then, in 1986, there is a sharp divide: from that point forward, each Term's volume of collected opinions falls to one to two inches in width. That visual break was not the result of a sudden lack of verbosity. Rather, it was a physical manifestation of Chief Justice Rehnquist's understanding of the very different task assigned a Chief Justice. No longer was his principal role to expound impassioned individual views; instead, it was to lead.

Thus, in 1996—his twenty-fifth anniversary as a Justice and his tenth as Chief—his third and most emblematic gift came from the clerks: a large ship's captain's wheel, which was mounted on the wall to commemorate his careful guidance of the Court over the decades.

The Chief steered the Court, carefully, steadily, over nineteen years at the helm. One result of that guidance, widely appreciated by lawyers, scholars, and public commentators, is that many of those 1970s-era Rehnquist dissents are now the law of the land. Indeed, there are few clearer legal arcs than the path from Rehnquist dissent to Court majority over these three decades.

Hence, the so-called federalist revolution, revitalizing an important structural safeguard to human liberty through the preservation of the real authority of sovereign states. ''We start with first principles,'' the Chief began in United States v. Lopez. ''The Constitution creates a Federal Government of enumerated powers,'' ''few and defined,'' in James Madison's words, which ''ensure[s] [the] protection of our fundamental liberties.''

Hence, the return to balance in the Court's Establishment Clause jurisprudence, repudiating the hostility toward religion manifested by earlier decisions. Thus, in 2002, the Chief wrote Zelman v. Simmons-Harris, upholding the Cleveland school-choice program and making clear that the Constitution does not require the exclusion of religious schools from the options presented to children in need.

Fittingly, the Chiefs last opinion, handed down as the last opinion on the last day of the Term, was Van Orden v. Perry. Texas defended the Ten Commandments monument outside our State Capitol, and we won, 5–4. In his plurality opinion, the Chief made clear that nothing in the First Amendment requires chisels and bulldozers to erase any and all public references to the Almighty.

Rather, the Constitution embraces tolerance, not hostility, toward religion.

And hence the well chronicled retreat from the 1960s- and 70s-era overbroad protections for criminal defendants, restoring a jurisprudential approach that preserves constitutional liberties without unnecessarily frustrating good-faith law enforcement efforts.

That legacy of legal transformation has earned Chief Justice Rehnquist, in the judgment of President Clinton's acting Solicitor General Walter Dellinger, a place—along with John Marshall and Earl Warren—among the three most influential Chief Justices in history.

Yet even so, the Chief's skill in steering the Court, the care and diligence with which he achieved that legacy, is not widely understood. Indeed, many scholars, lawyers, and law students have misperceived the Chief's jurisprudence—incorrectly deeming him, for example, significantly less conservative than Justices Scalia and Thomas—because they have failed to appreciate the distinct role of the Chief Justice, guiding the Court.

Take, for example, Dickerson v. United States, reaffirming Miranda v. Arizona as the law of the land. At the time of his death, eulogists pointed to Dickerson as an example of how the Chief had moderated his views, growing over time away from his Lone Ranger passion and toward an appreciation for elements of the status quo.

In my judgment, that view seriously misapprehends Chief Justice Rehnquist. Indeed, a careful examination of Dickerson can illuminate much of how he served as Chief. At the outset, Dickerson cannot be understood in isolation; instead, one must consider the entire course of the Chiefs criminal-law jurisprudence.

For decades before Dickerson, the Chief had been a vocal critic of Miranda. Beginning with Michigan v. Tucker in 1974, the Chief authored or joined dozens of opinions limiting Miranda's reach. Viewed by many as one of the worst Warren Court excesses, Miranda combined an activist approach—mandating specific police warnings found nowhere in the Constitution—with unsettling outcomes—ensuring, in conjunction with a robust exclusionary rule, that demonstrably guilty criminals could go free on the barest of technicalities.

The predicate for all of the Chief's efforts to cabin in Miranda was the notion that the specified warnings were not constitutionally required; rather, they were merely a ''prophylactic'' measure in aid of the broader constitutional value. Because Miranda was prophylactic—because the Constitution did not require its application in every respect—the Chief was able gradually to do much to mitigate its harmful effects.

Enter 18 U.S.C. §3501. Passed in the wake of Miranda and signed into law by President Lyndon B. Johnson, §3501, in effect, purported to overrule Miranda and return to the underlying constitutional standard of voluntariness for the admission of confessions. Yet, for three decades, §3501 lay dormant on the statute books, all but ignored.

In Dickerson, however, a federal court of appeals for the first time gave force to the words of the statute, admitting into evidence a voluntary confession notwithstanding the lack of properly administered Miranda warnings. Thus, the validity of §3501 was squarely presented.

If there was one thing the Chief knew, it was the minds of his colleagues; he had a remarkable sense for what his Brethren were and were not willing to do. As a practical matter, there was no way that Justice O'Connor or Justice Kennedy would possibly be willing to overrule Miranda. It was too established, too much a part of the legal firmament, for either of them to hazard extinguishing it.

If there had been four votes to overrule Miranda, it is difficult to imagine that, given his decades of principled opposition, the Chief would not have readily provided the fifth. But the votes were not there.

In their place was genuine peril. Section 3501 was a statute passed by Congress and signed into law by the President; the only way it could be invalidated was for it to be declared unconstitutional. And, if it were unconstitutional, that would presumably be because Miranda was not mere prophylaxis, but itself required by the Constitution.

Had the Chief voted with the dissenters, the majority opinion would have been assigned by the senior Justice in the majority, in this case Justice Stevens. And Justice Stevens, of course, had a very different view of Miranda than did the Chief.

It is not difficult to imagine a Justice Stevens Dickerson majority, recounting the history of Miranda and §3501 and then observing something like, ''Although we have often used the term 'prophylactic' to describe Miranda, over time it has become interwoven into the basic fabric of our criminal law; thus, today, we make explicit what had been implicit in our prior decisions: Miranda is required by the U.S. Constitution. Accordingly, §3501 is unconstitutional.''

That holding, in turn, would have undermined the foundation for most if not all of the previous decisions limiting Miranda, quietly threatening three decades of the Chief's careful efforts to cabin in that decision appropriately. Therefore, in my judgment, the Chief acted decisively to avoid that consequence. He voted with the majority and assigned the opinion to himself.

With that backdrop, the majority opinion in Dickerson is, in many respects, amusing to read. Its holding can be characterized as threefold: First, Miranda is NOT required by the Constitution; it is merely prophylactic, and its exceptions remain good law. Second, 18 U.S.C. §3501 is not good law. Third, do not ask why, and please, never, ever, ever cite this opinion for any reason.

Although not what one would describe as the tightest of logical syllogisms, it was the best that could be gotten from the current members of the Court. A majority of Justices agreed with each of the first two propositions, and so therefore—even though the propositions are in significant tension with each other—pursuant to Justice Brennan's famed ''rule of five,'' the Court declared both, and nothing more.

That leadership, I would suggest, is a hallmark of a great Chief Justice. The role of the Chief is unique, and Chief Justice Rehnquist understood his colleagues well. Consistently, he achieved the best legal outcome that could be reached in a given case, in aid of moving inexorably in the long term toward sound and principled jurisprudential doctrine.

For those of us who had the privilege of clerking for the Chief, we came to know a man of enormous intellect, principle, humor, and modesty.

Blessed with an eidetic memory, he seemed to know all the law that ever was. He would routinely amaze his clerks by quizzing them on the exact citation to some case or other; the clerks would, of course, never know the cite, and—off the top of his head—the Chief always would. As his son James observed at the Chief's funeral, he would have said that his dad had forgotten more history than most of us will ever know, but he didn't think his dad had ever forgotten anything.

A Midwesterner, born of modest means, the Chief enlisted in the Army in 1943 at age eighteen. Law has too long been a profession of the privileged few, and it is fitting, and worth noting, that the Chief Justice was an enlisted man, serving as weather observer in North Africa.

Once a week, the Chief played tennis with his clerks. We would play on a public court, and no one ever recognized the older gentlemen playing doubles with three young lawyers. He would also have us over to his house to play charades. One of my favorite memories is his lying on his stomach on the floor, pantomiming firing a rifle and mouthing ''pow, pow,'' as he acted out All Quiet on the Western Front.

He enjoyed simple tastes—his favorite lunch was a cheeseburger, a ''Miller's Lite,'' and a single cigarette—and he had little patience for putting on airs. Once, when a law clerk asked him how he went about choosing law clerks, the Chief replied, ''Well, I obviously wasn't looking for the best and the brightest, or I wouldn't have chosen you guys.'' Himself a former law clerk, he had no grand illusions about the job.

He was a kind and decent man. He knew everybody's name in the Court, every police officer and every janitor, and he treated them all with fairness and dignity. For that reason, the respect he enjoyed from his colleagues was unparalleled.

The Chief was beloved by his family, by his colleagues, by the thirty-four years' worth of law clerks whom he befriended, taught, and mentored. His views did not always prevail, but his steady hand at the helm—his vision, leadership, and unwavering principles—made this in every respect the Rehnquist Court.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING SUSTAINABLE LUMBER CO.

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I rise in recognition of the achievement of Sustainable Lumber Co., located in Missoula, MT. JPMorgan Chase recently announced that Sustainable Lumber Co. has been awarded a $100,000 grant and business trip to Linkedin's California headquarters for an opportunity of learning and networking. This award further emphasizes Sustainable Lumber Co. as a fine tribute to the State of Montana, and their both transformative and responsible approach to operating their business has earned them the success they rightfully have achieved.

I also would like to applaud JPMorgan Chase for investing in small businesses, like Sustainable Lumber Co., through its Mission Main Street initiative. These investments in small businesses strengthen our local communities and work as a catalyst towards revitalizing the American Dream.•

TRIBUTE TO JACOB FRANCOM

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I rise today in recognition of Jacob Francom, a top-tier educator from Troy, MT. Dr. Francom was recently honored as the 2015 Montana Principal of the Year and is an excellent example of the importance of education to the State of Montana.

Dr. Francom has not only succeeded in enhancing and tailoring the professional skills of his staff, but has made great advancements to the technological arenas at his school. He has

also developed and improved the systems of instruction used with the students of Troy Junior and Senior High Schools.

What sets Dr. Francom apart is not only his leadership and pioneering at his own school, but his initiative in helping the schools in other parts of Lincoln County. His efforts are focused on aiding Troy, Libby, and Eureka with hopes to share in the milestones they reach.

At only 36 years old, he has earned a bachelor's degree from Utah State University, a master's degree from University of Arizona, and his doctorate, along with a second master's from The University of Montana. He started his career working at a boarding school in the Yaak, but in 5 short years became a rising star at Troy Junior and Senior High School. Three years later, he was serving as superintendent.

The characteristics that have made Dr. Francom a prime candidate for this award are not limited to his work in the education field. His humility and perseverance have made him a positive and inspiring example for our State. It is with great appreciation that I thank Principal Francom for his work in Troy and across our State.●

CONGRATULATING KATHERINE KELLEY

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate a true role model in the Nevada community, Ms. Katherine Kelley. Ms. Kelley was crowned both Miss Summerlin and Miss Nevada and recently competed in the Miss America competition. I am truly honored to congratulate her on these great achievements.

The Miss America pageant began in 1921 and is one of the world's largest scholarship providers to young women. The initiative focuses on creating change in the lives of others and contributes a great amount of charity work in communities across the country. This characteristic of giving exemplifies Ms. Kelley's everyday life as a teacher in the Las Vegas community, working to help children excel academically.

Ms. Kelley, a Madisonville, KY, native, moved to Las Vegas in May of 2014 and began working with Teach for America in hopes of helping with the local teacher shortage. She is currently pursuing her master's degree at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, in the College of Education, studying secondary math education. Along with pursuing her master's degree, she is also a geometry instructor at Mojave High School. Her initial passion for teaching began when she spent time volunteering in the Alabama public school system. Her experience there drove her in her aspirations to create positive change. Through Miss America, Ms. Kelley has had the opportunity to bring light to the importance of school attendance in low-income communities, as well as encourage students of both genders in their science, technology, engineering, and math studies. The scholarships that Ms. Kelley has earned through Miss America will allow her to finish her master's degree debt free.

I know the citizens of the Silver State are proud to see a fellow Nevadan succeed in pursuing her dreams. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Katherine Kelley on this incredible honor. I wish her the best of luck as she serves as an ambassador for our great State and thank her for her work in helping Nevada's students.●

RECOGNIZING HOWARD R. HUGHES COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, UNLV, Hughes College of Engineering for its incredible work in creating the Flexy-Hand 2 for 5-year-old Hailey Dawson. Hailey was born with Poland syndrome, making it extremely difficult to grip smaller items. The Flexy-Hand 2, a 3D-printed prosthetic device created by the UNLV engineering department, provides Hailey with new technology that addresses this difficulty, giving her the ability to participate in her favorite sport—baseball.

Hailey's mom, Yong Dawson, approached Brendan O'Toole, UNLV's chair of medical engineering, to ask if the department would be willing to create a prosthetic hand for her daughter. O'Toole was eager to take on the project, gathering students from UNLV and local high schools to help. The team has spent nearly 2 years working on the project and continues perfecting the device, including the addition of individual finger movement. Hailey's current Flexy-Hand 2 is the fourth version from the university. The technology fits her palm, connecting the fingers to her wrist, ultimately giving her control of her hand's grasping motion.

Hailey has now had two unique opportunities to show off her prosthetic hand, both throwing out the first pitch at a UNLV baseball game in March and at a Baltimore Orioles game in August. Hailey's mother contacted the Orioles in pursuit of making her child's dreams a reality, asking them for a meet-up. In response, the team invited Hailey and her family to a game and allowed Hailey to throw the opening pitch. Before hitting the field, Hailey had the opportunity to meet Manny Machado and have her hand autographed.

I would like to congratulate Hailey on her participation in these unforgettable experiences and on an excellent first pitch. She is truly a shining example of positivity within the Las Vegas community.

I would also like to recognize UNLV's Howard R. Hughes College of Engineering and Brendan O'Toole for their hard work and dedication to improving the lives of others. This is an inspiring story and should stand as an example to the Nevada family. The team continues its work not only by fine tuning the Flexy-Hand 2 but also by connecting with other universities to raise awareness about the technology. I ask my colleagues to join me and all Nevadans in congratulating this incredible engineering department for its selfless work in helping a fellow Nevadan. I wish both the university and Hailey luck in all of their future endeavors.●

RECOGNIZING DR. YUICHI SHODA, DR. WALTER MISCHEL, AND DR. PHILIP PEAKE

● Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Golden Goose Award, which recognizes researchers whose seemingly obscure, federally funded research has returned significant benefits to society.

In particular, I rise to celebrate 2015 Golden Goose Awardees Drs. Walter Mischel, Philip Peake, and Yuichi Shoda for the impact of their Marshmallow Test research. Their work—funded by the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation—has had a significant impact on how we understand human behavior, how we educate our children, and even how we save for retirement.

These researchers used a simple test to measure pre-schoolers' self-control, offering children one marshmallow now or two if they could wait just 15 minutes alone with their prospective treat. They never expected to find that how children performed on this simple, silly-sounding test would be related to the children's future SAT scores, their propensity for obesity or drug addiction, and even the very chemistry of their brains.

In their followup study, Dr. Yuichi Shoda, now a professor at the University of Washington, found, based on reporting by parents and teachers, that children who had been able to wait longer for their extra treat at age 4 tended to show better adjustment in adolescence. They had more social and academic competence, were more able to handle stress adeptly, and persisted better in goal pursuit in the face of frustration. The researchers, joined by many collaborators across an array of disciplines, have followed these children now for more than 30 years. They have documented correlations between the ability to delay and life outcomes as diverse as SAT scores, body-mass index, the frequency of drug abuse, and measurable differences in brain functioning, which are visible thanks to modern functional MRI techniques.

Today, Dr. Shoda is looking at how people can benefit from an awareness of the kinds of situations in which they excel at self-control and those in which they are most vulnerable to self-control failure.

Far from a story about fixed fates, their discoveries about the importance of self-control and how it can be cultivated today informs how we teach

our children and helps us recognize the potential that lies in all of us. They have helped usher in a new age of understanding of human development and behavior. Our lives are the better for it. I am proud to stand in recognition of their work.●

RECOGNIZING MELANIE MASSEY PHYSICAL THERAPY

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, the folks who commit their lives to nursing people back to health provide tremendous benefit to their communities. Whether it is physical or speech therapy, providing community members with hope during a difficult time is a noble act, and one that is greatly appreciated, especially when those community members are children. This week's Small Business of the Week employs folks who provide therapy sessions to adults and children alike. I would like to recognize Melanie Massey Physical Therapy as Small Business of the Week for their commitment to providing exceptional health and therapy services to children in Monroe, West Monroe, Ruston, and Shreveport, LA.

Louisiana native Melanie Massey began her career as a physical therapist upon graduating from Louisiana State University School of Allied Health Sciences in 1993. Shortly after graduation, Melanie began working at LSU Medical Center in 1994, spending the majority of her time tending to wound and burn victims. However, she soon realized pediatric care was her passion. In 1995 with only 2 years of physical therapy experience, Melanie opened her own practice. Under the motto ''Joyfully use your gifts to brighten the lives of others,'' Melanie began spending one-on-one time with her young patients, developing unique relationships with her clients and building a strong reputation attractive to patients and parents seeking top-notch therapy centers for their children. As her clientele grew, so did her staff. Melanie has hired over 20 therapists and opened three more centers across north Louisiana within a few years of opening her business. Pediatric patients enjoy a multitude of events hosted by Melanie's clinics, such as boy's and girl's movie night and a summer camp that specializes in teaching handwriting, friendship building, and sensory integration. Today, the Melanie Massey Therapy team consists of full-time physical therapists, occupational therapists, and speech therapists, as well as a full billing department that allows patients to receive the necessary care upon arrival worry free.

Melanie Massey Physical Therapy maintains a hopeful spirit and high-energy staff that continuously motivates their patients in reaching their recovery goals. Furthermore, Melanie encourages her staff to continue their education while employed in her physical therapy centers, ensuring her staff can be among the most highly trained therapists in north Louisiana.

The ability to help her patients overcome some of the most challenging hurdles in their young lives serves as an inspiration to all entrepreneurs who devote themselves to the well-being of their customers. Congratulations to Melanie Massey Physical Therapy and her team for being recognized as this week's Small Business of the Week.●

CONGRATULATING DENNIS AND RUTH DITCH

● Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I wish to offer my congratulations to Dennis and Ruth Ditch as they celebrate their 50th wedding anniversary on September 25. Dennis and Ruth are the parents of David Ditch, one of my staffers on the Budget Committee. They are also the parents of three daughters, Lori, Lynn, and Barbara, and have two grandchildren, Lana and Ginger.

Dennis and Ruth Ditch both grew up in western New York, and their five decades together demonstrate the best qualities of a married couple. They have supported one another in raising four children, moved cross country twice for work opportunities prior to settling in Bloomfield, NY, and spent 25 years operating a small business they started together. Their commitment to one another never wavered even during the trying period when Ruth underwent chemotherapy to overcome an aggressive form of lymphoma. In recent years, they have become leaders for Gideons International in their area.

As successful parents, entrepreneurs, and active members of their community, Dennis and Ruth Ditch exemplify the values that make America great, whether in my home State of Wyoming or in New York. I give them my best wishes for the future.●

REMEMBERING HARRY McGRATH

● Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to Mr. Harry P. McGrath, Sr., a Pennsylvanian and a close friend. Harry passed away unexpectedly on September 7, 2015.

Harry devoted his life to his family and to public service and advocacy. Following his graduation from Dunmore High School, where he was an outstanding student and athlete, and Kutztown University, he worked as a Special Agent in the U.S. Secret Service. During the 1980s he protected President Ronald Reagan and Vice President George H.W. Bush, earning commendations for his work in Grenada and the Khyber Pass. By the time he left the Secret Service to attend law school, he had earned special achievement and performance awards for his significant contributions to the agency's efficient operation.

After graduating cum laude from the Widener University School of Law, where he was a member of the Law Review, Harry continued his work in public service as a law clerk for Judge William J. Nealon in the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania. He went on to become a distinguished lawyer in Northeastern Pennsylvania, admitted to practice law by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, and the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania. He was a partner in the law firm of O'Malley, Harris, Durkin, and Perry PC and the founder of the McGrath Law Offices in Scranton. With his legal expertise, significant experience and sound judgement, Harry was an ideal person to serve as the chairman of my Judicial Selection for the Middle District of Pennsylvania.

In addition to his work as a lawyer, Harry was also a strong advocate for Pennsylvania's children, as the solicitor for more than 30 years for the Scranton School District, representing students, parents, teachers, and administrators in matters of education and employment. He was passionate about his work on behalf of children with learning disabilities and other school-aged children in need. He was an early and strong supporter of the new Scranton High School Project and a past member of the Board of Directors of the Friendship House, an organization that provides quality programs and services designated to enhance the well-being of children and families in his community.

As much as public service and advocacy defined his career, politics was in Harry's blood. Named after his grandfather, the late Harry P. O'Neill, a U.S. Representative in the 1950s, Harry McGrath worked hard to elect candidates to public office, candidates in whom he believed. He served as Lackawanna County Democratic Party chairman and volunteered his time, talent, and energy to countless campaigns throughout his life.

Despite his numerous accomplishment, the most important legacy Harry leaves behind is his family. My thoughts and prayers are with his wife of 33 years, Joell; their four children, Harry, Bob, Betsey, and Joe; his brothers and sisters; all of his nieces and nephews; and his many friends. I pray that God will give them strength and that Harry's life of family, faith, and service will continue to inspire them in the years ahead.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:32 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 23) to reauthorize the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, without amendment:

S. 230. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corporation located in Bethel, Alaska.

S. 501. An act to make technical corrections to the Navajo water rights settlement in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 487. An act to allow the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma to lease or transfer certain lands.

H.R. 959. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the Medgar Evers House, located in Jackson, Mississippi, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1214. An act to amend the Small Tracts Act to expand the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to sell or exchange small parcels of National Forest System land to enhance the management of the National Forest System, to resolve minor encroachments, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1289. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 44 acres of land in Martinez, California, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1554. An act to require a land conveyance involving the Elkhorn Ranch and the White River National Forest in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1949. An act to provide for the consideration and submission of site and design proposals for the National Liberty Memorial approved for establishment in the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2223. An act to authorize, direct, expedite, and facilitate a land exchange in El Paso and Teller Counties, Colorado, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2791. An act to require that certain Federal lands be held in trust by the United States for the benefit of certain Indian tribes in Oregon, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH) announced that on today, September 17, 2015, he had signed the following enrolled bill, previously signed by the Speaker of the House:

H.R. 720. An act to improve intergovernmental planning for and communication during security incidents at domestic airports, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 487. An act to allow the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma to lease or transfer certain lands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H.R. 959. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the Medgar Evers House, located in Jackson, Mississippi, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1214. An act to amend the Small Tracts Act to expand the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to sell or exchange small parcels of National Forest System land to enhance the management of the National Forest System, to resolve minor encroachments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

H.R. 1289. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 44 acres of land in Martinez, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1554. An act to require a land conveyance involving the Elkhorn Ranch and the White River National Forest in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1949. An act to provide for the consideration and submission of site and design proposals for the National Liberty Memorial approved for establishment in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 2223. An act to authorize, direct, expedite, and facilitate a land exchange in El Paso and Teller Counties, Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–2915. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, notification of the Department's intent to close the Defense commissary store at Sugar Grove, West Virginia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2916. A communication from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Department of Defense, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2917. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of two (2) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2918. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of ten (10) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2919. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, the quarterly exception Selected Acquisition Reports (SARs) as of June 30, 2015 (OSS–2015–1410); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2920. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Venezuela that was originally declared in Executive Order 13692 of March 8, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2921. A copy of a complaint as required by section 403(a)(2) of the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002 relative to the case of Republican Party of Louisiana, Jefferson Parish Republican Parish Executive Committee, and Orleans Parish Republican Executive Committee v. FEC; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC–2922. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Regulations, Areas of the National Park System, Lake Meredith National Recreation Area, Off-Road Motor Vehicles'' (RIN1024–AD86) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–2923. A communication from the Deputy Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Pennsylvania Regulatory Program'' ((SATS No. PA–159–FOR) (Docket No. OSM–2010–0017)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–2924. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Kansas Regional Haze State Implementation Plan Revision and 2014 Five-Year Progress Report'' (FRL No. 9933–84–Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2925. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Control of NO_X Emissions From Large Stationary Internal Combustion Engines'' (FRL No. 9934–00–Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2926. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Louisiana: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision'' (FRL No. 9933–79–Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2927. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for the Portland Cement Manufacturing Industry and Standards of Performance for Portland Cement Plants; Correction'' ((RIN2060–AQ93) (FRL No. 9933–76–OAR)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 11, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2928. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Hampshire; Nonattainment New Source Review and Prevention of Significant Deterioration Program'' (FRL No. 9933–92–Region 1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 11, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2929. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Carbon Pollution Emission Guidelines for Existing Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units'' ((RIN2060–AR33) (FRL No. 9930–65–OAR)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 11, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2930. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standards of Performance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions from New, Modified, and Reconstructed Stationary Sources: Electric Generating Units'' ((RIN2060–AQ91) (FRL No. 9930–66–OAR)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 11, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2931. A communication from the Certifying Officer, Bureau of the Fiscal Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Offset of Tax Refund Payments to Collect Certain Debts Owed to States'' ((RIN1530–AA02) (31 CFR Part 285.8)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 15, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2932. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Procedures for Requesting a Waiver of the Electronic Filing Requirements for Form 8955-SSA and Form 5500-EZ'' (Rev. Proc. 2015–47) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 15, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2933. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Clarification of the Coordination of the Transfer Pricing Rules with Other Code Provisions'' ((RIN1545–BM72) (TD 9738)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 15, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2934. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''No-Rule on Certain Section 355 Transaction'' (Rev. Proc. 2015–43) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 15, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2935. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revenue Procedure Applying the Controlled Group Rules to Certain Fund of Funds'' (Rev. Proc. 2015–45) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 15, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2936. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Companion Notice to Rev. Proc. 2015–43 Announcing Issues Under Study and Requesting Comments'' (Notice 2015–59) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 15, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2937. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Controlled Group Regulation Examples'' ((RIN1545–BK96) (TD 9737)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 15, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2938. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Determination of Minimum Required Pension Contributions'' ((RIN1545–BH71) (TD 9732)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 15, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2939. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS–2015–1478); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2940. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS–2015–1479); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2941. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to revoking the designation of a group designated as a Foreign Terrorist Organization (OSS–2015–1480); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2942. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15–091); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2943. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15–022); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2944. A communication from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Board's budget request for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2945. A communication from the Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Office of Inspector General's budget request for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2946. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21–148, ''Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Support Act of 2015''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2947. A communication from the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's 2015 Annual Report for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2948. A communication from the Chief Impact Analyst, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Copayments for Medications in 2015'' (RIN2900–AP15) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 14, 2015; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–2949. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zones; Cleveland Dragon Boat Festival and Head of the Cuyahoga, Cuyahoga River, Cleveland, OH'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0082)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2950. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions No. 7 Through No. 13'' (RIN0648–XE020) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2951. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions No. 14 and No. 15'' (RIN0648–XE054) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2952. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2015 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for Gulf of Mexico Greater Amberjack'' (RIN0648–XE028) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2953. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Possession Limit Adjustments for the Common Pool Fishery'' (RIN0648–XD984) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2954. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Fishing Effort Limits in Purse Seine Fisheries for 2015'' (RIN0648–BF03) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2955. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Purse Seine Fishing Restrictions During Closure Periods'' (RIN0648–BF23) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2956. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Large Coastal and Small Coastal Atlantic Shark Management Measures; Final Rule'' (RIN0648–BA17) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2957. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Omnibus Amendment to Simplify Vessel Baselines''

(RIN0648–BB40) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2958. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coral, Coral Reefs, and Live/Hard Bottom Habitats of the South Atlantic Region; Amendment 8; Correction'' (RIN0648–BD81) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1170. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114–144).

By Mr. ROBERTS, from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 2051. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to extend the livestock mandatory price reporting requirements, and for other purposes.

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 32. A bill to provide the Department of Justice with additional tools to target extraterritorial drug trafficking activity, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Wilhelmina Marie Wright, of Minnesota, to be United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota.

John Michael Vazquez, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey.

Paula Xinis, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BURR, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 2045. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high cost employer-sponsored health coverage; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 2046. A bill to authorize the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to issue an order continuing a stay of a hydroelectric license for the Mahoney Lake hydroelectric project in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. AYOTTE:

S. 2047. A bill to terminate the independent third-party program for sectors of the Northeast Multispecies Fishery unless the program is fully funded by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 2048. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend authorities relating to homeless veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 2049. A bill to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a continuing medical education program for non-Department medical professionals who treat veterans and family members of veterans to increase knowledge and recognition of medical conditions common to veterans and family members of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. HEITKAMP:

S. 2050. A bill to provide for the establishment of a mechanism to allow borrowers of private education loans to refinance their loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARPER:

S. 2051. A bill to improve, sustain, and transform the United States Postal Service; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 2052. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to waive the requirement of certain veterans to make copayments for hospital care and medical services in the case of an error by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 2053. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to award grants to expand programs in maritime and energy workforce technical training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 2054. A bill to improve Federal sentencing and corrections practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 2055. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to national health security; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 2056. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Volcano Early Warning and Monitoring System; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 2057. A bill providing for additional space for the protection and preservation of national collections held by the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 2058. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to maintain and operate at least one Doppler weather radar site within 55 miles of each city in the United States that has a population of more than 700,000 individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 2059. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income amounts received on account of claims based on certain unlawful discrimination and to allow income averaging for backpay and frontpay awards received on account of such claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 2060. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize and extend the Fetal Alcohol Syndrome prevention and services program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. ERNST (for herself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BURR, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEE, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S.J. Res. 22. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency relating to the definition of ''waters of the United States'' under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. WARREN, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. TESTER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. REED, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. WARNER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. COONS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. GARDNER):

S. Res. 257. A resolution congratulating Captain Kristen Griest and First Lieutenant Shaye Haver on their graduation from Ranger School; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. REED, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. PETERS):

S. Res. 258. A resolution designating the week of September 20 through 26, 2015, as

''National Adult Education and Family Literacy Week''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. REID, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WICKER):

S. Res. 259. A resolution honoring the bravery and heroism of those who selflessly prevented a deadly terrorist attack and saved countless lives while aboard a passenger train bound from Amsterdam to Paris on August 21, 2015; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 32

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 32, a bill to provide the Department of Justice with additional tools to target extraterritorial drug trafficking activity, and for other purposes.

S. 258

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 258, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the 96-hour physician certification requirement for inpatient critical access hospital services.

S. 338

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 338, a bill to permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

S. 524

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 524, a bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use.

S. 563

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 563, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish the Physician Ambassadors Helping Veterans program to seek to employ physicians at the Department of Veterans Affairs on a without compensation basis in practice areas and specialties with staffing shortages and long appointment waiting times.

S. 571

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 571, a bill to amend the Pilot's Bill of Rights to facilitate appeals and to apply to other certificates issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, to require the revision of the third class medical certification regulations issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 865

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 865, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the disability compensation evaluation procedure of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for veterans with mental health conditions related to military sexual trauma, and for other purposes.

S. 901

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 901, a bill to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a national center for research on the diagnosis and treatment of health conditions of the descendants of veterans exposed to toxic substances during service in the Armed Forces that are related to that exposure, to establish an advisory board on such health conditions, and for other purposes.

S. 928

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 928, a bill to reauthorize the World Trade Center Health Program and the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001, and for other purposes.

S. 1056

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1056, a bill to eliminate racial profiling by law enforcement, and for other purposes.

S. 1099

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1099, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide States with flexibility in determining the size of employers in the small group market.

S. 1212

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1212, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 1239

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1239, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to the ethanol waiver for the Reid vapor pressure limitations under that Act.

S. 1383

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1383, a bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to subject the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to the regular appropriations process, and for other purposes.

S. 1387

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1387, a bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to update eligibility for the supplemental security income program, and for other purposes.

S. 1512

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1512, a bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.

S. 1559

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1559, a bill to protect victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence from emotional and psychological trauma caused by acts of violence or threats of violence against their pets.

S. 1598

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1598, a bill to prevent discriminatory treatment of any person on the basis of views held with respect to marriage.

S. 1631

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1631, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify certain provisions relating to multiemployer pensions, and for other purposes.

S. 1632

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1632, a bill to require a regional strategy to address the threat posed by Boko Haram.

S. 1867

At the request of Mr. SHELBY, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1867, a bill to protect children from exploitation by providing advance notice of intended travel by registered sex offenders outside the United States to the government of the country of destination, requesting foreign governments to notify the United States when a known sex offender is seeking to enter the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1890

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1890, a bill to amend chapter 90 of title 18, United States Code, to provide Federal jurisdiction for the theft of trade secrets, and for other purposes.

S. 1911

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1911, a bill to implement policies to end preventable maternal, newborn, and child deaths globally.

S. 1945

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1945, a bill to make available needed psychiatric, psychological, and supportive services for individuals with mental illness and families in mental health crisis, and for other purposes.

S. 1966

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1966, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require alternative options for program delivery.

S. 2001

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2001, a bill to phase out special wage certificates under section 14(c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 that allow individuals with disabilities to be paid at subminimum wage rates.

S. 2015

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2015, a bill to clarify the treatment of two or more employers as joint employers under the National Labor Relations Act.

S. 2032

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2032, a bill to adopt the bison as the national mammal of the United States.

S. 2042

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2042, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to strengthen protections for employees wishing to advocate for improved wages, hours, or other terms or conditions of employment and to provide for stronger remedies for interference with these rights, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 143

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 143, a resolution supporting efforts to ensure that students have access to debt-free higher education.

S. RES. 217

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 217, a resolution designating October 8, 2015, as ''National Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Day'' .

AMENDMENT NO. 2656

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2656 proposed to H.J. Res. 61, a joint resolution amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2656 proposed to H.J. Res. 61, supra.

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2656 proposed to H.J. Res. 61, supra.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CARPER:

S. 2051. A bill to improve, sustain, and transform the United States Postal Service; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, one of the factors in creating a favorable environment for job creation and job preservation is, of all things, something that has been around for 200 years to 225 years, and that is the U.S. Postal Service. Not many people think of the Postal Service as part of the engine that helps drive our economy, but it is.

There are 7 to 8 million jobs that flow directly from work directly involved or indirectly involved with the Postal Service—7 to 8 million jobs. For a number of years, the Postal Service has been losing money. There are a lot of questions about whether they will be able to make it, whether they will be able to survive, whether they are going to contribute or simply fold up and go away.

So I would note that another priority of mine for years has been postal reform. My dance partner on this for a number of years was Senator SUSAN COLLINS, a Republican and a very capable leader, and for the last several years Tom Coburn, a Republican from Oklahoma—Dr. Coburn—who retired at the end of last year. We have worked with a lot of folks—Democrats and Republicans in the House and Senate—in the last couple of years to try to find a way not just to make the Postal Service relevant but to enable them to be successful. And one of our real challenges has been how to take a 200-plus-year-old network—a legacy delivery network that goes to every mailbox in this country, business or residential—and enable them to make money in a digital age in the 21st century.

A lot of us are buying stuff differently than we used to. We are paying our bills differently than we used to. We don't send a whole lot of first-class mail the way we used to.

When I was a naval flight officer in Southeast Asia for three tours, the best day of the week was when the mail came. We would get all kinds of letters from home. We would get all kinds of postcards, birthday cards—you name it—Father's Day cards, and Valentine's Day cards. We would get magazines, and we would get newspapers. It was the best day of the week. Today, our folks in the Armed Forces are deployed to Afghanistan or other places around the world, and they still get mail, but it is not as important for them as it was for us because they have Skype, they have cell phones, and they have the Internet. They have other ways to communicate.

The challenge for the Postal Service has been, in a day and age where we communicate very differently than we did during the last war—than we do, say, in the war we have been involved in in Afghanistan for some time now—how do they make money? How do they remain relevant? They are starting to

get it. The Postal Service today—I think it was at 3 a.m. this morning—the Postal Service, in 33 ZIP Codes in San Francisco, delivered groceries. They use vehicles that otherwise would have been used between 3 a.m. and 7 a.m. The folks who work for the Postal Service have access to apartments and high rises to actually deliver groceries. And I think they are delivering for Amazon in those 33 ZIP codes. I think they have been trying it out for a while, and things are going pretty well. The Postal Service has turned around and has contacted 100 other grocery chains around the country. They said: This is what we are doing for Amazon, and we could probably do this for you and help you and help serve customers in a different kind of way.

This morning, in a place in Delaware, just around Middletown, DE, which is north of Dover, the Postal Service, literally during the middle of the night—or rather Amazon with the Postal Service in the middle of the night combined to take items from that Amazon distribution center in Middletown, DE, and literally drop off, all over the Northeast, the mid-Atlantic—all over the region—drop off items that are going to be delivered today. These are all kinds of products that were ordered through Amazon yesterday on the Internet, by phone, and so forth, and they are being delivered literally today. The Postal Service has a big hand in that.

Also, we have FedEx and UPS. A lot of folks think of FedEx and UPS as competitors of the Postal Service, and in a way they are, but they are also very good partners together. It works this way. FedEx doesn't want to deliver to every mailbox in the country, especially in the more rural areas where there is a lot of separation and, frankly, it is costly to do that. FedEx doesn't want to do it, and UPS doesn't want to do it. But guess who goes every day—6 days a week, sometimes 7—to pretty much every mailbox in the country? It is 6 days a week. Well, it is the Postal Service. So there has been a partnership for a number of years now where the Postal Service delivers for UPS and for FedEx the last mile, the last 2 miles, the last 5 miles, 10 miles, the last 20 miles. The Postal Service makes some money doing that, and it helps FedEx and UPS maybe save some money. And when the Postal Service sends its packages by air mail, it actually will partner with FedEx or UPS in order to be able to move its products around the country in an expeditious way.

So those are some things that are happening around the country that most people aren't thinking about or mindful about, some ways the Postal Service is becoming more involved in the digital age.

Christmas is still 3 months or so away, but as people start thinking about Christmas shopping, holiday shopping, in a lot of cases they are going to get on the phone and get on the Internet and order. Those packages they are ordering are going to have to be delivered by somebody, and the Postal Service is one of those somebodies.

I think the last time we saw the numbers—while first-class mail continues to trend down by a couple of percent per year, what is going up—I think the last time we saw 12 to 14 percent a year—is delivery packages and parcels. So the Postal Service is finding out how to be relevant even in the digital age in ways they haven't thought about before.

There are other things they could do. Among those things is they could deliver wine and beer. UPS does that, and FedEx does that. The postal service does that in Australia. I think they make maybe $5 billion a year doing that. I would like to say Australia doesn't have as many people as we do; they just drink more. But there is lots of money to be made by the Postal Service here, and I don't know of any reason why we shouldn't allow them to be involved in that business as well, with appropriate safeguards and as long as States approve of that activity.

Those are some things I would mention about the Postal Service.

The other thing I would say is that over the past couple of years, even though we found it difficult to pass legislation, one of the things the Postal Service has done on their own is they have tried to rightsize the enterprise to reflect the delivery—less—of first-class mail and the delivery of a little bit lower amounts of what we call standard mail, which could be nonprofits using the mail, it could be for-profits, it could be all kinds of stuff, but it is not first-class mail.

But one of the things the Postal Service has sought to do is to look at their workforce and say: In a day and age when we have to deliver a lot less mail, do we still need the same number of full-time employees?

They decided the answer is no, and I think their full-time equivalents are I would say down by a third from where it was about a decade ago.

The number of mail-processing centers across the country is down by about half, from maybe 600 to 300.

The number of post offices really hasn't changed a whole lot. They have over 30,000, maybe closer to 40,000 post offices around the country, some active, large, vibrant, and some small, rural, not a lot of activity, but important to those communities.

What the Postal Service has done with a number of their smaller post offices is basically they have said to the communities: You know, there is not a lot going on in your post offices. Are the amount of stamps and revenues generated by post offices really enough to make it worthwhile to run this post office 6 days a week, 8 to 10 hours a day?

What they have done is they have sort of presented a menu—the Postal Service has presented a menu to communities and said: You can't have a 6-day-a-week, 8- to 10-hour-a-day post office in your community, but you can have a post office if you want, maybe 4 hours a day, 6 hours a day.

The person running it would be maybe a contract employee, maybe not a full-time employee with full benefits but someone maybe making $15 an hour. For some people, that is pretty good money. And then the communities would still end up with their post offices. Or maybe the post office should be a rural letter carrier driving around on his or her route in the rural part of a county or a State. It would literally be a post office on wheels, a little bit like a bookmobile was when I was a kid growing up. Everybody on that route would know that rural letter carrier was going to be here or there throughout the day and be there to take packages or to provide stamps or to send mail or to provide services that you would normally get in a post office in a more urban, suburban area.

But long story short, the Postal Service has done a fair amount to reduce—I am tempted to call it—the size of their enterprise and the cost of their enterprise. There are fewer full-time-equivalent employees, fewer mail-processing centers. And while they still have a lot of post offices, a number of them—maybe one out of every five or so, one out of every four—is a post office that may be open 2 hours a day, 4 hours a day, 6 hours a day instead of 8 hours a day or 10 hours a day.

Today I am introducing legislation that seeks to enable the Postal Service, which is still—actually, if you didn't consider one factor, which is that the Postal Service is required by law to put money aside to meet a liability that most private companies and almost every State and local government and the Federal Government, too, have not addressed, and that is the health care liability of their pensioners.

Back in the late 1990s when I was Governor of Delaware—we had worked for years—Governor Pete DuPont, Governor Mike Castle, and my administration—to move from the State with the worst credit rating in America to a State with an AAA credit rating. In my next to last year as Governor, 1999, Delaware—in 1977 we had the worst credit rating in the country, and in 1999 we earned AAA credit ratings across the board—Standard & Poor's, Moody's, and Fitch. It was a day of great jubilation. But even after they awarded us our AAA credit ratings, they said to us: You have a problem, Delaware. And as it turned out, so did 49 other States. That is because while we had a fully funded pension fund, we had not set aside any money for a significant cost of the pensioners, and that is their health care costs once they reached the age of 65. And most employers in the country, those employers of any consequence, when their retirees reach the age of 65, and DuPont company is a great example—my

wife had a wonderful 27-year career with them, but when DuPont's retirees reach the age of 65, the DuPont company doesn't say: To heck with you. We are going to forget you.

They still try to meet their moral obligation to provide their employees a pension and access to health care. Part of that is Medicare. DuPont, and frankly almost any company of any consequence, says to their employees reaching the age of 65: Alright, you are 65, you are eligible for Medicare Part A, Medicare Part B, Medicare Part D, and we expect retirees 65 or older to use it—to sign up and use it. It is a requirement. And if that doesn't cover all their medical needs—and it probably will not—a lot of companies will continue to provide a wraparound supplemental program to fill in the holes that are left unfilled by Medicare Part A, Part B, and Part D.

Well, as it turns out, postal retirees, when they reach the age of 65 and are eligible for Medicare, most of them sign up for Medicare Part A, a majority sign up for Medicare Part B—one of those is hospital care and the other inpatient and the other outpatient doctor care—but almost none of them sign up for Medicare Part D, as in ''delta.'' Part D is a drug program for Medicare that has been around for close to 13, 14 years now. It has been a huge success—a huge success.

But while the postal service pays into Medicare, I think more than maybe any other employer in the country—they pay more money, I think, than any other employer in the country. I think the postal service is their No. 1 or No. 2 business in terms of full-time employees. And while they pay a ton of money into Medicare, they do not get full value. In fact, in effect, the postal service is actually overpaying to bring down the Medicare costs for other employers, including FedEx and UPS and DuPont, for that matter.

So the question is: Is that right? Is that fair? Is that equitable to the postal service? Is it fair to their employees and their pension? I don't think so, and neither did Dr. Coburn in the last Congress when we offered legislation that said this should be fixed. The postal service ought to be treated like other companies. They ought to be able to get full value for the contributions they make into Medicare.

That is something that should be part of postal reform legislation. It is part of the legislation I am introducing today, and it was part of the legislation we introduced a year ago.

Another important part of the legislation we are introducing today deals with the rates the postal service can charge. There was something after the last recession called an exigent rate case. The postal service's businesses were badly damaged. A lot of businesses that used first-class mail fled first-class mail and found a way to use the Internet and to replace the use of first-class mail, which had a severely damaging impact on the postal service. The postal service asked for an exigent rate case, which gave them an opportunity or a way to raise their rates a bit. The question is, Is that going to be forever or is it going to go away?

We have been negotiating, with the help of a guy named John Kane, a member of our staff on the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, an agreement with the postal service and with some mailers and others that are interested in these issues to enable the exigent rate case to stay in place for a couple more years, and then we will go through a new process or an existing process to establish a new postal rate for the postal service to charge. But this provides some stability over the next couple of years.

I will not go through the whole bill, but let me just say that the idea behind our legislation is to enable the postal service to have reasonable revenues to be successful, to enable them to be treated fairly and I think equitably with respect to their payments into Medicare for their retirees, to also enable them to be more creative, and to find ways to use that 200-plus-year-old distribution network in order to make money—in order to make money.

There are lots of other ideas as well, with the kind of stuff that happened this morning in those 33 zip codes in San Francisco and the kind of work that will happen tonight at the Amazon distribution center in Middletown, DE, and a lot of other places on this side of the United States.

This is legislation I am introducing on my own. We have worked with stakeholders, which includes certainly the postal service, certainly includes a lot of the customers—not every one of their customers—and includes the employee groups—the unions, the groups that represent postmasters—and other people as well—regular customers, residential customers, business customers. So we are introducing legislation, and my hope is that it will serve as a catalyst for a good conversation and a much needed consensus to say this is where we are headed on postal reform in 2015 and beyond.

I have never introduced a perfect bill, and I am not introducing probably a perfect bill now. But I think it is a pretty piece of legislation. We have listened to a lot of folks, and we have listened to a lot of folks who serve here with us in the Senate—Democrats, Republicans, folks on the committee and off the committee—and it is my hope we will have a chance to kick the tires on this new piece of legislation I have introduced and somewhere fairly soon be able to have a hearing so folks can come and say: This is what I like about it or don't like about the legislation, and they will decide ways to make it even better.

I like to say that everything I do I know I can do better. But as it says in the Constitution, ''in order to form a more perfect union''—in the preamble of the Constitution, ''in order to form a more perfect union''—our goal will be to form a more perfect postal service and hopefully form a more perfect piece of legislation. The real goal is to enable the postal service to be more successful—to enable them, and not be running them down all the time.

We have great people who work for the postal service. They deliver mail in my neighborhood and probably yours as well. There are folks who are going to work right now in the postal service. They will be up late tonight sorting mail and making sure it will be ready to be delivered tomorrow. We have people who will be working tomorrow and Saturday delivering the mail. We will have folks delivering some mail, priority mail, some of it on Sunday. The postal service is not just a 6-day operation today. They deliver a lot of packages and parcels now on Sunday.

Our legislation is designed to enable those folks to be more innovative, to unleash the innovative spirit within the postal service, and to bring ideas in from a lot of other folks to help the postal service in that regard.

I think that pretty well covers my talking points. Mr. President, I ask that, after you have had a chance to get a good rest this weekend, to maybe take a look. I will come and visit you, maybe tell you what we are doing here, and see if you would like to join us somewhere down the road as a cosponsor or at least be a constructive critic. Either role would be very welcome.

Today I am introducing the Improving Postal Operations, Service and Transparency Act of 2015, known as the iPOST Act. As my colleagues here in the Senate know, the way we communicate as a society has changed dramatically over the past 20 years. Instead of sending a letter to loved ones overseas, we send a Facebook message or Skype. Instead of sending our bills every month, we go online and enter our billing information. Instead of flipping through a catalogue, we visit the retail store's website. But while the way we communicate and conduct business has changed, we still require a vibrant, financially sound, and sustainable postal system. The United States Postal Service continues to be a critical enabler of communications and commerce that maintains a unique delivery network that connects every community, town, and city in this country and with posts around the world.

The Postal Service is a more than 200 year-old institution that today serves as the linchpin of a $1 trillion dollar mailing industry employing more than 8.4 million people. It is the nexus between consumers and businesses as diverse as Hallmark, Amazon, small town newspapers, and mail-order pharmacies. Over the years, the Postal Service has been a resilient institution that has consistently adjusted with the times and adapting when necessary to remain a vital part of our Nation's economic infrastructure and really our everyday lives. Many would agree that,

though much has changed in our country and our economy since the formation of the Postal Service, the need for an efficient and secure transfer of communications and goods has not. Nevertheless, the growing trend toward digital communication, the Postal Service's significant long-term financial liabilities, and the continued decline of First Class mail volume are threatening the future viability of this federal establishment enshrined in the Constitution. Thus, it is incumbent upon Congress to give the Postal Service the tools necessary to address its growing costs and modernize so it can remain relevant for generations to come.

Two American industries that have also undergone major disruption in the past and survived to live another day offer parallels to the Postal Service's current predicament. The U.S. freight rail industry faced disruption from the trucking industry and had significant overcapacity beginning in the 1950s. Three interrelated components helped the freight rail industry recover: a focus on improving productivity, containing costs, and generating revenue. Likewise, the U.S. auto industry has faced similar challenges: overcapacity, too many suppliers, and a declining market share. The freight rail and auto industries both have come roaring back to life and profitability. But it's important to note that they did so in part thanks to helpful legislative reform.

While containing costs, generating revenue, and improving productivity are certainly part of the postal reform equation and something postal management must continue to focus on, we must do our part to bring badly needed structural reforms to the Postal Service's business model and ensure long-term stability in the years to come.

Originally, the Postal Service was a federal department that required annual appropriations from Congress. In 1971, Congress passed legislation to make the Postal Service an ''independent establishment of the executive branch,'' designed to run as a self-sustaining entity that would cover its operating costs with revenues produced through sales, including postage and related products and services. Hence, the modern version of the Postal Service was born.

As time passed, Postal Service reforms became necessary to create stability in the agency and to ensure that the American taxpayer and the business community would continue to benefit from its products and services. In an effort to address these needs, Congress enacted the Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act of 2006, PAEA. When PAEA was signed into law a decade ago, First-Class Mail volume was peaking at 213 billion pieces, the postal workforce was composed of almost 700,000 career employees and the e-commerce market was in its infancy with a value of just over $100 billion annually.

Unfortunately, passage of the PAEA came at the cusp of immense change in the mailing industry, and also our economy as a whole. The significant advancement in digital communication that continued through the recession, the steady decline in First-Class Mail and Standard Mail volume, and the rising costs associated with longstanding healthcare and retirement obligations created a tumultuous relationship between Postal Service revenues and costs.

In the decade since passage of PAEA, total Postal Service mail volume has fallen some 27 percent to 155 billion pieces, the career workforce is 30 percent smaller and the booming domestic e-commerce market is now valued at more than $300 billion. The effects of the Great Recession in 2008 had a tremendous impact on the mailing industry, and by extension the Postal Service's bottom line. To combat these effects, the Postal Regulatory Commission approved a temporary emergency rate increase, which has been the primary reason for the Postal Service's positive operating income over the past 2 years.

I have worked on postal issues with various colleagues for a large part of my time in the United States Senate. Further, I have been working on postal reform diligently since 2010 when it became apparent that the future of the Postal Service was in jeopardy. Last Congress, former Senator Tom Coburn and I introduced a package that we felt moved the Postal Service forward and solved the long term problems that plague it. Unfortunately, that bill did not pass and in January the Postal Service was forced to change its delivery standards. Since then, service has noticeably declined.

I have worked diligently with my colleagues and a wide range of postal stakeholders including postal consumers, the mailing industry, postal labor unions, and Postal Service leadership for the last eight months on a compromise proposal. The legislation I have introduced is a starting point in making sure the Postal Service remains relevant in the digital age by achieving financial viability and better meeting our communication and commerce needs. I will continue to work with all interested parties, my colleagues in the Senate and the House, including Chairman RON JOHNSON of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, and the Administration to build on, perfect, and revise this legislation going forward. I am confident that the Postal Service can turn this corner and remain relevant in the decades to come, but it is going to take collaboration, communication, and compromise from all stakeholders and Congress to make that happen.

The Improving Postal Operations, Service and Transparency Act, iPOST Act, will set the path to make solvency possible and fix the Postal Service's financial and other challenges for the long-term. In particular iPOST Act would ensure that our federal pension systems recognize the differences between the postal and non-postal federal workforce to prevent the Postal Service from paying more than it owes into the federal retirement systems, as has happened in the past.

The iPOST Act would restructure the way the Postal Service funds its remaining liability for retiree healthcare by scrapping the existing, unaffordable payment schedule and replacing it with a system with realistic payment goals that would allow the Postal Service to invest over the next 10 years in a more lucrative TSP-like account. Combined, these provisions would help the Postal Service and taxpayers by paying down the Postal Service's long-term retiree health obligations sooner.

The iPOST Act would create a Postal Service Health Benefits Program, PSHBP, within the Federal Employee Health Benefits Plan, FEHBP, and require that all Medicare-eligible postal annuitants and employees enroll in Medicare parts A, B, and D. This would ensure better coordination between PSHBP and Medicare than we see with FEHBP and Medicare today and allow the Postal Service to reap the full benefit of the resources it and its employees pay into Medicare.

The iPOSTAct would require an independent analysis of the recent network changes put into place by the Postal Service and how service can be improved, particularly in rural areas. The bill further proposes a pause in the Postal Service's network optimization efforts for 2 years for plants and 5 years for post offices to ensure a stabilization of service for all postal customers.

The iPOST Act would provide customers big and small with better transparency into how the Postal Service performs for them regardless of whether they live in a large city, a suburban development, or a remote rural area.

The iPOST Act would makes the current temporary emergency rate increase permanent while freezing any further rate increases until a new rate system can be established by the Postal Regulatory Commission by January 1, 2018.

The iPOST Act would allow the Postal Service, based on meeting certain conditions, to introduce new non-postal products and services, ship beer, wine and distilled spirits, and partner with State and local governments in providing government services.

In introducing this bill, I invite all interested stakeholders from around the country, whether they happen to be residents of rural, urban, or suburban communities, businesses that use the mail broadly or individual customers of the Postal Service, to come to the table and work with Congress on a viable path forward. I encourage the mailing industry, the postal unions, and Postal Service management to continue to discuss reform measures and to view this bill as a possible path forward to consensus. To my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I look forward to working with you to make

what I think is a good bill even better. Again, introduction is the first step in this process. I am committed to working together to find consensus on this legislation and fix the serious, but solvable challenges facing the Postal Service.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 2059. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income amounts received on account of claims based on certain unlawful discrimination and to allow income averaging for backpay and frontpay awards received on account of such claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Civil Justice Tax Fairness Act of 2015. I am very pleased to be joined by my colleague from Maryland, Senator CARDIN, in introducing this bipartisan bill.

This bill would change the taxation of awards received by individuals that result from judgments in or settlements of employment discrimination and civil rights cases, and would apply to victims in cases including racial discrimination, sexual discrimination, and whistleblower discrimination. These changes would correct an inequity in current law and are designed to promote the fair and equitable settlement of such claims.

In 2003, I introduced the Civil Rights Tax Relief Act. In 2004, Congress adopted the most important part of that bill, allowing successful plaintiffs in civil rights actions to deduct the portion of their awards covering attorneys' fees from their annual incomes. This provision eliminated the double-taxation of such fees, which are still taxable income to the attorney. Two important provisions from my 2003 bill, which I will describe in a moment, have yet to be addressed, and the bill we introduce today would enact them.

The primary purpose of the bill we are introducing today is to remedy an unintended consequence of a 1996 law, which made damage awards that are not based on ''physical injuries or physical sickness'' part of a plaintiff's taxable income. Because most acts of employment discrimination and civil rights violations do not cause physical injuries, this provision has had a direct and negative impact on plaintiffs who successfully prove that they have been subjected to intentional employment discrimination or other intentional violations of their civil rights.

Our bill would remedy the unfair method of taxation of civil rights victims' settlements and court awards with respect to ''frontpay'' and ''backpay,'' and with respect to the taxation of noneconomic damages. By way of background, I should explain that awards of compensation attributable to the difference between what the employee was paid and the amount he or she should have been paid are known as ''backpay.'' ''Frontpay'' represents the future wages and benefits that would have been paid had the former employee not been terminated or had the employee not been forced to resign.

Our bill contains two important reforms: First, award amounts for frontpay or backpay would continue to be included as taxable income, but would be eligible for income averaging according to the time period covered by the award. This correction would allow individuals to pay taxes at the same marginal rates that would have applied to them had they not suffered discrimination. Income averaging more fairly takes into account the person's financial standing apart from the lump sum of the award.

Second, the bill would also allow plaintiffs to exclude non-economic damages, amounts awarded for pain, suffering or other health effects, from their income, to treat employment and civil rights claims the same as claims that involve a physical injury.

The Civil Justice Tax Fairness Act would encourage the fair settlement of employment discrimination claims. Our legislation would allow both plaintiffs and defendants to settle claims based on the damages suffered, not on the excessive taxes that are now levied—taxation that adds insult to a civil rights victim's injury and serves as a barrier to the just settlement of civil rights claims.

I invite my colleagues to join Senator CARDIN and me in support of this bipartisan, common sense legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter of support be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL EMPLOYMENT LAWYERS ASSOCIATION,
SEPTEMBER 16, 2015.

Re: Introduction of the Civil Justice Tax Fairness Act

Hon. SUSAN M. COLLINS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: On behalf of the National Employment Lawyers Association (NELA) we commend and thank you for your leadership in introducing the Civil Justice Tax Fairness Act of 2015 (CJTFA). Your interest in this bill demonstrates the kind of vision that is increasingly rare—the vision that it is possible to find solutions to pressing problems that are beneficial to both America's workers and employers.

Founded in 1985, NELA is the largest professional membership organization in the country comprised of lawyers who represent employees in labor, employment, and civil rights disputes. NELA advances employee rights and serves lawyers who advocate for equality and justice in the American workplace. With 69 circuit, state, and local affiliates, NELA has a membership of over 4,000 attorneys working on behalf of those who have faced illegal treatment in the workplace. There has been unanimity among our members for nearly 20 years that passage of the Civil Justice Tax Fairness Act is a top legislative priority.

The CJTFA has significant ramifications for people who have been harmed by illegal treatment in their workplace. No one starts a new job with any thought that they will find themselves in a subsequent legal dispute with their employer, yet this is unfortunately a reality for America's workers. The CJTFA, which has been known as the Civil Rights Tax Fairness Act and the Civil Rights Tax Relief Act in prior Congresses, is a ''win-win'' for both employees and business. Previous versions of the CJTFA garnered widespread support by a broad-based coalition of business, civil rights, and legal organizations such as the U.S Chamber of Commerce (USCC), the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM), the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights (LCCHR), and the American Bar Association (ABA). At present, we have the support of the ABA and we know that many other organizations will be joining us in the near future.

The CJTFA will correct current inequities in tax treatment of settlements and awards received by individuals in employment and civil rights cases. Under current law, those who suffer noneconomic damages as a result of unfair employment practices pay taxes; those who suffer noneconomic damages as a result of physical injuries (such as from car accidents) do not. The CJTFA will correct this unfairness by excluding from gross income non-economic damages received in civil rights and employment cases.

Similarly, employees who have not lost wages pay taxes at the rates applicable to the actual wages they earned in each year. But if they receive back or front pay in a settlement or award, they must pay taxes on lump sum recoveries that represent multiple years of such pay—a patently unfair practice. The CJTFA will correct this unfairness by taxing lump sum recoveries as if they were received in the year earned and by providing an exemption from the alternative minimum tax (AMT) for any resulting tax benefit.

By making settlements less expensive and easier to achieve, the CJTFA will reduce the number of employment and civil rights cases that go to trial, freeing up valuable court resources for other matters. The CJTFA not only benefits the parties to employment disputes, but also America's taxpayers who must bear the costs associated with a less efficient judicial system.

On behalf of our 69 affiliates, 4,000 members, and the hundreds of thousands of employees they represent, we are extremely pleased that you are championing this important bipartisan, bicameral legislation. We look forward to working closely with you and your staff to gain passage of the CJTFA in the 114th Congress.

Sincerely,

TERISA E. CHAW,
Executive Director.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 257—CONGRATULATING CAPTAIN KRISTEN GRIEST AND FIRST LIEUTENANT SHAYE HAVER ON THEIR GRADUATION FROM RANGER SCHOOL

Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. WARREN, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. TESTER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. REED, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr.

WARNER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. COONS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. GARDNER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 257

Whereas United States Army Rangers ''Lead the Way!'' and have played a decisive role in military engagements since before the Revolutionary War;

Whereas Ranger School prepares members of the Armed Forces to serve as leaders and members of elite combat forces tasked with dismounted infantry, airborne, airmobile, amphibious, and independent squad and platoon-size operations;

Whereas Ranger School is one of the toughest training courses for which a member can volunteer, with three phases testing a member's ability to patrol, navigate, mountaineer, and execute combat arms functional skills;

Whereas students in Ranger School train to exhaustion, pushing the limits of their minds and bodies;

Whereas although many members apply to Ranger School, fewer than 45 percent, on average, possess the mental and physical toughness required to earn the highly coveted Ranger tab signifying graduation from the School;

Whereas Captain Kristen Griest and First Lieutenant Shaye Haver braved the rigors of Ranger School, becoming the first women to successfully earn the Ranger tab;

Whereas they stood shoulder-to-shoulder with their fellow members, carrying their own weight and, at times, the weight of others;

Whereas their personal courage, sacrifices, and extraordinary leadership skills establish them as role models for women and men alike, proving that skill, not gender, determines military aptitude and success; and

Whereas, as graduates of the United States Military Academy, they exemplify the time-honored creed of ''Duty, Honor, Country'', and will continue to shape the future of our military and the Rangers in the years to come: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors and recognizes the patriotism and historic contributions to the United States by Captain Kristen Griest and First Lieutenant Shaye Haver;

(2) commends their character, courage, and tenacity as the first women to earn the Ranger tab signifying graduation from Ranger School;

(3) recognizes that our military and our country are more battle ready as a result of their accomplishments;

(4) celebrates their service as they continue to ''Lead the Way!'' as our nation's newest United States Army Rangers; and

(5) congratulates them for their inspiring and groundbreaking accomplishments.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I wish to honor and congratulate CPT Kristen Griest and 1LT Shaye Haver for their historic accomplishment of being the first two women soldiers to complete U.S. Army Ranger School and earn their highly coveted Ranger tabs.

Earning the right to wear a Ranger tab is not for the faint-hearted. The rigors of the course test even the strongest servicemembers. Many try; few succeed.

Through their grit and determination, Captain Griest and Lieutenant Haver have demonstrated that character, courage, and tenacity, not gender, are the hallmarks of great servicemembers and leaders.

Just as teamwork and dedication are the benchmarks for military effectiveness, they are also the mandates of the U.S. Army Rangers who are tasked with our Nation's most challenging and difficult missions. Captain Griest and Lieutenant Haver, along with their fellow Ranger School classmates, braved the challenges and serve as role models for girls and boys—women and men—in the United States and around the world. This integrated class answered our Nation's call to service. They stood shoulder-to-shoulder, enduring the course's extreme mental and physical stress, together. Each carried his or her own weight, and at times the weight of others, proving that integration represents not just a lofty goal, but an achievable reality. Their collective and distinguished accomplishments embody the values of our Armed Forces and our Nation.

The journey toward integration, however, has been hard fought. Before them, the first African Americans and women who answered the call to service laid the foundation for making integration possible. These pioneers inherently understood the importance of their contributions to the realization of integration. They also recognized the undeniable truth that an integrated and balanced force is a successful force both on and off the battlefield.

The effectiveness of a military unit is almost always determined by the cohesion of its individual members, their dedication to the team, and their commitment to the mission. No individual servicemember can succeed by his or her efforts alone. Success is forged from equality and integration.

As we celebrate Captain Griest's and Lieutenant Haver's historic and inspiring achievements, we express our pride and gratitude for their personal courage and sacrifice. I am confident that the military and our country are more battle ready as a result. I am also confident that Captain Griest and Lieutenant Haver will continue to serve with distinction as they ''Lead the Way!'' as our Nation's newest U.S. Army Rangers. As a result of their milestone achievements, they have inspired a nation.

With this in mind, I am pleased to offer this resolution with Senators MIKULSKI, AYOTTE, BALDWIN, BOXER, CANTWELL, CAPITO, ERNST, FEINSTEIN, FISCHER, GILLIBRAND, HEITKAMP, HIRONO, KLOBUCHAR, MCCASKILL, MURKOWSKI, MURRAY, SHAHEEN, STABENOW, WARREN, PERDUE, MURPHY, KIRK, TESTER, FLAKE, REED, DONNELLY, GRASSLEY, BLUMENTHAL, ISAKSON, WARNER, LEAHY, FRANKEN, RUBIO, HEINRICH, COONS, THUNE, and MERKLEY honoring and recognizing the patriotism and historic contributions to the United States by Captain Griest and Lieutenant Haver, and extend my best wishes and heartiest congratulations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 258—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 20 THROUGH 26, 2015, AS ''NATIONAL ADULT EDUCATION AND FAMILY LITERACY WEEK''

Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. REED, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. PETERS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 258

Whereas the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development reports that approximately 36,000,000 adults in the United States lack the basic literacy and numeracy necessary to succeed at home, in the workplace, and in society;

Whereas the literacy of the people of the United States is essential for the economic and societal well-being of the United States;

Whereas the United States reaps the economic benefits of individuals who improve their literacy, numeracy, and English-language skills;

Whereas literacy and educational skills are necessary for individuals to fully benefit from the range of opportunities available in the United States;

Whereas the economy and position of the United States in the world marketplace depend on having a literate, skilled population;

Whereas the unemployment rate in the United States is highest among those without a high school diploma or an equivalent credential, demonstrating that education is important to economic recovery;

Whereas the educational skills of the parents of a child and the practice of reading to a child have a direct impact on the educational success of the child;

Whereas parental involvement in the education of a child is a key predictor of the success of a child, and the level of parental involvement in the education of a child increases as the educational level of the parent increases;

Whereas parents who participate in family literacy programs become more involved in the education of their children and gain the tools necessary to obtain a job or find better employment;

Whereas, as a result of family literacy programs, the lives of children become more stable, and the success of children in the classroom and in future endeavors becomes more likely;

Whereas adults need to be part of a long-term solution to the educational challenges faced by the people of the United States;

Whereas many older people in the United States lack the reading, math, or English-language skills necessary to read a prescription and follow medical instructions, which endangers the lives of the older people and the lives of their loved ones;

Whereas many individuals who are unemployed, underemployed, or receive public assistance lack the literacy skills necessary to obtain and keep a job, to continue their education, or to participate in job training programs;

Whereas many high school dropouts do not have the literacy skills necessary to complete their education, transition to postsecondary education or career and technical training, or obtain a job;

Whereas a large portion of individuals in prison have low educational skills and prisoners without educational skills are more likely to return to prison once released;

Whereas many immigrants in the United States do not have the literacy skills necessary to succeed in the United States; and

Whereas National Adult Education and Family Literacy Week highlights the need to

ensure that each individual in the United States has the literacy skills necessary to succeed at home, at work, and in society: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of September 20 through 26, 2015, as ''National Adult Education and Family Literacy Week'' to raise public awareness about the importance of adult education, workforce skills, and family literacy;

(2) encourages people across the United States to support programs to assist individuals in need of adult education, workforce skills, and family literacy programs;

(3) recognizes the importance of adult education, workforce skills, and family literacy programs; and

(4) calls upon public, private, and nonprofit entities to support increased access to adult education and family literacy programs to ensure a literate society.

SENATE RESOLUTION 259—HONORING THE BRAVERY AND HEROISM OF THOSE WHO SELFLESSLY PREVENTED A DEADLY TERRORIST ATTACK AND SAVED COUNTLESS LIVES WHILE ABOARD A PASSENGER TRAIN BOUND FROM AMSTERDAM TO PARIS ON AUGUST 21, 2015

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. REID, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WICKER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 259

Whereas, on Friday, August 21, 2015, United States Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone, Oregon Army National Guard Specialist Aleksander Skarlatos, college student Anthony Sadler, and others selflessly risked their lives and forcibly subdued a gunman on a train carrying more than 500 passengers;

Whereas the gunman was armed with a Kalashnikov assault rifle, a handgun, a box cutter, and 9 magazines carrying hundreds of rounds of ammunition and could have killed and injured dozens of passengers had the gunman not been stopped;

Whereas Mark Moogalian, a 51 year old French-American professor and musician, courageously attempted to subdue the gunman and wrestled the Kalashnikov away from the gunman, but was shot by the gunman;

Whereas United States Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone, Oregon Army National Guard Specialist Aleksander Skarlatos, college student Anthony Sadler, and British consultant Chris Norman took courageous action on their own initiative and forcibly subdued the gunman, rendering the gunman unconscious and tying up the gunman on the floor of the train with t-shirts;

Whereas United States Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone suffered serious injuries, including a partially severed thumb, from the gunman's box cutter;

Whereas, notwithstanding his own injuries, United States Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone treated the wounds and likely saved the life of French-American Mark Moogalian;

Whereas French President François Hollande awarded United States Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone, Oregon Army National Guard Specialist Aleksander Skarlatos, college student Anthony Sadler, and British consultant Chris Norman the highest civilian honor in France, the Legion of Honor, and pledged to do the same for French-American Mark Moogalian and Frenchman Damien A., who also helped thwart the attack;

Whereas the United States Air Force has stated that it will nominate United States Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone for the Airman's Medal, the highest award of the Air Force for non-combat bravery;

Whereas the United States Army has nominated Oregon Army National Guard Specialist Aleksander Skarlatos for the Soldier's Medal, the highest award of the Army for acts of heroism not involving actual conflict with an enemy;

Whereas the Department of Defense will honor United States Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone with the Purple Heart award and Oregon Army National Guard Specialist Aleksander Skarlatos and college student Anthony Sadler each with an award for courage and valor;

Whereas the city of Sacramento recognized the heroism of United States Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone, Oregon Army National Guard Specialist Aleksander Skarlatos, and college student Anthony Sadler through a Hometown Heroes Parade on the California Capitol Mall on September 11, 2015;

Whereas United States Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone, who is 23 years old and a resident of California, joined the United States Air Force nearly 3 years ago and serves as a medical technician stationed at Lajes Air Base in the Azores;

Whereas Oregon Army National Guard Specialist Aleksander Skarlatos is 22 years old and a resident of Oregon and had recently returned to Oregon after a 9 month deployment in Afghanistan;

Whereas Anthony Sadler is 23 years old, a resident of California, and is a student studying kinesiology at the California State University at Sacramento; and

Whereas United States Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone, Oregon Army National Guard Specialist Aleksander Skarlatos, and college student Anthony Sadler were childhood friends raised in the Sacramento area who were on vacation in Europe together at the time they courageously and selflessly thwarted a terrorist attack and saved countless lives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors and commends the extraordinary bravery, courage, and heroism of United States Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone, Oregon Army National Guard Specialist Aleksander Skarlatos, college student Anthony Sadler, French-American Mark Moogalian, British consultant Chris Norman, and Frenchman Damien A., who selflessly risked their own lives to prevent a terrorist attack that could have killed dozens aboard a passenger train bound for Paris; and

(2) extends best wishes for a full recovery to all innocent individuals who were injured during the attack, including United States Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone and French-American Mark Moogalian.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2666. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. THUNE) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 719, to require the Transportation Security Administration to conform to existing Federal law and regulations regarding criminal investigator positions, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2666. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. THUNE) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 719, to require the Transportation Security Administration to conform to existing Federal law and regulations regarding criminal investigator positions, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 12, line 11, insert ''*and the Committee on the Judiciary*'' after ''*Transportation*''.

On page 13, line 4, insert ''*and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs*'' after ''*Transportation*''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 17, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SR–328A of the Russell Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Business Meeting.''

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

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 September 17, 2015, at 10 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 17, 2015, at 10 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 meet during the session of the Senate on September 17, 2015, at 9:45 a.m., in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 17, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–366 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 September 17, 2015, at 11:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''State Department Processes in Establishing Tier Rankings for the 2015 Trafficking in Persons Report.''

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 September 17, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''Biosimilar Implementation: A Progress Report from FDA.''

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 17, 2015, at 10:15 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 17, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

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

HONORING THE BRAVERY AND HEROISM OF THOSE WHO SELFLESSLY PREVENTED A DEADLY TERRORIST ATTACK ON AUGUST 21, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 259.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 259) honoring the bravery and heroism of those who selflessly prevented a deadly terrorist attack and saved countless lives while aboard a passenger train bound from Amsterdam to Paris on August 21, 2015.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I submitted this resolution recognizing and commending those who boldly prevented what could have amounted to an unspeakable tragedy aboard a high-speed train headed toward Paris, France, on August 21, 2015.

Those who took these courageous actions were: U.S. Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone, Oregon Army National Guard Specialist Aleksander Skarlatos, California State University Sacramento student Anthony Sadler, French-American Mark Moogalian, Frenchman Damien A., and Chris Norman, a British citizen.

I would particularly like to recognize U.S. Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone, Oregon Army National Guard Specialist Aleksander Skarlatos, and California State University Sacramento student Anthony Sadler, three childhood friends who grew up in California, and thank them for their fearlessness, commitment to one another, and swift action that saved countless lives.

That day, aboard the train carrying more than 500 passengers, a gunman armed himself with a Kalashnikov rifle, a pistol, a box cutter, hundreds of rounds of ammunition, and a container of gasoline, seeking to exact serious harm on innocent passengers.

In response to this threat, U.S. Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone, Oregon Army National Guard Specialist Aleksander Skarlatos, college student Anthony Sadler, Mark Moogalian, Chris Norman, and Damien A. took action to protect other passengers.

They subdued the gunman, risking their lives for the safety of others and representing the type of courage that should inspire us all.

Initially, Damien A. and Mark Moogalian encountered the gunman and tried to disarm him. In the struggle, Mark Moogalian suffered a gunshot wound. We wish Mark Moogalian a full and speedy recovery from his wounds, and thank him for his courageous action.

Upon noticing the disruption, U.S. Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone saw the gunman in the passenger car and immediately tried to subdue him.

He grabbed the gunman around the neck to prevent the gunman from shooting his weapon. U.S. Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone suffered multiple box cutter wounds while wrestling the gunman.

Oregon Army National Guard Specialist Aleksander Skarlatos quickly followed, as did Anthony Sadler and Chris Norman.

Ultimately, the gunman was subdued, rendered unconscious, and tied up on the floor of the train.

And, U.S. Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone, a medical technician himself injured by the attacker's box cutter, then treated Mark Moogalian's injuries and helped save his life.

The swift, decisive, and courageous actions of these men prevented what could have been the deaths of dozens of passengers.

Their heroism should be recognized as an inspiration by all Americans, including by this body, and I thank all of my Senate colleagues for cosponsoring the resolution to honor their bravery and heroic acts.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 259) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

WELCOMING KING FELIPE VI AND QUEEN LETIZIA OF SPAIN ON THEIR OFFICIAL VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Relations Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 253 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 253) welcoming King Felipe VI and Queen Letizia of Spain on their official visit to the United States, including visits to Miami and St. Augustine, Florida.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 253) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of September 15, 2015, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

EMERGENCY INFORMATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 227, S. 1090.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1090) to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide eligibility for broadcasting facilities to receive certain disaster assistance, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 1090) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1090

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 Information Improvement Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. ELIGIBILITY OF BROADCASTING FACILITIES FOR CERTAIN DISASTER ASSISTANCE.

(a) PRIVATE NONPROFIT FACILITY DEFINED.—Section 102(11)(B) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(11)(B)) is amended by inserting ''broadcasting facilities,'' after ''workshops,''.

(b) CRITICAL SERVICES DEFINED.—Section 406(a)(3)(B) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5172(a)(3)(B)) is amended by striking ''communications,'' and inserting ''communications (including broadcast and telecommunications),''.

COMPETITIVE SERVICE ACT OF 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 228, S. 1580.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1580) to allow additional appointing authorities to select individuals from competitive service certificates.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 1580) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1580

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 ''Competitive Service Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL APPOINTING AUTHORITIES FOR COMPETITIVE SERVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3318 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

''(b) OTHER APPOINTING AUTHORITIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—During the 240-day period beginning on the date of issuance of a certificate of eligibles under section 3317(a), an appointing authority other than the appointing authority requesting the certificate (in this subsection referred to as the 'other appointing authority') may select an individual from that certificate in accordance with this subsection for an appointment to a position that is—

''(A) in the same occupational series as the position for which the certification of eligibles was issued (in this subsection referred to as the 'original position'); and

''(B) at a similar grade level as the original position.

''(2) APPLICABILITY.—An appointing authority requesting a certificate of eligibles may share the certificate with another appointing authority only if the announcement of the original position provided notice that the resulting list of eligible candidates may be used by another appointing authority.

''(3) REQUIREMENTS.—The selection of an individual under paragraph (1)—

''(A) shall be made in accordance with subsection (a); and

''(B) subject to paragraph (4), may be made without any additional posting under section 3327.

''(4) INTERNAL NOTICE.—Before selecting an individual under paragraph (1), and subject to the requirements of any collective bargaining obligation of the other appointing authority, the other appointing authority shall—

''(A) provide notice of the available position to employees of the other appointing authority;

''(B) provide up to 10 business days for employees of the other appointing authority to apply for the position; and

''(C) review the qualifications of employees submitting an application.

''(5) COLLECTIVE BARGAINING OBLIGATIONS.—Nothing in this subsection limits any collective bargaining obligation of an agency under chapter 71.''.

(b) ALTERNATIVE RANKING AND SELECTION PROCEDURES.—Section 3319 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

''(c) SELECTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—An appointing official may select any applicant in the highest quality category or, if fewer than 3 candidates have been assigned to the highest quality category, in a merged category consisting of the highest and the second highest quality categories.

''(2) USE BY OTHER APPOINTING OFFICIALS.—Under regulations prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management, appointing officials other than the appointing official described in paragraph (1) (in this subsection referred to as the 'other appointing official') may select an applicant for an appointment to a position that is—

''(A) in the same occupational series as the position for which the certification of eligibles was issued (in this subsection referred to as the 'original position'); and

''(B) at a similar grade level as the original position.

''(3) APPLICABILITY.—An appointing authority requesting a certificate of eligibles may share the certificate with another appointing authority only if the announcement of the original position provided notice that the resulting list of eligible candidates may be used by another appointing authority.

''(4) REQUIREMENTS.—The selection of an individual under paragraph (2)—

''(A) shall be made in accordance with this subsection; and

''(B) subject to paragraph (5), may be made without any additional posting under section 3327.

''(5) INTERNAL NOTICE.—Before selecting an individual under paragraph (2), and subject to the requirements of any collective bargaining obligation of the other appointing authority (within the meaning given that term in section 3318(b)(1)), the other appointing official shall—

''(A) provide notice of the available position to employees of the appointing authority employing the other appointing official;

''(B) provide up to 10 business days for employees of the other appointing authority to apply for the position; and

''(C) review the qualifications of employees submitting an application.

''(6) COLLECTIVE BARGAINING OBLIGATIONS.—Nothing in this subsection limits any collective bargaining obligation of an agency under chapter 71.

''(7) PREFERENCE ELIGIBLES.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), an appointing official may not pass over a preference eligible in the same category from which selection is made, unless the requirements of section 3317(b) and 3318(c), as applicable, are satisfied.''.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 3319(c)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''3318(b)'' and inserting ''3318(c)''.

(2) Section 9510(b)(5) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''3318(b)'' and inserting ''3318(c)''.

(d) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall issue an interim final rule with comment to carry out the amendments made by this section.

TSA OFFICE OF INSPECTION ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 191, H.R. 719.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 719) to require the Transportation Security Administration to conform to existing Federal law and regulations regarding criminal investigator positions, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''TSA Office of Inspection Accountability Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Consistent with Federal law and regulations, for law enforcement officers to qualify for premium pay as criminal investigators, the officers must, in general, spend on average at least

50 percent of their time investigating, apprehending, or detaining individuals suspected or convicted of offenses against the criminal laws of the United States.

(2) According to the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS IG), the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) does not ensure that its cadre of criminal investigators in the Office of Inspection are meeting this requirement, even though they are considered law enforcement officers under TSA policy and receive premium pay.

(3) Instead, TSA criminal investigators in the Office of Inspection primarily monitor the results of criminal investigations conducted by other agencies, investigate administrative cases of TSA employee misconduct, and carry out inspections, covert tests, and internal reviews, which the DHS IG asserts could be performed by employees other than criminal investigators at a lower cost.

(4) The premium pay and other benefits afforded to TSA criminal investigators in the Office of Inspection who are incorrectly classified as such will cost the taxpayer as much as $17 million over 5 years if TSA fails to make any changes to the number of criminal investigators in the Office of Inspection, according to the DHS IG.

(5) This may be a conservative estimate, as it accounts for the cost of Law Enforcement Availability Pay, but not the costs of law enforcement training, statutory early retirement benefits, police vehicles, and weapons.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATION.—The term ''Administration'' means the Transportation Security Administration.

(2) ASSISTANT SECRETARY.—The term ''Assistant Secretary'' means the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security) of the Department of Homeland Security.

(3) INSPECTOR GENERAL.—The term ''Inspector General'' means the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security.

SEC. 4. INSPECTOR GENERAL AUDIT.

(a) AUDIT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General shall analyze the data and methods that the Assistant Secretary uses to identify Office of Inspection employees of the Administration who meet the requirements of sections 8331(20), 8401(17), and 5545a of title 5, United States Code, and provide the relevant findings to the Assistant Secretary, including a finding on whether the data and methods are adequate and valid.

(b) PROHIBITION ON HIRING.—If the Inspector General finds that such data and methods are inadequate or invalid, the Administration shall not hire any new employee to work in the Office of Inspection of the Administration until—

(1) the Assistant Secretary makes a certification described in section 5 to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate; and

(2) the Inspector General submits to such Committees a finding, not later than 30 days after the Assistant Secretary makes such certification, that the Assistant Secretary utilized adequate and valid data and methods to make such certification.

SEC. 5. TSA OFFICE OF INSPECTION WORKFORCE CERTIFICATION.

(a) CERTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.—The Assistant Secretary shall, by not later than 90 days after the date the Inspector General provides its findings to the Assistant Secretary under section 4(a), document and certify in writing to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate that only those Office of Inspection employees of the Administration who meet the requirements of sections 8331(20), 8401(17), and 5545a of title 5, United States Code, are classified as criminal investigators and are receiving premium pay and other benefits associated with such classification.

(b) EMPLOYEE RECLASSIFICATION.—The Assistant Secretary shall reclassify criminal investigator positions in the Office of Inspection as noncriminal investigator positions or non-law enforcement positions if the individuals in those positions do not, or are not expected to, spend an average of at least 50 percent of their time performing criminal investigative duties.

(c) PROJECTED COST SAVINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Secretary shall estimate the total long-term cost savings to the Federal Government resulting from the implementation of subsection (b), and provide such estimate to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate by not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) CONTENTS.—Such estimate shall identify savings associated with the positions reclassified under subsection (b) and include, among other factors the Assistant Secretary considers appropriate, savings from—

(A) law enforcement training;

(B) early retirement benefits;

(C) law enforcement availability and other premium pay; and

(D) weapons, vehicles, and communications devices.

SEC. 6. INVESTIGATION OF FEDERAL AIR MARSHAL SERVICE MISCONDUCT.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, or as soon as practicable, the Assistant Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate—

(1) materials in the possession or control of the Department of Homeland Security associated with the Office of Inspection's review of instances in which Federal Air Marshal Service officials obtained discounted or free firearms for personal use; and

(2) information on specific actions that will be taken to prevent Federal Air Marshal Service officials from using their official positions, or exploiting, in any way, the Service's relationships with private vendors to obtain discounted or free firearms for personal use.

SEC. 7. STUDY.

Not later than 180 days after the date that the Assistant Secretary submits the certification to Congress under section 5(a), the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a study—

(1) reviewing the employee requirements, responsibilities, and benefits of criminal investigators in the TSA Office of Inspection with criminal investigators employed at agencies adhering to the Office of Personnel Management employee classification system; and

(2) identifying any inconsistencies and costs implications for differences between the varying employee requirements, responsibilities, and benefits.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Thune amendment to the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to, that the substitute amendment, as amended, be agreed to, that the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The amendment (No. 2666) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To require the Assistant Secretary to submit certain materials and information to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security to submit a study to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate)

On page 12, line 11, insert ''*and the Committee on the Judiciary*'' after ''*Transportation*''.

On page 13, line 4, insert ''*and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs*'' after ''*Transportation*''.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 719), as amended, was passed.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m., Monday, September 21; 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; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 36.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2015, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:20 p.m., adjourned until Monday, September 21, 2015, at 2 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 17, 2015:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

MICHAEL C. MCGOWAN, OF DELAWARE, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE, FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

SIM FARAR, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2015.

SIM FARAR, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2018.

WILLIAM JOSEPH HYBL, OF COLORADO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2015.

WILLIAM JOSEPH HYBL, OF COLORADO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2018.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

JOHN MUIR NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE EXPANSION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. MARK DeSAULNIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support of H.R. 1289, the John Muir National Historic Site Expansion Act.

This bipartisan legislation will expand the Martinez, California historic site in my district that celebrates the life and legacy of John Muir. Muir was a lifelong conservationist, leading advocate of the National Park Service and a co-founder of the Sierra Club. He worked to establish and protect national parks including Yosemite, Sequoia, the Grand Canyon and Mt. Rainier.

The John Muir National Historic Site, which includes the home where he lived, covers 330 acres of Contra Costa County where Muir championed the revolutionary idea that wild spaces should be set aside for all to enjoy. This bill would add 44 acres of donated land from a non-profit trust, improving access to the park and its scenic trails, including those on Mount Wanda, named for Muir's eldest daughter. The trail systems are accessible for hikers, bikers and equestrians, including critical connections to the 550-mile Bay Area Ridge Trail and to nearby protected lands along the Franklin Ridge corridor.

As John Muir said, "everybody needs beauty as well as bread, places to play in . . . where nature may heal and cheer and give strength to body and soul alike."

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my predecessor Congressman George Miller who has been a champion of this bill. I appreciate Natural Resource Committee Chairman BISHOP and Ranking Member GRIJALVA, Subcommittee Chairman MCCLINTOCK, and Subcommittee Ranking Member TSONGAS for their leadership in bringing H.R. 1289 to the floor today.

I am grateful for the support of 31 of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle who cosponsored this bill and to Senators BOXER and FEINSTEIN for sponsoring this legislation in the U.S. Senate. I would also like to thank the John Muir Land Trust for its hard work and dedication preserving and protecting this valuable parkland and shoreline in Contra Costa County for future generations.

As our Nation prepares to celebrate the Centennial of the National Park Service, this legislation will help preserve the trails and lands that surround the longtime home of the man known as the Father of the National Park Service. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bipartisan legislation—The John Muir National Historic Site Expansion Act.

IN HONOR OF JOE CASEY, GENERAL MANAGER OF SEPTA

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Joe Casey, the general manager of the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority, who is planning to retire at the end of September after 34 years of service, the last seven as general manager.

Mr. Casey began working for SEPTA in 1982, and his tenure has included various senior management positions before his appointment as general manager in 2008. Under his leadership, SEPTA has seen tremendous improvement in customer service, infrastructure, and financial soundness. Notably, SEPTA has received the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) Distinguished Budget Award for 10 consecutive years under Mr. Casey's authority as Chief Financial Officer and general manager, a testament to Mr. Casey's commitment to fiscal responsibility and leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. Casey for his dedication to the Southeastern Pennsylvania community. The remarkable accomplishments and improvements SEPTA has achieved in recent years can be attributed to Mr. Casey's exceptional guidance. I applaud his efforts and wish him the best of luck in retirement.

TRIBUTE TO CONSTITUTION WEEK

HON. MIMI WALTERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following proclamation:

Whereas: September 17, 2015, marks the two hundred twenty-eighth anniversary of the drafting of the Constitution of the United States of America by the Constitutional Conventions; and

Whereas: It is fitting and proper to accord official recognition to this magnificent document and its memorable anniversary; and to the patriotic celebrations which will commemorate the occasion; and

Whereas: Public Law 915 guarantees the issuing of a proclamation each year by the President of the United States of America designating September 17 through 23 as Constitution Week;

Now, therefore, I, MIMI WALTERS, by virtue of the authority vested in me as Representative of the 45th Congressional District of the State of California do hereby recognize the week of September 17 through 23 as Constitution Week;

And ask our citizens to reaffirm the ideals the Framers of the Constitution had in 1787 by vigilantly protecting the freedoms guaranteed to us through this guardian of our liberties, remembering that lost rights may never be regained.

RECOGNIZING FLORIDA'S 16TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT FIRE AND RESCUE AND EMS PERSONNEL

HON. VERN BUCHANAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize fire and rescue and EMS personnel who have provided distinguished service to the people of Florida's 16th Congressional District.

As first responders, fire departments and emergency medical service teams are summoned on short notice to serve their respective communities. Oftentimes, they arrive at scenes of great adversity and trauma, to which they reliably bring strength and composure. These brave men and women spend hundreds of hours in training so that they are prepared when they get "the call."

In 2012, years ago, I established the 16th District Congressional Fire and Rescue and EMS Awards to honor officers, departments, and units for outstanding achievement.

On behalf of the people of Florida's 16th District, it is my privilege to congratulate the following winners, who were selected this year by an independent committee comprised of a cross section of current and retired fire and rescue personnel living in the district.

Firefighter/EMT Michael Dunn of the Cedar Hammock Fire Recue was chosen to receive the Preservation of Life Award

Lt. Don Rossow of the Englewood Area Fire Control District was chosen to receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award

District Chief/Paramedic Robin Thayer of the Manatee County Emergency Medical Services was chosen to receive the Career Service Award

Lt. Jason Wilkins, Lt. Jamie Mann, Firefighter/EMT Nicholas Jones, Firefighter/EMT Sean Sponable and Firefighter/EMT Clayton Huber were chosen to receive the Unit Citation Award

Deputy Chief Brett Pollok of the West Manatee Fire and Rescue was chosen to receive the Career Service Award

Fire Investigator/Inspector Larry Betts of the Southern Manatee Fire and Rescue District was chosen to receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

CELEBRATING CONSTITUTION DAY

HON. SCOTT GARRETT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, on this date two-hundred and twenty-eight years ago, the

delegates to the Constitutional Convention completed their arduous work and signed the document designed to restore liberty to the citizens of a new nation.

The American Republic was born out of a struggle against British tyranny and a monarchical system that our forefathers deemed incompatible with the rights of free men and women. Consistent with the principles espoused by the Spirit of '76 and enshrined in the Declaration of Independence, the United States Constitution was not imposed on the people. It was humbly submitted to the people for their approval.

A great national debate followed. If the people were to judge the Constitution, they were expected to understand the Constitution. The Federalist Papers, a series of 85 essays written by Alexander Hamilton, John Jay, and James Madison, responded to Antifederalist critics by serving as an invaluable guide to the Constitution's provisions. Their arguments proved decisive and, eventually, the requisite number of states ratified the Constitution. Education was integral to the Constitution's ratification.

At a time when the globe was dominated by kingdoms and empires, a skeptical world believed that a republic devoted to the ancient cause of liberty would inevitably fail. But the test of time has proven the wisdom, effectiveness, and durability of our great charter.

It has guaranteed our natural rights and preserved our cherished liberties.

It has inspired foreign peoples shackled by tyranny to seek to replicate what the Americans have accomplished.

It has resisted the waves of totalitarian ideologies that claimed human liberty to be a relic of antiquity.

On Constitution Day, Americans follow in the footsteps of the Founders, not only by recommitting ourselves to the Constitution's enlightened provisions, but also by accepting the duty to provide the education necessary for the survival of a free people.

I commend all those that take the opportunity this day provides to promote the American ideals of human liberty and renew our commitment to the preservation of the Constitution of the United States.

RECOGNIZING MISSOURI PRESS ASSOCIATION EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR DOUG CREWS ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today and ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Doug Crews for his 36 years of service to the Missouri Press Association.

Since 1990, Doug has led the Missouri Press Association as Executive Director. His service has been dedicated to promoting open government, in particular by advocating for the protection of state and federal Sunshine Laws. In addition, Doug has advocated on behalf of 75 North American press associations as President of the Newspaper Association Managers.

Doug's leadership has extended beyond the press community. A graduate of the University of Missouri School of Journalism, Doug served as President of the Mizzou Alumni Association and the State Historical Society of Missouri.

This February, Doug will join his wife Tricia in retirement. He can do so with great pride, knowing that in the span of his career he has accomplished so much and helped so many. While he will be missed in the communications world, I wish him the very best that retirement has to offer.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to join me in congratulating Doug Crews for his service to the State of Missouri and to journalists everywhere.

HONORING POLICE CHIEF JOSEPH COLLINS ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE GILMANTON POLICE DEPARTMENT AFTER 25 YEARS IN LAW ENFORCEMENT

HON. FRANK C. GUINTA

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my congratulations to Chief Joseph Collins on his retirement after 25 years with various law enforcement agencies throughout New Hampshire, and thank him for the outstanding work he did during his career.

Chief Collins' continuous progression within the law enforcement ranks during his time exemplifies his intelligence, positive attitude, and commitment to protecting and serving his community with the utmost professionalism.

Although Chief Collins will now shift his focus from serving his community to his family and faith, it's clear he leaves behind an example of strong leadership and compassion for others to emulate in his absence.

It is with great admiration that I congratulate Chief Collins on his retirement, and wish him the best on all future endeavors.

HONORING POLICE SERGEANT RANDALL BOGGS

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the service of Sergeant Randall Boggs, a man who has truly devoted himself to public service. Mr. Boggs was hired as a Police Officer by the Fairfield Police Department on September 18, 1989 and over the duration of his career worked in various capacities which included: Narcotic Investigations, Patrol, Special Operations, Major Crimes Investigation, Mobile Field Force, and the Fugitive Apprehension Team. On April 19, 2002 he was promoted to Police Corporal where he served for five years before being promoted to Police Sergeant on February 2, 2007.

As a Police Sergeant, Mr. Boggs consistently assisted City Management during changes in leadership and command staff, ensuring that the Fairfield Police Department upheld the highest operational standards during those times. Additionally, Mr. Boggs assumed the Police Lieutenant's position twice and managed Police Bureau operations.

Sergeant Boggs is a skilled team leader who has led numerous operations with exceptional professionalism and character. He has been a valued public servant in which his hard work and commitment to the public safety have made him a model representative of the law enforcement community.

CONGRATULATING CHAMOIS HIGH SCHOOL ON ITS BRONZE MEDAL AWARD

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Chamois High School on its Bronze Medal Award as a top Missouri High School from U.S. News and World Report.

This school's administration, teachers, and students should be commended for all of their hard work throughout the past year and for their commitment to education.

I ask you to join me in recognizing Chamois High School for a job well done.

CONGRATULATING AL AND LINDA FOURNIER FOR THEIR DECADES OF SERVICE AT FORT McCOY, WISCONSIN

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and thank Al and Linda Fournier for their combined 80 years of distinguished service at Fort McCoy, Wisconsin. The Fourniers, who met at Fort McCoy and were married in 1991, will be retiring from federal service on October 3, 2015. Together, the Fourniers helped Fort McCoy become one of the most capable and desirable training installations in the Army.

Al Fournier began his tenure of dedicated service at Fort McCoy in 1971. Since 2002 he has served as Deputy to the Garrison Commander. Thanks to Al's outstanding leadership and strategic contributions, Fort McCoy has been transformed into one of the nation's premier training centers and a preferred Army force projection site. Some of Al's major accomplishments at Fort McCoy include: the writing and publication of the Fort McCoy Installation Management System Handbook, the Fort McCoy Strategic Planning Handbook, and the Fort McCoy Acquisition Management–Financial Management Planning Handbook. Al's other achievements and awards are too numerous to note here, but suffice it to say that he is a visionary whose legacy will have a lasting impact on Fort McCoy and its mission as a Total Force Training Center of unparalleled excellence.

Linda Fournier began working at Fort McCoy in 1978 and has served as Public Affairs Officer since 2000. She has been instrumental in conducting programs designed to inform both the military community and the general public regarding Army and Fort McCoy activities, events, missions and policies. She has been the force behind numerous Fort

McCoy books and publications, the installation newspaper (The Real McCoy) and community outreach to ensure that Fort McCoy remains a great community partner and neighbor. Probably her most lasting impact at Fort McCoy is her role in the creation of the installation's Commemorative Area, History Center and Equipment Park. Under Linda's supervision, the Fort McCoy Commemorative Area was recognized with a Department of the Army Award of Excellence in the 2009 Major General Keith L. Ware Public Affairs Communications Competition and specifically cited for its Community Relations outreach.

It has been an honor for me to serve as U.S. Representative for Wisconsin's Third Congressional District during the Fournier's tenure at Fort McCoy. I know their leadership will be greatly missed at the base and surrounding communities, but I am thankful for their dedication and contributions to ensuring that Fort McCoy remains a shining star in the nation's military training infrastructure.

On behalf of my constituents in Wisconsin and a grateful nation, I would like to thank and commend Al and Linda Fournier for their decades of dedicated service with the U.S. Army Reserve at Fort McCoy and wish them the very best in their future endeavors.

CONGRATULATING DR. YUICHI SHODA, GOLDEN GOOSE AWARDEE

HON. SUZAN K. DelBENE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate University of Washington Professor Dr. Yuichi Shoda on being recognized this week as a recipient of the 2015 Golden Goose Award.

Created in 2012, the Golden Goose Award celebrates obscure science to show how basic research—even research that may sound odd—can lead to major breakthroughs and significant impacts on society.

Dr. Shoda's work with the "Marshmallow Test," first funded by the National Institutes of Health in the 1960s to test a child's self-control, is more than deserving of this honor. His test was seminal in interpreting human behavior and has impacted how we educate children and save for retirement today.

Each year, federal investments in research like this help push the boundaries of scientific knowledge, support new industries and address the challenges facing our country.

But to remain a world leader, we need to ensure our researchers and institutions continue to have the tools to explore new ideas and frontiers in research, as well as the funding opportunities to do so.

Unfortunately, research continues to face irresponsible funding cuts in Congress. When sequestration took effect two years ago, more than 1,000 grants at the National Science Foundation went unfunded, and NIH funding was slashed by $1.6 billion.

It's time we learn that research isn't a spigot that can just be turned on and off. Breakthroughs come after years of incremental research, and cutting funds now could set us back for decades to come.

Through my post-graduate research work, I have also seen firsthand the economic impact of these investments in communities nationwide. In my home state of Washington, for example, funding for NIH supports more than 14,000 jobs.

I hope this week's recognition of obscure science by the Golden Goose Awards helps renew our commitment to research. We must support the tireless efforts of those who allow our country to continue to break new ground in scientific discovery.

Congratulations to Dr. Shoda and the other Golden Goose Awardees, and thank you for your continued contributions to our nation.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL NEUROBLASTOMA AWARENESS DAY

HON. MICHAEL T. McCAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize September 20th as National Neuroblastoma Awareness Day. Neuroblastoma is a deadly pediatric cancer that primarily strikes infants and young children. Of the 15,780 new cases of pediatric cancer in the U.S. each year, approximately 700 are neuroblastoma diagnoses. About half of these children will have an advanced-stage, high-risk form of disease. Even with aggressive treatment, only 40 to 50 percent of high-risk patients will survive. Neuroblastoma is the most common extra-cranial solid tumor among children and the most common cancer in infancy. The cause of the disease is unknown but leads to abnormal cell growth during the development of the sympathetic nervous system.

I am pleased to inform my colleagues that we have seen significant progress this year in the fight against this devastating disease. In March, the Food and Drug Administration approved the first drug ever to treat children with high-risk neuroblastoma. In August, the same product received regulatory approval in the European Union. The drug, Unituxin (dinutuximab), is marketed by United Therapeutics Corporation. United Therapeutics was also granted a Pediatric Rare Disease Priority Review Voucher by the FDA. This innovative voucher program was established by the Creating Hope Act—legislation that I sponsored with my colleagues Congressman CHRIS VAN HOLLEN (D–MD) and Congressman G.K. BUTTERFIELD (D–NC). Enacted into law in 2012, the Creating Hope Act is designed to incentivize the pharmaceutical industry to invest in new therapies for rare childhood diseases.

Approval of this groundbreaking therapy is the result of a unique public-private partnership over many years. Originally developed by Dr. Alice Yu, University of California San Diego, the drug was tested in high-risk neuroblastoma patients in clinical studies conducted by the Children's Oncology Group through support from the National Cancer Institute (NCI). Manufacturing of the complex chimeric antibody was conducted by the NCI at its biopharmaceutical laboratory in Frederick, Maryland. In 2010, United Therapeutics entered into a Cooperative Research and Development Agreement with the NCI where the company assumed responsibility for manufacturing the drug and moving it through the regulatory approval process.

According to Dr. Malcolm Smith, Associate Branch Chief, Pediatrics in the Cancer Therapy Evaluation Program at NCI, "The FDA approval of dinutuximab represents the culmination of a remarkably productive collaboration between researchers of the NCI-supported Children's Oncology Group, the manufacturing and clinical research groups of NCI, and the oncology team at United Therapeutics. Children with neuroblastoma will benefit from this collaboration, and the drug development pathway blazed by dinutuximab will likely be followed in the future to develop other novel agents directed against pediatric cancer therapeutic targets."

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of co-chairing the Congressional Childhood Cancer Caucus with Congressman VAN HOLLEN. Each September, the Caucus commemorates National Childhood Cancer Awareness Month by hosting a Childhood Cancer Summit on Capitol Hill. This event features pediatric cancer patients, advocates, physicians, industry partners and other key stakeholders. As part of this year's Summit on September 18th, we will hear from Casey and Lesley Ryan, the parents of Rex Ryan, a young neuroblastoma patient from my home state of Texas. We will also hear from Roger Jeffs, PhD, President and Co-Chief Executive Officer of United Therapeutics, Dr. Lee Helman from the National Cancer Institute, Dr. Michael Link of the Stanford School of Medicine, Dr. Amy Fowler of the Dell Children's Medical Center, and Danielle Leach of the St. Baldrick's Foundation.

As we recognize the progress that has been made in neuroblastoma treatment, we remain focused on the many challenges that remain and the toll this disease has taken on so many families. One such family is the Lindbergs from Germantown, Maryland. Wendy and Gavin Lindberg lost their 7 year-old son Evan to neuroblastoma in 2010. He was their only child. Diagnosed at the age of 3, Evan waged a four-year battle against Stage IV neuroblastoma that defined courage. Evan was a remarkable little boy who inspired everyone he met with his bravery, compassion and joyful approach to life.

In his memory, Wendy and Gavin established The Evan's Victory Against Neuroblastoma Foundation to promote awareness of the disease, fund much-needed research, and support patient wellness programs for children in treatment. Since Evan's passing, the Foundation bearing his name has made and continues to make a real difference in the lives of children and families suffering from neuroblastoma. There are many other organizations doing wonderful philanthropic work in memory of children lost far too young to this terrible disease. Their strength in the face of adversity compels us to do all we can to help families facing the unthinkable.

So Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise in recognition of September 20th as National Neuroblastoma Awareness Day and encourage my colleagues to join in the fight against all pediatric cancers. Our children's future depends on it.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF CALVIN GEORGE MORET

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Calvin George Moret, the last surviving Louisiana member of the Tuskegee Airmen, a group of African-American pilots who fought in World War II and were the first African-American pilots in the United States military. Mr. Moret passed away on September 12, 2015, at the age of 90.

Mr. Moret entered the military in 1943 and trained as a military pilot at Tuskegee, Alabama, receiving his wings and commission as a Flight Officer on November 20, 1944. His preparation for overseas combat duty continued through the end of the war in Europe and then through the end of the war in the Pacific. He was discharged from military service on January 31, 1946.

Following his discharge from military duty he returned to the family printing business, Moret Press. To help the family business Moret needed to look outside of New Orleans for school, because segregation laws prohibited him from studying at Delgado Trade School. He was able to gain admission to the printing department at Southern University in Baton Rouge and completed the course.

Mr. Moret's flying experience did not stop upon discharge from the military. In the spring of 1949, he and his brother Adolph, who had learned to fly before the war, formed a flying club. Along with twenty other men, they purchased a 3-place Piper Super Cruiser airplane and hangered it at Lakefront Airport in New Orleans until the summer of 1953, where they introduced members to the miracle of human flight.

On June 17, 2008, as a result of Hurricane Katrina and the flooding aftermath that decimated the city, Moret Press was destroyed and the family was separated for months. The business has not operated since the Friday before the hurricane struck.

Following the release of ''The Tuskegee Airmen'' movie in 1995, Mr. Moret frequently lectured about his experiences and promoting the proud history of African-American accomplishments in American life.

In 2007, Mr. Moret was present when he Tuskegee Airmen received the Congressional Gold Medal in the rotunda of the Capitol.

Mr. Moret was a trailblazer, clearing the path for countless men and women of color to enter the military and fight to defend their country. He will be sorely missed by his family, his friends, and all of those who are able to pursue their dreams because of his courage. His memory will serve an inspiration for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, as a beneficiary of Mr. Moret's courage, commitment and sacrifice, I celebrate his life and legacy, because he has made America a more perfect union.

HONORING WILLIS ''WALLY'' WALLING

HON. MARK SANFORD

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember Willis R. Walling, who died on Wednesday, September 9, 2015, at the age of ninety-four. Affectionately known as ''Wally'' to me and many others, he will be missed.

Born in Newark, NJ, he was the son of the late Willis H. and Gladys R. Walling.

Those who knew Wally would say some of his fondest memories were of the time he spent serving as a fighter pilot in the U.S. Army Air Force during World War II. You might even call his adventures ''legendary,'' with sixty-six missions in Europe and becoming the tenth Allied plane to land in France after D–Day. He was one of the greatest supporters of the Allied Forces through France and beyond.

After leaving the service, he and his wife, Peg, moved to New Jersey where he served as President of Swan Manufacturing in Rockaway, NJ. It was during his time in Rockaway that he and Peg became active in the New Jersey Republican Party where he served as chairman for a period of time.

As many Northerners do, he and Peg moved south after retirement. Lucky for us South Carolinians, they chose Pawleys Island as their new home. They both quickly became active in local politics. I had the pleasure of meeting Wally during my first run for Congress in 1994 and have since appreciated his kindness and hospitality. Of course, you appreciate everyone who joins you in the heat of battle on the campaign trail, but it is the ones who are with you from the beginning who you hold closest to your heart. Wally was one of the loyal ones who would stick with you.

Loyalty, duty, respect, selfless service, honor, integrity, and personal courage are the seven values of the Army, and Wally was a man who exemplified every one of them. His surviving daughters, Susan Houser, Jeanne Auermuller (Bob), and Diane Dunham (Phil), eight grandchildren, and twelve great-grandchildren can be proud of the man they called ''Dad'' or ''Grandpa,'' and I have no doubt that they would be. They will miss him dearly . . . and I will too.

IN RECOGNITION OF SEPTEMBER 18, 2015 AS THE UZEYIR HAJIBEYLI MEMORIAL DAY

HON. PAUL A. GOSAR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Uzeyir Hajibeyli Memorial Day, celebrated on September 18, 2015.

Uzeyir Hajibeyli was born in the City of Agjabadi in Azerbaijan on September 18, 1885. He is recognized as the father of Azerbaijani classical music, as well as the founder of the first opera, Leyli and Majnun (1908), and first operetta The Cloth Peddler (1913) in the Muslim world. Arshin Mal Alan (The Cloth Peddler), is a romantic and musical comedy that delves into a young couple's struggle to live a modern lifestyle in the presence of restricting customs through pure love and women's rights.

In 1945, a cinematic version of the operetta was filmed in Azerbaijan and became an instant box office sensation. It remains today an important cultural touchstone across Eurasia, having been widely distributed in 86 languages and shown in 136 countries.

Uzeyir Hajibeyli was influential in both cultural and historical contexts. Hajibeyli was responsible for a new genre of music which evolved from the culmination of traditional Azerbaijani music and European classical opera. He is recognized as a leader in fighting illiteracy throughout the nation. As not only a musician but as a teacher and journalist, he inspired a new cultural movement throughout the nation that transcended the country's borders. Further, Hajibeyli is responsible for composing the first national anthem of Azerbaijan. Uzeyir Hajibeyli played an active role in the creation of the Azerbaijan Democratic Republic founded in 1918.

As today marks the 130th anniversary of Uzeyir Hajibeyli's birth, I am honored to recognize him today for his valuable contributions towards the world of music and to Azerbaijan.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF REVEREND JOSEPH C. PROFIT, JR.

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Reverend Joseph C. Profit, Jr., a pastor of Stronger Hope Baptist Church, who passed away on September 4, 2015, at the age of 80.

Reverend Profit dedicated fifty years to the Stronger Hope Baptist Church and was a leading civil rights activist in New Orleans. He served as the fifth president of the Ideal Missionary Baptist and Educational Association, Inc. and Regional Vice President of the Louisiana Baptist State Convention. Rev. Profit also participated in the Baptist World Alliance in Stockholm, Sweden, as a delegate.

After Hurricane Katrina, Rev. Profit was a leader in rebuilding New Orleans—physically and spiritually. Although he evacuated to San Antonio, Texas, Reverend Profit drove to New Orleans every other weekend to hold service, and finally in 2008, he completely rebuilt The Stronger Hope Baptist Church with the help of his loyal congregation. The Church sits on the corner of South Galvez and First Street, where it has rested since 1937.

To honor Reverend Profit, who was a vital asset to the New Orleans community of faith, we acknowledge the importance of faith and culture in resilience. To commemorate Rev. Profit and his irreplaceable legacy, we remember his life-long contribution to the city of New Orleans and we strive to continue his messages of faith, hope, and unity.

Mr. Speaker, as a beneficiary of Reverend Profit's courage, dedication and undying faith, I celebrate his life and legacy, because he has made America a more perfect union.

HONORING THE LIFE OF EDWARD L. FIRE

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Edward L. Fire of Chagrin Falls, Ohio who passed away on Wednesday, July 1, 2015. Edward was the son of Frank and Pauline Fire. He was a 1954 graduate of Lowellville High School and attended Youngstown State University. Following his education, Edward served in the U.S. Navy shortly after graduation at age 17 in 1954 until 1958.

In addition to serving in the armed forces, Ed was an active force in labor. Ed's career as a union leader began in 1961 at Packard Electric in Warren, where he served in elected office for 40 plus years. His leadership roles included President of the 13,000 member IUE Local 717 at Delphi Packard, Vice President of the Ohio AFL–CIO, and Secretary-Treasurer of the 80,000 member IUE District 7, headquartered in Kettering, OH. Ed loved every aspect of his job helping people have good jobs with good pay. The highlights of his career included leading the Union's bargaining teams with major corporations, GM, GE, and Delphi. He led IUE's efforts in the merger with the CWA. He also led the Union's political action efforts, including being actively involved in the campaigns of Presidents Lyndon Johnson, Jimmy Carter and Bill Clinton as well as Ohio Governor Dick Celeste, Senators John Glenn, Howard Metzenbaum and SHERROD BROWN.

He is survived by his wife Margaret Fire of Chagrin Falls, three sons Dino (Pamela) Fire of Jenson, MI, Patrick Fire of Myrtle Beach, SC and Ted (Melissa) Fire of Stow, MA, three granddaughters Morgan and Lina Fire and Capri (George) Kandris, two grandsons Sam and Jake Fire, a sister Jeanette Farley of Warren and several nieces and nephews. He is preceded in death by his parents, a brother, Charles Fire and four sisters Margaret Fire, Ida Marino, Rosemarie Whalen and Ann Fire.

There is no doubt that Ed's effort helped to improve the lives of countless workers in Northeastern Ohio, and across the country. I was deeply saddened to hear of his passing, but I am honored to pay tribute to such a selfless man.

RECOGNIZING THE INAUGURATION OF DR. REBECCA CHOPP

HON. DIANA DeGETTE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Dr. Rebecca Chopp on the occasion of her inauguration as the chancellor of the University of Denver. An advocate for education, inclusivity and community, Dr. Chopp brings decades of leadership experience and success to DU. As a first-generation college student, she understands the importance of access to college for all and the need to continue to mentor and nurture students for their success and that of their community.

After earning a BA from Kansas Wesleyan University and a Master of Divinity from St. Paul School of Theology, Dr. Chopp went on to receive her PhD from the University of Chicago. She has received six honorary doctorates from additional institutions and distinguished awards from each of her alma maters. Dr. Chopp has served as dean at Yale Divinity School, as provost and executive vice president for academic affairs at Emory University, and as president of Swarthmore College and Colgate University. She is also a widely published author.

While at Swarthmore, Dr. Chopp was committed to admitting the most highly qualified students without regard to financial circumstances, and she supported innovative ways to build new, inclusive communities motivated to contributing to the common good. Though she took the reins during the middle of the Great Recession, she steered Swarthmore through this time without cutting faculty or financial aid. Dr. Chopp was the first woman to serve in several of her previous roles and is the first woman chancellor for DU. She is a true role model and trailblazer.

Dr. Chopp joined the University of Denver in September of last year as its 18th chancellor. Within her first 100 days she announced Imagine-DU, a community-wide effort that focused on transforming the student experience, expanding the design of knowledge, and engaging in new ways with the surrounding areas. Chancellor Chopp envisions the University of Denver as an institution capitalizing on the changes and opportunities that come of an institution invested in the 21st Century. In addition, she already has several new innovative projects including serving a more diverse student body and building the next generation of leaders with the establishment of the Latino Leadership Institute, addressing the needs of an aging population in the Knoebel Center for the Study of Aging, and a new interdisciplinary approach to science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) with the Daniel Felix Ritchie School of Engineering and Computer Science.

Dr. Chopp has been quoted as saying, ''As in any university, the most important resource is its people.'' In her case, that could not be more true. She will be an invaluable resource to DU. Please join me in commending Dr. Rebecca Chopp for her continued commitment and passion for education and community. Her persistence and dedication are an inspiration to build a better future for all who live in Colorado.

RECOGNIZING THE RECIPIENTS OF THE 22ND ANNUAL PERSONAL ACHIEVEMENT AWARD FROM THE HEALTHSOUTH REHABILITATION HOSPITAL OF ALTOONA

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the winners of the 22nd annual Personal Achievement Award from the HealthSouth Rehabilitation Hospital of Altoona, given to encourage and reward those who have made an outstanding effort to deal with or overcome a disability. This year, I congratulate: Barbara Horne of Hollidaysburg, Larry Snyder of Hollidaysburg and Isaac Snowberger of Roaring Spring.

Barbara Horne is the recipient of a HealthSouth Personal Achievement Award. Barbara was a devoted wife, mother and grandmother until August 31, 2014, when tragedy struck and changed her life forever. Barbara was diagnosed with an acute brain stem stroke which caused her to have garbled speech, double vision and limpness on her right side. Shortly thereafter, she developed a urinary tract infection. She was dialysis dependent and was given a small percentage of survival. With hard work, determination and assistance from her family, she overcame these obstacles. Barbara actually walked out of HealthSouth's facility at discharge on November 5, 2014, and now walks without the assist of a device. She's been able to return to her active lifestyle.

Larry Snyder is also the recipient of a Personal Achievement Award. On April 3, 2013 Larry sustained a life-changing injury to his dominant right hand when it was crushed between the couplings of two railroad cars. Larry underwent a total of 7 surgeries to repair vascular, skin, bone, nerve, and tendon damage sustained in the accident. Surgeons were able to save Larry's hand, but had to amputate his thumb. He also lost much of the sensation to his remaining fingers, leaving his hand essentially non-functional. Larry was a year away from retirement, after a lifetime of work in the local railroad shops, when he sustained this injury. With the help of his family and friends, he has fought discouragement by keeping an optimistic and cheerful attitude, and learned to make his left hand the dominant one.

Isaac Snowberger is also the recipient of a Personal Achievement Award. For Isaac and his family, June 21, 2015 will be a day they will never forget. Normally healthy and active, Isaac collapsed at home due to an arteriovenous malformation in the brain. His parents were able to revive him, and he was taken immediately to Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh for surgery. Due to his injury, he had some weakness in his right side, balance issues, double vision and swallowing difficulties. But Isaac remained in good spirits and has made rapid progress in therapy. With his family's help, he is now walking well, and has achieved his main goals of returning to high school and participating in garden tractor pulling events.

Congratulations to Barbara, Larry and Isaac. Their accomplishments are a testament to us all that with hard work, persistence and a big heart, we can overcome any hardship. I honor each of them for their perseverance, and I wish them the best as they continue to overcome illnesses and disabilities while setting an example for the rest of the community.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF ALICE THOMPSON

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Alice Marie Thompson, a civil rights icon and Freedom Rider, who passed away on August 24, 2015.

Alice was born on September 25, 1939, the sixth of eight children, born to Cora Mae Atlas and John Henry Thompson, Sr. and was the

granddaughter of Susie Lee and Louis Balfour Atlas, Sr. and Alice Piercey and Norah Thompson. In 1944, Alice and her family moved from Lake Providence to New Orleans' Ninth Ward. Alice attended Lockett, V.C. Jones, McCarthy, and Joseph S. Clark schools and graduated from George Washington Carver High School in 1959. She later attended and graduated from Southern University in New Orleans with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Liberal Arts and Sciences. Alice worked for many years as a social worker until her retirement in 2002.

Between 1959 and 1960, Alice, and her sisters Jean and Shirley, became members of the Youth Council of the New Orleans branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). The Thompson Sisters, as they famously became known, soon sought more direct action, and in 1960 joined the New Orleans chapter of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) under the leadership of Rudy Lombard and later Oretha Castle Haley. Alice was active in countless pickets, sit-ins, and sit downs. She integrated a number of high-profile public places in the city, including McCrory's, Woolworths, the Loews Theater, and the City Hall Cafeteria.

In 1961, when the Interstate Commerce Commission outlawed segregation on buses, terminals, restrooms, restaurants, Alice's CORE members began testing the ruling throughout the Deep South. Their first test was in New Orleans at the Trailways bus terminal on Tulane Avenue. Alice and her comrades faced violence, intimidation and even imprisonment. In Poplarville, Mississippi, Alice was arrested and charged with breach of peace. She was placed in the same cell that Mack Charles Parker was placed in, taken from, and beaten two years earlier. In McComb, Mississippi, she and her fellow riders were viciously beaten. Alice volunteered for numerous projects during the U.S. Civil Rights Movement such as Mississippi and Louisiana Freedom Summer, and was present at the historic March on Washington on August 28, 1963. Alice was honored for her work by the State of Mississippi, the City of New Orleans, and by Oprah Winfrey during her show commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Freedom Riders.

In addition to her courageous civil rights advocacy, Alice was active in her community. She was one of the founding members of the Southern Organization for the Unified Leadership (SOUL), a founding member of the Lower Ninth Ward Development Association, an organizer of the New Orleans Health Corporation, and an organizer of the Copeland-Sanchez Center in the Lower Ninth Ward.

Alice loved to have a good time. She was always a centerpiece of family gatherings. With her signature beer in hand, she could always be seen recounting hilarious stories of her life and times, especially things that happened while she was in the Civil Rights Movement. She will be sorely missed by her family, her friends, and all of those who benefitted from her life's work—to bring freedom to all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, as a beneficiary of the courage, commitment and sacrifice of Alice Thompson, I celebrate her life and legacy, because she made America a more perfect union.

TRIBUTE TO DR. MARY SANDERS

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, our lives have been touched by the life of this one woman, who gave of herself in order for others to stand; and

Whereas, Dr. Mary Sanders' work is present in DeKalb County, Georgia for all to see, where she was an unwavering advocate for the youth as an educator; a community leader who worked tirelessly for the rights of our citizens in our district; and as a civic leader who volunteered as a Poll Officer in Gwinnett County, Georgia ensuring that the right to vote was administered to all that wanted to exercise their right; and

Whereas, this remarkable woman gave of herself, her time, her talent and her life; never asking for fame or fortune but only to uplift those in need; and

Whereas, Dr. Mary Sanders led by working behind the scenes, as well as front and center for the state of Georgia, DeKalb County NAACP, the Georgia Perimeter College Retirees Association Book Club, her beloved church, Antioch-Lithonia Baptist Church, and for her beloved Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc.; and

Whereas, this virtuous Proverbs 31 woman was a wife, a mother, a sister, a daughter and a friend; she was a warrior, a matriarch, and a woman of great integrity; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to bestow a Congressional recognition on Dr. Mary Sanders for her leadership, friendship and service to all of the citizens in Georgia and throughout the Nation; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr., do hereby attest to the 114th Congress that Dr. Mary Sanders of DeKalb County, Georgia is deemed worthy and deserving of this "Congressional Honor".

Dr. Mary Sanders, U.S. Citizen of Distinction in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 10th day of August, 2015.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF MR. MICHAEL GODBEY

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding educator, Michael Godbey. Mr. Godbey leads Frankfort High School as its principal. Mr. Godbey's career as an educator spans twenty years. In this time he has served as an instructional assistant, bus driver, mathematics teacher, assistant principal, director of curriculum and instruction, and principal. Under Godbey's leadership, Frankfort High School has earned the classification of a Proficient and Progressing High School based on Kentucky's Next Generation Learner Accountability system. Frankfort High School was also ranked the Twelfth Best High School in the Commonwealth of Kentucky by U.S. News and World Report in 2014.

Mr. Godbey was recently selected as the 2015 Principal of the Year for the Commonwealth of Kentucky. This Award was presented by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP). Godbey earned this award by his accomplishments in the education field over the years. His dedication to the education of his students is evident.

Godbey earned his B.A. in Secondary Education from the University of Kentucky and his M.A. in Education from Eastern Kentucky University. Prior to his tenure at Frankfort High School, Godbey worked in the Danville, Kentucky Independent School district. He and his wife Claudia reside in Nicholasville, Kentucky with their sons Jared and Hayden.

Education of our nations' young men and women is critically important. Mr. Godbey has exemplified strong leadership and innovation and is very deserving of the recent Principal of the Year award. Mr. Speaker, I applaud his creative talents and dedication in the education field.

BLUE RIDGE CHRISTIAN SCHOOL

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, for 25 years, Blue Ridge Christian School in Bridgewater, Virginia, has provided a high quality, value-based Christian education to students. I am proud to represent an excellent institution of learning like Blue Ridge Christian School in the U.S. House of Representatives. As their programs have expanded in size and scope, diversity in both denominations and heritage has also grown. Staying true to the principles of their founding families, Blue Ridge Christian School has continuously maintained a strong commitment to academic excellence.

Today, the school is preparing to expand their mission by constructing a new campus. At the same time they will create a new relationship with another Christian institution of learning in the Sixth Congressional District, Liberty University in Lynchburg, Virginia. This new partnership will be beneficial to the students and further expand the opportunities available through Blue Ridge Christian School.

I commend Blue Ridge Christian School as it marks its silver anniversary with an ambitious plan for growth that remains true to its Christian mission. I am hopeful that its next 25 years will be filled with fine opportunities for its students to make their mark on their hometowns, our nation, and the world beyond our borders. Go Bears!

TRIBUTE TO PASTOR McKENZIE JONES

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, this year, Pastor McKenzie Jones is celebrating twenty (20) years in pastoral leadership at Zoe Baptist Church where he has provided stellar leadership to the church and community; and

Whereas, Pastor Jones under the guidance of God has pioneered and sustained Zoe Baptist Church as an instrument in our community that uplifts the spiritual, physical and mental welfare of our citizens; and

Whereas, this remarkable and tenacious man of God has given hope to the hopeless and is a beacon of light to those in need; and

Whereas, Pastor Jones is a spiritual warrior, a man of compassion, a fearless leader and a servant to all, but most of all a visionary who has shared not only with his Church, but with our state and the nation his passion to spread the gospel of Jesus Christ; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Pastor McKenzie Jones, as he celebrates this milestone in pastoral leadership; now therefore, I, HENRY C. ''HANK'' JOHNSON, Jr., do hereby proclaim August 30, 2015 as Pastor McKenzie Jones Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 30th day of August, 2015.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 495, I was unavoidably detained and missed the vote on H.R. 1214. Had I been present, I would have voted aye.

IN RECOGNITION OF NAPPANEE MAYOR LARRY THOMPSON

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the honorable public service of Larry Thompson as he retires as Mayor of Nappanee, Indiana. As a five-term mayor, Mayor Thompson continues to represent the American spirit and his contributions are truly deserving of this body's recognition.

A devoted husband and proud father, Mayor Thompson has dedicated his life to serving his community. He and his wife Linda grew up in the Nappanee area and are both graduates of Northwood High School. He worked part-time in the funeral home business during high school and graduated from Indiana College of Mortuary Science in 1973. His dedication to public service was obvious early in his life, when he began serving as one of Nappanee's first Emergency Medical Technicians in 1973. Ten years later, he and his wife purchased what is now the Thompson-Lengacher & Yoder Funeral Home and he began serving as a local firefighter. Today, he and his family continue to run and operate their funeral home business, where they provide funeral services to the entire community. Mayor Thompson became involved in government affairs when he was appointed to serve on the Nappanee Park Board and ran in his first election, a successful bid for the Wa-Nee Community Schools Board of Education.

After several years of serving in those capacities, the mayor's position became open. Prodded to run, he ran against an opponent for the only time in his career. Every election since, Mayor Thompson has run unopposed.

Since 1995, Mayor Thompson has been instrumental in improving the structure and services of Nappanee. His support to create community development, economic expansion, and job growth, made Nappanee one of the most vibrant communities in Indiana.

Mayor Thompson's tireless work to improve the community is nothing short of remarkable. His collaboration with local and regional partners to lobby for specific projects and funding for the city brought businesses like Martin's Super Market and Miller's Assisted Living to Nappanee. Mayor Thompson also helped establish the Boys and Girls Club of Nappanee and develop the East Side/Airport Industrial Park.

While Mayor Thompson should be commended for his business savvy, his training as a first responder proved helpful when an F–3 tornado struck Nappanee in 2007. During the aftermath, Thompson led a coalition of community leaders to help rebuild areas of Nappanee that had been destroyed or damaged.

The care and compassion the mayor had for his friends, neighbors and relatives who suffered loss and experienced trauma was abundantly clear. His business sense, integrity, and passion to restore people's lives were driving forces behind the recovery process for the town.

Mr. Speaker, once again, please join me in congratulating Mayor Larry Thompson on his retirement. It is my hope that my colleagues will join me in thanking him for his leadership and service to the City of Nappanee.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $18,151,049,785,935.02. We've added $7,524,172,737,021.94 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.

TRIBUTE TO MR. MARION JORDAN

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, Sixty-five years ago on August 19, 1950 a tenacious man of God was born in Macon, Georgia; and

Whereas, Mr. Marion Jordan, served in the United States Military, worked for over forty years as a consummate professional in the insurance industry, and has devoted countless hours towards the betterment of his community; and

Whereas, Mr. Jordan has shared his time and talents as a family man, sailor, and mentor to many, giving the citizens of the United States an admired leader and person of great worth. A servant to all advancing the lives of others, through his service to our country in the U.S. Navy and being the ideal husband, father and grandfather; and

Whereas, Mr. Jordan has been blessed with a long, healthy, happy life, devoted to God, family and community; and

Whereas, Mr. Jordan along with his family and friends are celebrating this day a remarkable milestone, his 65th Birthday, we pause to acknowledge a man who is a cornerstone in his professional industry; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside these days to honor and recognize Mr. Jordan on his birthday and to wish him well and recognize him for an exemplary life which is an inspiration to all; now therefore, I, HENRY C. ''HANK'' JOHNSON, Jr., do hereby proclaim August 19, 2015 as Mr. Marion Jordan Day, in Georgia's 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 19th day of August, 2015.

RECOGNIZING KEISER UNIVERSITY ON OPENING ITS FLAGSHIP CAMPUS

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Keiser University on opening its Flagship campus in West Palm Beach, located in my Congressional district. For a university that puts its students first, while serving the community and preparing professionals for the workforce, I am excited for the school's expansion.

The 100-acre campus will provide its ever growing student population with dormitories, athletic teams, and other amenities. This bold move will also support students by giving them access to even more degree programs, High school students from all across America seeking a traditional college experience now have an opportunity to enroll and enjoy a rich multidisciplinary institution.

Keiser University is the second largest member of the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida and is a Level VI regionally accredited institution by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The University serves a rich and diverse student body in traditional, nontraditional and online formats. The University was founded in 1977, with the lasting intention to serve adult learners seeking career-focused education. In 2001, the school had fewer than 4,000 students; it now has nearly 20,000 students. The acquisition of the Northwood University campus is just one of many ambitious ways Keiser University continues to expand and serve the hardworking students of South Florida.

Although the main campus is located in Fort Lauderdale, Keiser University now boasts 18 campuses located in Florida's major and mid-sized metropolitan areas and communities. The university has international sites beyond America's shores as well, with regionally accredited off-campus sites in San Marcos, Nicaragua and Shanghai, China. Keiser students

can also access learning centers in Moldova, Taiwan and Seoul, South Korea.

With over 3,500 talented and distinguished faculty and staff Keiser University has served nearly 60,000 hardworking alumni over the years. The university's committed philosophy of putting "students first" is reflected in its 60 programmatically-accredited academic offerings designed to prepare students for careers in business, criminal justice, health care, technology, hospitality, education, and career-focused general studies. Approximately 62 percent of students at Keiser University graduate in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math) and healthcare fields. The university's students are pursuing degrees in over 100 doctoral, specialist, master's bachelor's, and associate fields as well as various continuing education programs.

Keiser University's goals include continually improving and ensuring effectiveness of its programs, building students' analytical and technical skills, as well as maintaining an unwavering devotion to powerful research at the doctoral level. These goals have led to successful students, an improved economy, and satisfied employers. Annually, Keiser University has made a statewide economic impact of over $3 billion, as well as direct and indirect impacts for over 30,000 Florida jobs. It is no wonder that Keiser University is ranked 40th among colleges within the Southern Region of the United States.

Aside from changing the lives of its students and touting an impressive staff, Keiser University has consistently given back to the community. They have a major involvement in, among other things, food drives for primary schools, seniors citizen assistance, and major job fairs for those who want to find a role in America's and the international community's workforce. The U.S. News & World Report ranked Keiser 13th overall and 1st in Florida for the category of Regional Colleges South, specifically for its service to our nation's veterans Moreover, Keiser University and the Keiser Mills Foundation have provided nearly $44 million in scholarship funds to academic and needs-based US and international students.

Mr. Speaker, I once again want to congratulate the Board of Trustees of Keiser University, Chancellor Dr. Arthur Keiser, and Vice Chancellor Belinda Keiser, on opening their new Flagship campus. I wish them much success as they continue their perpetual dedication to students and commitment to quality, education and community service.

175TH ANNIVERSARY OF BETHEL UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST

HON. TIM WALBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 175th Anniversary of Bethel United Church of Christ in Freedom Township, Michigan.

In 1840, a young German minister, Rev. Friedrich Schmid, gathered 20 German immigrant farm families into a congregation named The Evangelical German Bethel Congregation of Freedom Township. Holding their first services in a log building, the congregation built a wood frame church in 1857. The stone church used today by the congregation was constructed in 1909 with members providing the stones from their fields.

Eighteen pastors have shepherded Bethel UCC over the last 175 years, during which they have undertaken numerous mission projects for the benefit of those near and far away. For example, in the 19th century, clothing and blankets were sent to a Detroit hospital and orphan homes in three states. In the 20th century, several heifers were raised by the church and sent to Appalachia and Germany. The farmers in the congregation sent a rail car of wheat to help feed the hungry and quilts were made for veterans and those in hospitals. Today, quilts are still being sewn and the congregation also helps to feed the homeless locally and participates in a variety of projects that reach worldwide, keeping with the church's mission statement to "reach beyond these stone walls to impact communities both near and far."

In a stone church on a hilltop in rural Freedom Township, this congregation of more than 300 still gather to worship at Bethel, the "House of God." In January of this year, Bethel United Church of Christ began their yearlong celebration and reflection on 175 years of sharing joys and sorrows together. On Sunday, November 8, descendants of those early pioneers will gather for a special worship service to acknowledge God's many blessings. I pray for a memorable celebration and for many more years of faithful witness of God's everlasting love in our community.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE RULE OF LAW IN THE REPUBLIC OF SERBIA

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise on the occasion of the visit of Prime Minister Aleksandar Vucic to the United States and his meeting with Vice President Biden, to add my voice to the international criticism about human rights and the rule of law in the Republic of Serbia.

In December 2012, Miroslav Miskovic, the president of Delta Holding was arrested and charged with a crime based on an outdated, internationally discredited provision of the Serbian criminal code that is a relic of the nation's communist past. He was charged with "abuse of position by a responsible person" (Article 234) for allegedly receiving market rate interest payments on legitimate commercial loans to a Serbian road construction company that was privatized in 2005. This is not only legal, but common in other European Countries.

The State Department and the European Union have criticized Miskovic's arrest as an example of the ineffective judiciary, excessive use of pretrial detention and a denial of fair public trials. The State Department Human Rights Report states that Mr. Miskovic's pretrial detention was "contrary to the well-established position of the European Court of Human Rights on the issue, that custody must not only be lawful, but also reasonable and necessary." The European Union, as part of Serbia's EU accession process, has called on the government to reform the provision of the Serbian criminal code under which Mr. Miskovic and 4,168 other individuals are charged. Mr. Miskovic's arrest is indicative of the Serbian justice system's serious need for reform.

With Prime Minister Vucic's visit, the Serbian government is seeking to foster closer ties to the United States as it continues its efforts to join the European Union. While I share the U.S. government's appreciation for Serbia's contribution to Balkan stabilization, I believe any U.S. support for improved relations or for Serbian accession to the EU should depend on that country's commitment to political reform, the addressing of the lack of transparency in the government and genuine efforts to increase the independence of its judiciary. The repeal of Article 234 would go a long way toward establishing those goals.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF ROSARIO ANAYA

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, on August 5th a beloved community leader, education and affordable housing advocate, and civil rights activist passed away in San Francisco. Rosario Anaya was a trailblazer and a pillar of San Francisco's Latino community, who dedicated her life to championing social and economic justice for the disenfranchised and underserved.

Rosario was born on October 7, 1944 in Cochabamba, Bolivia and moved to San Francisco in the early 1960's, where she earned her bachelor's degree in public administration and a master's degree in counseling and psychology from the University of San Francisco. She went on to the UCLA Anderson School of Business's Management Development for Entrepreneurs program.

From the start, she proved herself to be a formidable force in the struggle for civil rights. Soon after moving to our city, she became a leader within the Mission Coalition Organization, a diverse network of local agencies that advocated for employment, housing, and education reform.

For forty years, until her untimely passing, she directed the Mission Language and Vocational School, a nonprofit community organization that offers English as a Second Language, and a wide range of computer and vocational courses for all immigrants. Among her many accomplishments with MLVS, she established the flourishing Latino Cuisine Culinary Academy, which provides immigrant workers with expanded opportunities within the San Francisco food industry.

In addition to her commitment to MLVS, Rosario was a key leader in many campaigns and coalitions for social and economic justice, including the San Francisco Latino Voter Registration Project, Jesse Jackson's Rainbow Coalition and the United Farm Workers, where she organized food caravans from San Francisco to UFW's headquarters in Delano, California. She campaigned to rename Army Street in San Francisco for legendary labor leader Cesar Chavez.

Mayor George Moscone appointed Rosario to the San Francisco Board of Education in

the late 1970's. When she ran for a full four-year term in 1978, she became the first woman of Latin American descent elected to public office in San Francisco and subsequently served two more terms as School Board President.

More recently, in 2010 Mayor Gavin Newsom appointed her to the San Francisco Redevelopment Commission in order to help plan and supervise the construction of affordable housing.

Rosario served on more boards and committees and received more commendations and honors than can be named for her work in San Francisco and the State of California, as well as receiving international recognition from the governments of Mexico and Venezuela.

Rosario Anaya's leadership improving the lives of immigrants and at-risk populations within the San Francisco community has inspired generations of activists. She epitomized dignity and grace, and she leaves a shining legacy of fighting injustice.

I extend my deepest sympathy and condolences to Rosario's family and friends during this sad time. I hope it is a comfort to them to know that Rosario's legacy will live on through the countless lives she touched and the numerous coalitions and programs she helmed in her efforts to create a more just and equitable world.

IN RECOGNITION OF PROGRESS AT WEST LOS ANGELES VA MEDICAL CENTER

HON. TED LIEU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to recognize the remarkable accomplishments being made at the VA West Los Angeles Medical Center by the Department of Veterans Affairs and Secretary Robert A. McDonald.

I will not be able to join Secretary McDonald in Los Angeles today as Congress is in session, but it is my pleasure to acknowledge the attention given and progress made at the West LA VA this year by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The West LA VA is the largest VA Medical Center in the nation and it had faced unfortunate challenges for many years. In January 2015, Secretary McDonald quickly settled a lawsuit that had been holding back progress for Veterans in Los Angeles. Since that time, all of the parties involved have been following a Principles Document that has been driving a Strategic Homeless Initiative and the development of a Master Plan.

In addition to being the largest VA Medical Center, Los Angeles has the largest population of homeless Veterans in the United States. We cannot solve homelessness nation-wide without addressing it in LA. Secretary McDonald engaged me early this year and we have partnered on many initiatives to address the crisis in homelessness. He has demonstrated a serious commitment to addressing homelessness among Veterans in Los Angeles and to developing a roadmap to ensure the sprawling West LA VA campus is focused on uses and services to directly benefit our nation's Veterans.

In fact, since March 2015 almost 1,400 area Veterans have been placed into permanent supportive housing. The VA expanded capacity to care for homeless Veterans by providing $30 million in additional Supportive Services for Veteran Families (SSVF) grants. Additional HUD-VASH vouchers have been awarded to our region, new beds have been added, and VA has hired more than 100 new employees prioritizing outreach and case management.

The VA has also actively forged relationships with every level of government, along with public and private partners to leverage resources in a truly unprecedented way.

We have a rare opportunity at this moment to solve homelessness among Veterans if we work together to make it happen. At the same time, we must also transform the West LA VA into a campus that serves our nation's Veterans with the dignity and integrity they so deserve. I am confident with our support and partnerships, Secretary McDonald will achieve this.

I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing gratitude to VA Secretary McDonald for dedicating an enormous amount of time and resources to restoring the trust of our Veterans at West Los Angeles and for delivering critical housing, programs, and services.

TAIWAN NATIONAL DAY

HON. STEVE STIVERS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the Taiwan National Day, known as Double Tenth National Day and celebrated every year on October 10th.

Taiwan is a critical country in the Asia-Pacific region, and the people of Taiwan and the current President Ma Ying-jeou have been instrumental in improving relations between neighboring countries. President Ma has been a leader in finding peaceful solutions to the challenges they face, including building a cross-strait relationship between Taipei and Beijing as well as promoting the East China Sea Peace Initiative and the South China Sea Peace Initiative, both of which call upon the countries making claims in contested waters to share the natural resources in those waters.

Taiwan's role in trade has also grown significantly over the past 20 years. Taiwan now ranks as the 10th largest trade partner of the United States. The economic expansion in Taiwan has raised the country to become the 10th ranked country in trade volume among the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation economies and a leading supplier of intermediary goods in the region.

There is no doubt that Taiwan is leading by example in the Asia-Pacific region, and I am grateful that the United States and Taiwan remain close allies. I wish the people of Taiwan all the best as they prepare to celebrate Double Tenth National Day.

SAFER OFFICERS AND SAFER CITIZENS ACT OF 2015

HON. JANICE HAHN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to join my colleagues Senator TIM SCOTT and Senator CORY BOOKER in introducing the "Safer Officers and Safer Citizens Act of 2015." This legislation will provide federal grant funding to outfit law enforcement officers with body cameras.

Police departments that use body cameras consistently have lower rates of complaints, show a reduced use of force, and have been shown to be a win-win for officers. A report conducted by the City of San Diego showed a 40% reduction in complaints filed by individuals, a 46% reduction in the use of force, and a 30% reduction in the use of pepper spray. A second study in Rialto, California showed a 60% reduction in force. These cameras make our streets safer for law enforcement and individuals.

Further, 785 federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies participated in a study of the effectiveness of body-worn cameras, and 85% agreed that these cameras reduce false complaints.

The bill I am introducing today with Congressman BILL FOSTER and Congresswoman ELIZABETH ESTY, which is the companion to the Senate bill recently introduced by Senators CORY BOOKER and TIM SCOTT, will provide these law enforcement agencies additional resources to equip their officers.

At a time of tension and eroding trust between law enforcement and the public in many communities, body cameras help hold police officers accountable and encourage them to act appropriately as they protect and serve. This legislation enables departments to purchase body cameras without cutting or diverting funds from other important programs including community outreach efforts.

The "Safer Officers and Safer Citizens Act of 2015," will provide $100 million annually to state, local, and tribal law enforcement departments through a grant program to outfit their officers with body cameras. I call on my colleagues in Congress to join me in this effort, and pass this bill.

CONGRATULATING DR. JEFF REUTTER ON THE ANNOUNCEMENT OF HIS RETIREMENT

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dr. Jeff Reutter, pioneering and indefatigable Director of the Ohio Sea Grant College Program, Stone Laboratory, Center for Lake Erie Area Research, and Great Lakes Aquatic Ecosystem Research Consortium, on the announcement of his retirement.

Dr. Reutter's name has become synonymous with Lake Erie. He has spent his career fighting to develop the foundational data sets to support Lake Erie's recovery. During that time, Dr. Reutter has distinguished himself as

a scholarly and popular leader; he is the foremost expert on the health of Lake Erie and our Great Lakes endowment.

Dr. Reutter has tackled many issues facing Lake Erie during a distinguished career where he has witnessed the first Earth Day, the passage of the Clean Water Act in 1972, the return of nesting eagles to Lake Erie following a ban on DDT, and many other changes in our Great Lakes system.

More recently, since the mid 1990s, Dr. Reutter has concentrated his efforts on finding solutions for Harmful Algal Blooms (HAB), caused by high nutrient run-off in the Western Lake Erie Basin, the largest watershed in the Great Lakes. Dr. Reutter's commitment and service to the people of Ohio and our Great Lakes will be celebrated for years to come. His talents will continue to be applied to those endeavors to which he has dedicated his life.

I would like to extend my heartfelt appreciation for his years of service and his unparalleled dedication to a healthy Lake Erie, a restored Great Lakes ecosystem and clean water for those who count on this amazing freshwater abundance—collectively, the most important freshwater body on the face of the earth.

HONORING ROBBIE WILKIE

HON. MARK MEADOWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Robbie Wilkie for his work as the Caldwell County Emergency Services Director and congratulate him on his retirement.

Mr. Wilkie began his career in 1983 as a volunteer firefighter with the North Catawba Fire Department, where he continued serving through 2004. During that time, he also served as a firefighter for the Lenoir Fire Department from 1988 through 2004, where he worked his way through the ranks to eventually become Fire Captain. After working as a Fire Marshal from 2004 to 2010, Mr. Wilkie was eventually promoted to the Emergency Services Director position in 2013. While serving in this role, his duties included handling all budgetary, administrative, and policy decisions for Caldwell County Emergency Services, while coordinating all fire rescue efforts for Caldwell County. Due to his faithful service, Mr. Wilkie has received multiple awards throughout his career, including Firefighter of the Year from both the North Catawba Fire Department in 1985 and the Lenoir Fire Department in 1998, and the Author H. "Ott" Dellinger Leadership Award in July 2006.

Mr. Wilkie has demonstrated a steadfast commitment to serving the people of Caldwell County in emergency management. As such, I am proud to honor Mr. Robbie Wilkie for his faithful service to the people of Caldwell County and I wish him the best on his retirement.

GOLD STAR MOTHER'S DAY

HON. TOM RICE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of our Gold Star Mothers.

As we honor the men and women who made the ultimate sacrifice for our nation, we pay tribute to their families, who have made tremendous sacrifice for the sake of our country. On this day, we give due honor to those mothers whose sons or daughters have given their lives while defending our nation.

The Congress, by Senate Joint Resolution 115 of June 23, 1936 designated the last Sunday in September as "Gold Star Mother's Day."

Now, therefore, I, TOM RICE by virtue of the authority vested in me as representative of the Seventh District of the state of South Carolina, do hereby proclaim September 27, 2015 to be Gold Star Mother's Day. I encourage the American people to display the flag and hold appropriate ceremonies as an expression of our nation's sympathy and respect for our Gold Star Mothers.

IN RECOGNITION OF BISHOP PRESTON W. WILLIAMS II

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an outstanding Man of God who has provided sage counsel, wisdom, and guidance throughout Georgia, the United States of America, and the world, Bishop Preston W. Williams II. Bishop Williams is the Presiding Prelate of the Sixth Episcopal District, which spans the state of Georgia. After his term concludes in 2016, Bishop Williams will be retiring. A celebration will be held in his honor on Saturday, September 19, 2015 at Allen Temple African Methodist Episcopal Church in Byron, Georgia.

Bishop Preston W. Williams II was born in Willacoochee, Georgia and has worked tirelessly to spread the Word of God in the state throughout his life. He pastored several A.M.E. churches in Georgia, leaving a lasting mark on each through increased membership, improved worship facilities, and impactful community outreach. He also served as the Treasurer of the Sixth Episcopal District and Director of Communication in radio and television for the A.M.E. Church, where he was responsible for coordinating media outreach to more than 100,000 Georgians. He served as a member of the General Assembly of the World Council of Churches and was selected as the State of Georgia Distinguished Churchman.

From 2000 to 2004, Bishop Williams served as the Presiding Prelate of the Seventeenth Episcopal District, located in Central Africa. Under his leadership, the membership of the Seventeenth District expanded exponentially, necessitating that the district be split into two separate parts and leading to the formation of a new Twentieth Episcopal District. In fact, this trend of increasing membership would continue throughout the Bishop's distinguished career, with thousands of people inspired to give their lives to Christ by this charismatic leader's everlasting love and enthusiasm for God.

From 2004 to 2012, Bishop Williams served the Seventh Episcopal District, which consists of the state of South Carolina. There, Bishop Williams advocated for the implementation of Christian education by founding Youth Adult ministries, expanding the curriculum at Allen University, establishing scholarship funds for clergy members to pursue their Master of Divinity degrees, and increasing opportunities for seminary-level training. Moreover, Bishop Williams served the community at large by creating after-school programs dedicated to improving the lives of at-risk teens, among many other worthy contributions. Known to many, respected by all, he left an indelible mark on the Seventh Episcopal District.

In 2012, Georgia rejoiced at the return of Bishop Williams when he was appointed to lead the Sixth Episcopal District of the A.M.E. Church. From 2012 to 2016, Bishop Williams will continue to govern the 543 A.M.E. churches in the state of Georgia. He will also serve as Chairman on the Board of Turner Theological Seminary and Morris Brown College, both located in Atlanta, Georgia.

Bishop Williams has accomplished much for the Kingdom of Christ throughout his life, but none of this would be possible without the grace of God and the love and support of his wife, Wilma, and his children, Arnold Andre, Wilma Priscilla, Stella Jacinta, and Prestina Delores.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing Bishop Preston W. Williams II for his numerous invaluable contributions to Georgia, the United States of America, and the world. Bishop Williams has made a tremendous impact on communities across the globe. Even in his forthcoming retirement, I am confident that Bishop Williams will remain an esteemed and active member of the community, as his limitless enthusiasm and diligent work ethic knows no bounds.

RECOGNIZING THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE HONORS COUNCIL

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the National Collegiate Honors Council and highlight its work to bettering the education of over 325,000 students in more than 800 member colleges and universities around the country.

I want to specifically commend my alma mater, the University of North Georgia, for its prestigious honors program. I am proud to say that this university—which I believe to be one of the finest institutions of higher learning in the state of Georgia—is located in the beautiful town of Dahlonega in the Ninth District.

I attended the school when it was still known as North Georgia College, but I am glad to say that the school continues to grow. In 2013, North Georgia College and State University was consolidated with Gainesville State University and became the well-known institution we are honoring today—the University of North Georgia.

The University of North Georgia seeks to improve the quality of life for residents of the North Georgia region. They do this through excellence in academic performance, student research, student leadership, service learning, and study abroad programs. Additionally, the University of North Georgia is a premier senior military college and one of only six federally designated senior military colleges in the nation.

The Honors Program at UNG cultivates a community of engaged and academically motivated students who uphold the values of service and integrity, demonstrate global awareness, and exhibit strong leadership skills. Evidence of the program's success is exhibited by some of their outstanding alumni. One example among many is Sara Brubaker, class of 2010. Sara completed her Doctorate of Physical Therapy in 2013 and was one of just twelve physical therapists chosen for employment by the U.S. Navy. She now serves at the rank of Lieutenant as the Rehabilitation Department Head at the Naval Hospital in Beaufort, SC.

I am proud to recognize the accomplishments of Sara and other accomplished students and alumni of the University of North Georgia and to commend the University's successful honors program.

HONORING PRINCIPAL CHIEF MICHELL HICKS

HON. MARK MEADOWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Principal Chief Michell Hicks of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, who is retiring on September 26, 2015. I am proud to call Chief Hicks a good friend and thank him for his dedicated service as Principal Chief.

After graduating from Western Carolina University, Chief Hicks served for twelve years as the Principal Chief for the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, and prior to that served eight years as the Chief Finance Officer for the Eastern Band. During his tenure as Principal Chief, Chief Hicks was instrumental in the completion of several vital service facilities, such as the Shawn Blanton Emergency Operations Center, the Snowbird Youth Center, the new Justice Center and Jail, and a new Cherokee Hospital, scheduled to open in October of this year.

Additionally, Chief Hicks spearheaded many educational efforts in the region. He developed and implemented a reading program for kindergarten children in the region, he oversaw the development of a financial literacy program for Cherokee youth, and he helped rekindle an interest in the Cherokee language by including it as required curriculum at Cherokee schools.

Chief Hicks is known by his friends as a kind, compassionate man who, while cherishing the old Cherokee traditions, is a visionary for a better future for his people. His tremendous passion and vision earned him the Tribal Leader of the Year Award from the Native American Finance Officers Association.

The exemplary leadership and vision of Chief Hicks is something that all of us can admire and respect. As such, I am proud to honor Principal Chief Michell Hicks on his faithful service to the people of Cherokee and congratulate him on his retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM COLE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and not present for Roll Call vote number 495. Had I been present, I would have voted "YEA" on H.R. 1214, the National Forest Small Tracts Amendments Act.

CELEBRATING THE HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH AND THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE LATINO COMMUNITY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, since 1968, America celebrates the National Hispanic Heritage Month from September 15th to October 15th, 2015, to recognize the legacy of those whose ancestors came from Latin America and Spain. The beginning of the National Hispanic Heritage Month is very important because it is also the anniversary of independence for some Central American countries such as: Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and El Salvador. Also, Mexico and Chile celebrate their independence days on September 16th and September 18th respectively.

We are fortunate to have in our district so many dedicated community leaders and organizations, such as CUNY Dominican Studies Institute, Dominican American National Roundtable, Hispanic Federation, Dominican Women Development Center, Mirabal Sisters Cultural and Community Center, Dominican Medical Association DMA, National Dominican Women Caucus, Dominican Bar Association, Latino Leadership Institute, East Harlem Preservation, Inc., Falu Foundation, El Museo del Barrio, Little Sisters of the Assumption Family Health Service, East Harlem Council for Community Improvement, Inc., Friendly Hands Ministry, VIDA Family Services, Inc., N.E.R.V.E., Inc., Teatro Moderno Puertorriqueno, Inc., Casabe Houses Development Fund, Company, Inc., Julia de Burgos Cultural Center, Latino Justice PRLDEF, Hispanic Federation, La Casa de la Herencia Cultural Puertorriquena, Borikén Health Center, Nuevo Caribe Democratic Club of El Barrio and Cataño Gardens and the Association of Progressive Dominicans, working tirelessly to improve the lives of people living in East Harlem, Inwood, Washington Heights and the Bronx. Pioneers such as Secretary Thomas Pérez, America's first Cabinet Secretary of Dominican descent and Justice Sonia Sotomayor who is of Puerto Rican descent and is the country's first Hispanic to be appointed to the Supreme Court, are not only role models for youths in our congressional district, but also symbols of the American Dream. They remind us that willingness to strive can help us to achieve great success, not only for ourselves but for America as a country.

Like all Americans, Latino families aspire to own a home, save for their children's higher education, and put aside enough money for a secure retirement. We need comprehensive immigration reform that will fix our broken system and allow millions of aspiring Americans to come out of the shadows. Every day we delay the issue of immigration reform is another day that our economy, our businesses, and our families lose out. I will continue to fight for comprehensive immigration reform and for the policies that will strengthen the Latino community and expand their opportunities to achieve the American Dream.

The United States of America is greater, thanks to the contributions of the Latino community, which is 55.4 million strong, and continues to grow and make a great impact throughout our country. Happy Hispanic Heritage Month.

IN HONOR OF BETTY HARDY

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, residents in Montgomery County are blessed to have non-profit organizations that provide a true safety net for struggling families and individuals.

One of those organizations is the Montgomery County Food Bank which has been helping families since 1985.

This food bank is an integral part of our community today because a group of individuals led by Betty Hardy saw a need and found a way to fill that need by partnering with other agencies.

Betty Hardy has put others first as long as any of us have known her. She is a blessing to our community. She went from helping people on the crisis hotline to ensuring families in need had a meal on the table.

Betty's passion to put others first is what led her to bring together several like-minded friends each week to organize and create food pantries, food drives and deliveries.

Out of her commitment—and her garage, trunk and backseat—grew the program we know as the Montgomery County Food Bank.

From the food bank's initial one-room office space this program has grown to service countless families.

The Food Bank went from serving nearly 18,000 meals in the first year to 400,000 annual meals just a short decade later.

In 2007, the food bank opened its first official warehouse with the help of a community development grant. Today, the food bank operates out of a 60,000 square foot facility that distributes several million pounds of food every year. They coordinate with a network of approximately 50 food pantries, soup kitchens, senior centers and other agencies to provide fresh produce, meat and non-perishables to more than 32,000 people each month.

Betty's dream of helping Montgomery County residents weather a crisis has evolved into the sixth largest food bank in Texas.

Betty Hardy is proof that one person's determination, dedication and willingness to roll up her sleeves can have a far reaching impact on individuals and families who need to know there is hope and support in their community.

Today, the Montgomery County Food Bank will hold its inaugural Food for Life Luncheon celebrating its past, present and future. That celebration begins with the accomplishments of Betty Hardy and her efforts to fight hunger in our community.

HONORING LIEUTENANT GENERAL PATRICIA D. HOROHO

HON. BRAD R. WENSTRUP

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, Primum Non Nocere: Above all, do no harm.

Today we honor the service of Lieutenant General Patricia D. Horoho, the United States' 43rd Surgeon General of the Army.

Lt. Gen. Horoho, the first woman and first nurse to serve in the role, boasts a remarkable record of service to our nation and the medical profession.

Serving at all levels of leadership of Army Medicine, her service includes deployments in Haiti and Kabul, Afghanistan. In the United States, she has served as Chief of the Army Nurse Corps among other roles.

Any recognition would be incomplete without highlighting her heroic service on September 11, 2001. Working in the Pentagon, she rushed to triage wounded victims in the immediate hours following the attack.

Lt. Gen Horoho's service is recognized with four of the highest honors awarded by the United States: the Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal, and the Army Meritorious Service Medal.

She exhibits the highest standards of integrity, moral character, and professional excellence. Also a recipient of the Order of Military Medical Merit Medallion, an award presented to those who demonstrate the in their service to the Army Medical Department.

For those in military medicine, Lt. Gen. Horoho says it best: ''In every conflict the U.S. Army has fought, Army Medicine has stood shoulder to shoulder with our fighting forces, supporting those who are putting their lives on the line to defend our freedom.''

Lt. Gen. Patricia Horoho, our grateful nation thanks you, and salutes you, for your service to us all.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S6773–S6820

Measures Introduced: Sixteen bills and four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2045–2060, S.J. Res. 22, and S. Res. 257–259. **Pages S6809–10**

Measures Reported:

S. 1170, to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research. (S. Rept. No. 114–144)

H.R. 2051, to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to extend the livestock mandatory price reporting requirements, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

S. 32, to provide the Department of Justice with additional tools to target extraterritorial drug trafficking activity. **Page S6809**

Measures Passed:

Honoring Passenger Train Bravery and Heroism: Senate agreed to S. Res. 259, honoring the bravery and heroism of those who selflessly prevented a deadly terrorist attack and saved countless lives while aboard a passenger train bound from Amsterdam to Paris on August 21, 2015. **Page S6818**

Welcoming King Felipe VI and Queen Letizia of Spain to the United States: Committee on Foreign Relations was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 253, welcoming King Felipe VI and Queen Letizia of Spain on their official visit to the United States, including visits to Miami and St. Augustine, Florida, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S6818**

Emergency Information Improvement Act: Senate passed S. 1090, to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide eligibility for broadcasting facilities to receive certain disaster assistance. **Page S6819**

Competitive Service Act: Senate passed S. 1580, to allow additional appointing authorities to select individuals from competitive service certificates. **Page S6819**

TSA Office of Inspection Accountability Act: Senate passed H.R. 719, to require the Transportation Security Administration to conform to existing Federal law and regulations regarding criminal investigator positions, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, and the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S6819–20**

McConnell (for Thune) Amendment No. 2666, to require the Assistant Secretary to submit certain materials and information to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security to submit a study to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate. **Page S6820**

Measures Considered:

Hire More Heroes Act: Senate continued consideration of H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, taking action on the following amendments and motions proposed thereto: **Pages S6775–93**

Pending:

McConnell Amendment No. 2640, of a perfecting nature. **Page S6775**

McConnell Amendment No. 2656 (to Amendment No. 2640), to prohibit the President from waiving, suspending, reducing, providing relief from, or otherwise limiting the application of sanctions pursuant to an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran. **Page S6775**

McConnell Amendment No. 2657 (to Amendment No. 2656), to change the enactment date. **Page S6775**

McConnell Amendment No. 2658 (to the language proposed to be stricken by Amendment No. 2640), to change the enactment date. **Page S6775**

McConnell Amendment No. 2659 (to Amendment No. 2658), of a perfecting nature. **Page S6775**

McConnell motion to commit the joint resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations, with instructions, McConnell Amendment No. 2660, to prohibit the President from waiving, suspending, reducing, providing relief from, or otherwise limiting the application of sanctions pursuant to an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran. **Page S6775**

McConnell Amendment No. 2661 (to (the instructions) Amendment No. 2660), of a perfecting nature. **Page S6775**

McConnell Amendment No. 2662 (to Amendment No. 2661), of a perfecting nature. **Page S6775**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 53 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 266), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on McConnell Amendment No. 2656 (to Amendment No. 2640). **Page S6780**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the motion to invoke cloture on the joint resolution, be withdrawn. **Page S6780**

By 56 yeas to 42 nays (Vote No. 267), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on McConnell Amendment No. 2640. **Page S6781**

Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act—Agreement: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 36, to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children. **Page S6798**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Tuesday, September 22, 2015. **Page S6798**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 2 p.m., on Monday, September 21, 2015, Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S6820**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

Sim Farar, of California, to be a Member of the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy for a term expiring July 1, 2015.

Sim Farar, of California, to be a Member of the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy for a term expiring July 1, 2018.

William Joseph Hybl, of Colorado, to be a Member of the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy for a term expiring July 1, 2015.

William Joseph Hybl, of Colorado, to be a Member of the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy for a term expiring July 1, 2018.

Michael C. McGowan, of Delaware, to be United States Marshal for the District of Delaware, for the term of four years. **Pages S6798, S6820**

Messages from the House: **Pages S6806–07**

Measures Referred: **Page S6807**

Executive Communications: **Pages S6807–09**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S6809**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S6810–11**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S6811–17**

Additional Statements: **Pages S6804–06**

Amendments Submitted: **Page S6817**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S6817–18**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—267) **Pages S6780–81**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:20 p.m., until 2 p.m. on Monday, September 21, 2015. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S6820.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee ordered favorably reported H.R. 2051, to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to extend the livestock mandatory price reporting requirements, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

MARITIME SECURITY STRATEGY

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine maritime security strategy in the Asia-Pacific region, after receiving testimony from Admiral Harry B. Harris, Jr., USN, Pacific Command, and David B. Shear, Assistant Secretary for Asian and Pacific Security Affairs, both of the Department of Defense.

NOMINATION

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Adam J. Szubin, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes, Department of the Treasury, after

the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Shelby, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

NOMINATION

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Sarah Elizabeth Feinberg, of West Virginia, to be Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Manchin, testified and answered questions in her own behalf.

FEDERAL LAND RECREATION ENHANCEMENT ACT

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine reauthorization of and potential reforms to the Federal Land Recreation Enhancement Act, after receiving testimony from Peggy O'Dell, Deputy Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior; Mary Wagner, Associate Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; Kitty Benzar, Western Slope No-Fee Coalition, Durango, Colorado; and David L. Brown, America Outdoors Association, Knoxville, Tennessee.

TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS REPORT

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee received a closed briefing on State Department processes in establishing tier rankings for the 2015 Trafficking in Persons Report from Anthony J. Blinken, Deputy Secretary of State.

BIOSIMILAR IMPLEMENTATION

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Subcommittee on Primary Health and Retirement Security concluded a hearing to examine biosimilar implementation, focusing on a progress report from FDA, after receiving testimony from Janet Woodcock, Director, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 32, to provide the Department of Justice with additional tools to target extraterritorial drug trafficking activity; and

The nominations of John Michael Vazquez, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey, Wilhelmina Marie Wright, to be United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota, and Paula Xinis, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 25 public bills, H.R. 3531–3555; and 6 resolutions, H. Res. 424–429 were introduced. **Pages H6135–38**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H6138–39**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Allen to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H6079**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:02 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H6086**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Reverend Brondon Reems, Center of Hope Community Church, Oakland, California. **Pages H6086–87**

Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act of 2015: The House passed H.R. 758, to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, by a recorded vote of 241 ayes to 185 noes, Roll No. 501. **Pages H6090–H6121**

Rejected the DelBene motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 179 yeas to 239 nays, Roll No. 500. **Pages H6118–20**

H. Res. 420, amended, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 348) and (H.R. 758) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 238 ayes to 183 noes, Roll No. 499. **Pages H6111–12**

Agreed to the Collins (GA) amendment by a recorded vote of 237 ayes to 187 noes, Roll No. 498, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 238 yeas to 179 nays, Roll No. 497. **Pages H6109–11**

Oath of Office—Eighteenth Congressional District of Illinois: Representative-elect Darin LaHood presented himself in the well of the House and was administered the Oath of Office by the Speaker. Earlier, the Clerk of the House transmitted a facsimile copy of a letter received from Mr. Steven S. Sandvoss, Executive Director, State Board of Elections for the State of Illinois, indicating that, according to the preliminary results of the Special Election held September 10, 2015, the Honorable Darin LaHood was elected Representative to Congress for the Eighteenth Congressional District, State of Illinois. **Page H6134**

Whole Number of the House: The Speaker announced to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from Illinois, the whole number of the House is 435. **Page H6110**

Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015 and Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act—Rule for consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 421, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 3134) to provide for a moratorium on Federal funding to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc. and (H.R. 3504) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion, by a recorded vote of 246 ayes to 179 noes, Roll No. 503, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 243 yeas to 183 nays, Roll No. 502. **Pages H6121–22**

Senate Messages: Message received from the Senate and message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appear on pages H6090, H6109–10 and H6133.

Senate Referrals: S. 1090 was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. S. 1580 was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. **Page H6133**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and four recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H6109, H6111, H6111–12, H6119–20, H6120–21, H6121 and H6122. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:17 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 702, to adapt to changing crude oil market conditions. H.R. 702 was ordered reported, as amended.

PROTECTING INFANTS: ENDING TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION PROVIDERS WHO VIOLATE THE LAW

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled ''Protecting Infants: Ending Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Providers Who Violate the Law''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE DODD-FRANK ACT FIVE YEARS LATER: ARE WE MORE FREE?

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''The Dodd-Frank Act Five Years Later: Are We More Free?''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

STRENGTHENING U.S. LEADERSHIP IN A TURBULENT GLOBAL ECONOMY

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade held a hearing entitled ''Strengthening U.S. Leadership in a Turbulent Global Economy''. Testimony was heard from Nathan Sheets, Under Secretary for International Affairs, Department of the Treasury.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES; MAJOR BENEFICIARIES OF THE IRAN DEAL: IRGC AND HEZBOLLAH

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa held a markup on H. Res. 277, honoring the Tunisian People for their democratic transition; and H. Res. 293, expressing concern over anti-Israel and anti-Semitic incitement within the Palestinian Authority; and a hearing entitled ''Major Beneficiaries of the Iran Deal: IRGC and Hezbollah''. H. Res. 277 and H. Res. 293 were forwarded to the full committee, as amended. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

CHALLENGES TO RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN THE AMERICAS

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere held a hearing entitled ''Challenges to Religious Freedom in the Americas''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies held a markup on H.R. 3490, the ''Strengthening State and Local Cyber Crime Fighting Act''; H.R. 3493, the ''Securing the Cities Act of 2015''; H.R. 3510, the ''Department of Homeland Security Cybersecurity Strategy Act of 2015''; and Committee Print of the ''DHS Science and Technology Reform and Improvements Act of 2015''. H.R. 3510 and H.R. 3493 were reported to

the full committee, without amendment. H.R. 3490 and the Committee Print of the ''DHS Science and Technology Reform and Improvements Act of 2015'' were reported to the full committee, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence held a markup on H.R. 3350, the ''Know the CBRN Terrorism Threats to Transportation Act''; H.R. 3361, the ''Department of Homeland Security Insider Threat and Mitigation Act of 2015''; H.R. 3503, the ''Department of Homeland Security Support to Fusion Centers Act of 2015''; H.R. 3505, the ''Department of Homeland Security Clearance Management and Administration Act''; and Committee Print of the ''Fusion Center Enhancement Act of 2015''. H.R. 3361 was reported to the full committee, as amended. H.R. 3350, H.R. 3505, H.R. 3503, and the Committee Print of the ''Fusion Center Enhancement Act of 2015'' were reported to the full committee, without amendment.

SAFEGUARDING OUR NATION'S SURFACE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS AGAINST EVOLVING TERRORIST THREATS

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Transportation Security; and Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence, held a joint hearing entitled ''Safeguarding our Nation's Surface Transportation Systems Against Evolving Terrorist Threats''. Testimony was heard from Eddie Mayenschein, Assistant Administrator, Office of Security Policy and Industry Engagement, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security; Jennifer Grover, Director, Transportation Security and Coast Guard Issues, Homeland Security and Justice Team, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 1428, the ''Judicial Redress Act of 2015''; H.R. 1755, to amend title 36, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the congressional charter of the Disabled American Veterans; and H.R. 3449, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to extend honorary citizenship to otherwise qualified noncitizens who enlisted in the Philippines and died while serving on active duty with the United States Armed Forces during certain periods of hostilities, and for other purposes. H.R. 1428, H.R. 1755, and H.R. 3449 were ordered reported, without amendment.

EPA'S ANIMAS SPILL

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee; and the House Committee on Natural Resources, held a joint hearing entitled ''EPA's Animas Spill''. Testimony was heard from Gina McCarthy, Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency; Ryan Flynn, Secretary, New Mexico Environment Department; Larry Wolk, Executive Director and Chief Medical Officer, Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment; and public witnesses.

FEDERAL AIR MARSHAL SERVICE: OVERSIGHT

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Federal Air Marshal Service: Oversight''. Testimony was heard from Roderick Allison, Director, Office of Law Enforcement/Federal Air Marshal Service, Transportation Security Administration; and Heather Book, Assistant Administrator, Office of Professional Responsibility, Transportation Security Administration.

FINANCING MAIN STREET: HOW DODD-FRANK IS CRIPPLING SMALL LENDERS AND ACCESS TO CAPITAL

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Tax and Capital Access held a hearing entitled ''Financing Main Street: How Dodd-Frank is Crippling Small Lenders and Access to Capital''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 3106, the ''Construction Reform Act of 2015''; H.R. 3016, the ''VA Provider Equity Act''; H.R. 677, the ''American Heroes COLA Act of 2015''; H.R. 1338, the ''Dignified Interment of Our Veterans Act of 2015''; H.R. 1384, the ''Honor America's Guard-Reserve Retirees Act''; H.R. 2360, the ''Career-Ready Student Veterans Act''; and H.R. 2915, the ''Female Veteran Suicide Prevention Act''. H.R. 3106, H.R. 3016, H.R. 677, H.R. 1338, H.R. 2360, and H.R. 2915 were ordered reported, as amended. H.R. 1384 was ordered reported, without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 2061, the ''EACH Act''; H.R. 1270, the ''Restoring Access to Medication Act of 2015''; H.R. 2940, the ''Educator Tax Relief Act of 2015''; H.R. 765, the ''Restaurant and Retail Jobs and Growth Act''; H.R. 2510, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and make permanent bonus depreciation; H.R. 961, to amend the

Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the subpart F exemption for active financing income; and H.R. 1430, the ''Permanent CFC Look-Through Act of 2015''. H.R. 2061, H.R. 1270, H.R. 2940, H.R. 765, H.R. 2510, H.R. 961, and H.R. 1430 were ordered reported, as amended.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2015

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled ''Improving the Medicaid Program for Beneficiaries'', 9 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency, hearing entitled ''Making DHS More Efficient: Industry Recommendations to Improve Homeland Security'', 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Research and Technology; and Subcommittee on Oversight, joint hearing entitled ''NEON Warning Signs: Examining the Management of the National Ecological Observatory Network'', 9 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Subcommittee on Department of Defense Intelligence and Overhead Architecture, hearing on the Defense Intelligence Agency and the Defense Clandestine Service, 9 a.m., HVC–304. This hearing will be closed.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Monday, September 21

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 36, Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, September 18

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Consideration of H.R. 3134—Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015 (Subject to a Rule) and H.R. 3504—Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barr, Andy, Ky., E1310
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E1314
Brady, Kevin, Tex., E1315
Buchanan, Vern, Fla., E1305
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1311
Cole, Tom, Okla., E1315
Collins, Doug, Ga., E1314
DeGette, Diana, Colo., E1309
DeSaulnier, Mark, Calif., E1305
DelBene, Suzan K., Wash., E1307
Garamendi, John, Calif., E1306
Garrett, Scott, N.J., E1305
Goodlatte, Bob, Va., E1310
Gosar, Paul A., Ariz., E1308
Guinta, Frank C., N.H., E1306
Hahn, Janice, Calif., E1313
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E1311
Hudson, Richard, N.C., E1311
Johnson, Henry C. ''Hank'', Jr., Ga., E1310, E1310, E1311
Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E1313
Kind, Ron, Wisc., E1306
Lieu, Ted, Calif., E1313
Luetkemeyer, Blaine, Mo., E1306, E1306
McCaul, Michael T., Tex., E1307
Meadows, Mark, N.C., E1314, E1315
Meehan, Patrick, Pa., E1305
Pelosi, Nancy, Calif., E1312
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E1315
Rice, Tom, S.C., E1314
Richmond, Cedric L., La., E1308, E1308, E1309
Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E1309
Sanford, Mark, S.C., E1308
Shuster, Bill, Pa., E1309
Stivers, Steve, Ohio, E1313
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E1312
Walberg, Tim, Mich., E1312
Walorski, Jackie, Ind., E1311
Walters, Mimi, Calif., E1305
Wenstrup, Brad R., Ohio, E1316

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.