



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 22, 2015

No. 155

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 22, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHARLES J. FLEISCHMANN 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.

TRANSPORTATION REAUTHORIZATION

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today, the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee will consider a surface transportation reauthorization. Unfortunately, calling it a "reauthorization" doesn't make it so.

This legislation calls for a 6-year period of reauthorization and hopes to be funded for 3 years, but it doesn't actually provide a single dime of revenue

from the highway trust fund. It is simply an empty shell.

It really doesn't have to be this hard. There is a single solution that is supported by everyone outside of Capitol Hill, one that has been employed by six red Republican States already this year and championed by Ronald Reagan when he was President: raise the gas tax. Our problems are that we are trying to fund 2015 infrastructure with 1993 dollars—the last time we raised the Federal gas tax.

I have a bill that will accomplish this fact. H.R. 680 provides that assurance and certainty by phasing in a gas tax increase over 3 years. It will permit us to fully fund a 6-year reauthorization for the first time since 1998 without resorting to gimmicks. It is cosponsored by over three dozen House Members, but, more importantly, it enjoys the broadest base of support for any major piece of legislation before Congress.

Is there any other bill of any significance that is endorsed by the U.S. Chamber and the AFL-CIO, countless business and trade associations, as well as individual unions, the American Trucking Association, representing that industry, and auto users, represented by AAA?

The answer is "no."

The coalition includes bicyclists, engineers, local government, transit agencies—virtually anyone who builds, maintains, or depends upon our transportation system.

For all the rhetoric about "strengthening the economy," this will be the one proven way of putting several million people to work at family-wage jobs while it reduces the deficit and strengthens our communities from coast to coast. Every State, every metropolitan area, every rural region of America would benefit both by the transportation improvements as well as the economic impact this work will create.

This has been recognized by independent analysts, editorials in major

newspapers, and in small newspapers all across the country. There really is no controversy.

Indeed, in the over two dozen States that have raised transportation revenue since 2012, the legislators who voted for more transportation revenue got reelected by a higher percentage than the legislators who voted against it. It is broadly supported, not politically controversial, and is desperately needed.

I am glad my colleagues were able to reach a compromise on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and put forward some interesting ideas. It gives a hint of what could happen if we had a real funding source, which we don't; and the bill being marked up raises more questions, therefore, than it answers. Even if the House were to embrace it unanimously, we would still be where we were 3 months ago, 6 months ago, and many times before that.

We are facing another short-term extension—this will be the 35th—and are providing zero assurance or long-term certainty to the many who rely on our transportation system. No country became great building its infrastructure 8 months at a time.

We can have markups and pass a reauthorization shell on the floor of the House; but until we embrace H.R. 680 and raise the gas tax, finding revenue that is sustainable, dedicated, and big enough to do the job, we are still going to be spinning our wheels; and America will be stuck.

ASHLEY MITCHELL

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

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the accomplishments of a truly remarkable lady in my district.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H7093

Ashley Mitchell is a student at Alexandria High School in Louisiana, and her hard work and dedication to the sport that she loves so much has paid off in huge dividends.

Miss Mitchell just broke two world records while participating in the World Powerlifting Championships in the Czech Republic. Those records were the deadlift at 326.5 pounds and the other at 762 pounds. Now, those are impressive numbers, but even more impressive when you keep in mind that this young lady is 94 pounds. She represented the United States well and has returned home as the world champion for the United States of America.

It is young people like Ashley, who are leaders among their peers and who will be leaders in our communities very soon, whom we encourage.

I urge my colleagues to keep these young people, their potential, and their impressive accomplishments in mind as we do our jobs here in D.C. I commend Ashley for her talent, for her tireless effort, and for representing this country on an international stage in such an impressive manner.

CLIMATE CHANGE AND ADAPTATION

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, this morning, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration announced that last month was the warmest September in recorded history. Our reality can no longer be ignored. Climate change is here, and communities across the country—and the world—are feeling its effects. Just take the events we have seen unfold in 2015 as an example.

In April, drought-stricken California witnessed a snowpack with virtually no snow. On the other side of the country, Boston recorded its snowiest year with 110 inches between July 2014 and June 2015. Boston had so much snow, it did not melt until mid-July. 2015 also brought us the wettest months ever recorded in the U.S. within the 121 years of NOAA's recordkeeping; and this year, Tropical Storm Ana became the second-earliest tropical storm in history to make landfall in the U.S., in early May.

So what does all of this mean?

It means that we are no longer at a place where talking about climate change is enough. We need to act, and we need to act now.

I am proud that we have a President who is taking actions like reducing dangerous greenhouse gas emissions to mitigate climate change. Altering our current policies and enacting new ones will help reduce the impacts of climate change in the future. But mitigation is only one piece of the solution. We also need to adapt our policies to handle the effects of our already-changing climate in the present.

Climate change is already happening; and adaptation to climate change is

the only way we can help protect the people, the infrastructure, businesses, and ecosystems that are already threatened. We know that societies have adjusted to and have coped with changes in climate with different degrees of success; but our modern life is tailored to the stable climate we have been accustomed to. As the President recently pointed out, our climate is changing faster than we are adapting to it.

While climate change is a global issue, it is often felt on a hyper-local scale, so our cities have to be at the front line of adaptation. We need communities that have better flood defenses, plans for dealing with higher temperatures and heat waves, as well as better management of our water storage and use. Some cities are already taking steps to create these adaptation plans. Roughly 20 percent of cities around the globe have adopted adaptation strategies. My city of Chicago is included on that list.

The most obvious changes that Chicago is dealing with are hotter summers and more intense heat waves. Increased temperatures are leading to countless unforeseen consequences, such as heat-related illness and a deterioration in air quality. Higher temperatures are also boosting the demand for electricity, placing stress on our power plants. Heavy rains and snow are becoming more frequent in winter and spring. Increasing downpours make travel more dangerous, pollute our drinking water, damage crops, and disrupt infrastructure and transportation across the city.

But adaptation means more than protecting our cities. We must also protect our national defense. Many of our most critical military installations are already at risk.

A 2011 National Research Council report found that 128 U.S. military sites could be impacted by a sea-level rise of just 3 feet. Of those 128 sites, 56 are naval facilities valued at \$100 billion. Recent hurricanes have pushed water levels to dangerous heights in Norfolk, Virginia, threatening the largest naval base in the world. As sea levels rise and storms intensify, climate change threatens to require the relocation of that naval base.

This proves that local and State efforts are simply not enough. We need congressional action to produce lasting solutions that address the root causes of climate change and to prepare us for a very different future.

In closing, I defer to Charles Darwin, who said, "It is not the strongest of the species that survives nor the most intelligent; it is the one that is most adaptable to change."

I urge my colleagues to heed this warning and adapt to the reality in front of us.

SENSE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to paint a picture of the incredible progress of an industry that is making my district in western Pennsylvania a better place to work and live.

For many years, the coal industry has been an important part of the economy in Pennsylvania. Historic mining activity, unfortunately, left behind large piles of coal refuse. These piles consist of lower-quality coal mixed with rock and dirt.

For a long time, we did not have the technology to use this material, so it accumulated in large piles in cities and towns, close to schools and neighborhoods, and in fields across the region. This has led to a number of environmental problems: vegetation and wildlife have been harmed, the air has been polluted, acid mine drainage has impaired nearby rivers and streams, and problems compound when these piles catch fire.

The cost to clean up all of this is astronomical. Pennsylvania's environmental regulator estimates that fixing abandoned mine lands could take over \$16 billion, \$2 billion of which would be needed for the coal refuse piles alone. We needed an innovative solution to this tough challenge. A commonsense compromise was necessary to get the job done and protect the environment. That is where the coal refuse to energy industry comes in.

Using advanced technology, they have been able to use this previously unusable fuel to generate electricity. This activity powers remediation efforts that have, so far, been successful in removing over 200 million tons of coal refuse and repairing formerly polluted sites. I visited the Nanty Glo waste coal site, in my district, earlier this week and witnessed the massive transformation this area has undergone.

In this picture, you can see an example of the progress that has been made across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. In the foreground are the remnants of a coal refuse pile that is up to 40 feet deep. In the distance, you can see what used to be a coal refuse pile that is almost completely restored. A little bit of work remains. This hillside has been restored, and, soon, it will be covered with trees and wildlife. This is an example of the environmental progress that is being made.

□ 1015

The Nanty Glo site is one of the many examples of the good work being done by the coal refuse energy industry in Pennsylvania and in historic coal sites across the country.

We can all agree that we want to be good stewards of our natural resources and to use them as efficiently as possible. We also want to ensure that regulations do not hamper job creation, the economy, and opportunity for our families.

Unfortunately, expanding EPA regulations threatens to bring much of the waste coal industry's activity to a halt. That would leave billions of dollars of vital cleanup unfinished and hurt jobs and Pennsylvania's energy security.

A lot of people in Washington like to offer up a false choice between protecting the environment and economic opportunity. The success of the coal refuse industry shows that that does not have to be the case.

This week I am introducing a commonsense approach to keeping these facilities open while holding them to tough standards. We are calling this bill the Satisfying Energy Needs and Saving the Environment Act, or SENSE Act, for short.

The bill addresses problems arising from two of the EPA's more expansive rules: the mercury and air toxin standards and the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule, known as CSAPR.

Under CSAPR, which relies on allocations to limit emissions, we are requesting that the status quo remain in place with regard to sulphur dioxide emissions from bituminous coal refuse-fired power generators. Due to the nature of the coal refuse, these facilities would be unable to comply with a new standard that is expected in 2017. Under the mercury and air toxin standards rule, we are proposing to hold the industry to alternative limits for hydrogen chloride or sulphur dioxide emissions.

Consistent with this legislation, Senators TOOMEY and CASEY recently offered an amendment in the Senate exempting these plans from both the MATS and CSAPR requirements. While this proposal was supported by a bipartisan majority of Senators, it failed to achieve the supermajority required to pass.

This shouldn't be a controversial or partisan issue. We want to hold this industry to high standards, but standards that they can actually achieve. My bill will help keep the coal refuse industry in business so that the local community, economy, and environment will continue to reap the benefits. The fact that this industry performs such a vital environmental function means that we owe it to our communities to recognize these circumstances and do everything we can to allow them to keep up the good work.

Dennis Simmers, an engineer with Colver Power Project in Cambria Township and a long-time resident of the area, told me why he hopes my legislation is signed into law and the waste coal industry can go forward. "It's personal," he said. "Three generations of my family lived in Nanty Glo. Unfortunately, they died without ever seeing this environmental catastrophe corrected. There is a real shot now that I will see that in my lifetime."

With my legislation, I am working to ensure his vision becomes a reality.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT AND HEALTHCARE WITHIN CA-46

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today a little disheartened, disheartened because my colleagues across the aisle seem to have forgotten about the priorities and the needs of the American people.

For an unprecedented 61st time, the majority has introduced a measure that would cripple the landmark Affordable Care Act. The consequences of such a budget measure would be terrible. Millions of Americans would lose their healthcare insurance, and premiums for others would skyrocket.

The majority claims that the ACA somehow is ineffective, costly, or illegal. They claim that it doesn't work. Well, they are just wrong.

Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act is working. It has been working. It has been working in my hometown. It has been working in Orange County, California, under the Affordable Care Act, the CHIP, and Medicaid. We have expanded insurance to over 12.3 million individuals; 2.6 million of those individuals are Latinos.

Costs under the ACA have been greatly reduced, and the ACA is projected to save the United States \$200 billion in the next decade and over \$1 trillion in the second decade. I would say that those statistics speak to the success of the Affordable Care Act.

The ACA has had great success back home in my home district. In Orange County, we had the highest number of new people enroll into the healthcare benefit exchange that we have in California. Currently, there are more than 1.3 million Californians that now have health insurance that didn't have it before.

See, Mr. Speaker, before the enactment of the ACA, the folks in my district—well, they considered it a luxury. They chose between buying clothes for their kids to go to school or putting food on the table. Or worse, they used home remedies.

I know because I grew up on home remedies. I grew up not going to the doctor. I grew up trying all these crazy things at home, having a simple flu, and being out of school for 10 days because we couldn't afford to go to the doctor. It is pretty unacceptable in today's time, Mr. Speaker, in the greatest country in the world.

Health care should be a right, not a privilege. We need to continue moving forward. We need to continue moving our communities from a culture of coping to a culture of coverage.

No longer do people have to worry about being denied for their existing health conditions. Quality health insurance is now available to all who seek it. Because nearly 4 out of every 10 people in my district are Medicare recipients, I understand how important

this legislation is for working families; so I will continue to work to join with my community-based organizations to ensure that our people are covered.

So tomorrow, when my colleagues across the aisle once again vote—number 61—to defund the Affordable Care Act, I would like for them to think about all the families in America that will suffer when that is passed; think of all the families; think about all the kids and their home remedies.

My colleagues in the minority and I have stood up. We have tried to explain to the other side the importance of the Affordable Care Act, only to have our passionate voices fall on deaf ears.

Despite these continuous attacks against an existing law which has improved the lives of millions of Americans, I will continue to fight for quality health care for the folks back home in my district.

OBAMACARE IS FAILING

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk for a few minutes this morning about the families that are suffering under the false promises of ObamaCare. We are beginning to see this play out all across the country. The ObamaCare failings are very pronounced; and you see them in the communities; and you understand how they are affecting lives.

Now, the supporters of ObamaCare continue to have blinders on about this; and they don't want to admit that the entire premise is a theory, not proven. It was change for the sake of change. It was change for the sake of centralized control. It was change for the sake of the arrogance of the elite making decisions for millions of Americans and determining what kind of health care they were going to be able to access.

We all remember that the press said that the biggest fabrication of the decade was, if you like your doctor, you can keep him. It is all so unfortunate.

I want to look, Mr. Speaker, for just a few minutes at what has happened with these co-ops that are now failing. The failings are very pronounced, and they truly have an imprint and an effect in our communities.

One month before the ObamaCare-funded Oregon co-op announced its failure in bankruptcy, the CEO said she saw a "long health life in front of us." They had a \$50 million Federal loan, if you will, and had managed to enroll only 10,000 people. Now the taxpayers are beginning to wonder if that loan is ever going to be repaid.

Take a look at Colorado. In the Colorado co-op, the same story; 72 million taxpayer dollars, and they enrolled 83,000 people. Do the math on what the enrollment alone is costing the American taxpayer, and do the math on what kind of healthcare access could

have been if individuals were going straight to the marketplace.

We have heard Kentucky celebrated as being such a success story and the poster child for the success of ObamaCare. Here is the truth: they have \$146 million in Federal loans and then another \$65 million in an emergency solvency loan. They have 51,000 people in a co-op that is not functioning.

And in Tennessee, where our co-op is going under, \$73 million, and they had 27,000 people enrolled.

Now, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to say, oh, ObamaCare has been such a success. If you do the math and look at the numbers, I take issue with that. I would not term that a success. I term it a failure.

I wonder if the people in Oregon and Colorado, Kentucky and Tennessee are feeling success as they, once again, find out that simply having an insurance card is not health care. It is access to the queue, if the company is solvent and the queue exists.

Imagine, four States, a collective nearly \$500 million for experiments. That is half a billion taxpayer dollars for experiments in health insurance delivery, all before anybody received any mental health help or received a single mammogram or a single child's vaccine.

We know that ObamaCare is too expensive to afford; and, for all too many, it is too expensive to use once they get the insurance. It is proving to be a failure.

VIOLENCE IN ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express strong support for the people and nation of Israel and to wholly condemn the horrific acts of violence targeting innocent civilians.

My heart goes out to the families of the victims. All people have the right to live in peace and security, and every nation has the right to take actions to protect its citizens.

As chaos envelopes Israel from all borders, we must stand stalwartly with our strongest ally in the region. Over the past month, unprovoked Palestinian attacks against Israeli civilians, including children, police officers, and members of the IDF, have increased to shocking levels.

Perhaps even more disturbing are the Palestinian leadership's recent incitements to violence. In a September 30 address, Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas addressed the United Nations, saying that Palestinians would no longer be bound by their commitments to the Oslo Accords. One day later, Palestinians ambushed two Jewish Israelis, Rabbi Eitam and Naama Henkin, murdering them in front of their children.

Since then, barbaric terrorist attacks against civilians, including stabbings, rock throwing, and deliberate car crashes, have become all too commonplace.

□ 1030

We have seen a 15-year-old teenager stabbed in Jerusalem, two rabbis stabbed and killed in the Old City, five people attacked with a screwdriver in Tel Aviv, and a driver intentionally hitting civilians at a bus stop, then getting out of the car with a sharp object and causing more bloodshed and destruction in broad daylight.

These are only some of the innocent victims of this deplorable violence. Rather than showing leadership and calling for common civility, President Abbas and other Palestinian leaders have chosen to further incite violence.

President Abbas has perpetuated false accusations about the Israeli Government's treatment of Palestinians and undermined the Israeli Government's assurance that it seeks to maintain the status quo on the Temple Mount.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to support the United States' longstanding policy of supporting our partners for peace in the region to reach a two-state solution. However, the Palestinian Authority's words and lack of action to quell the violence calls into question those partnerships.

I call on the international community to speak out against these brutal terrorist attacks. In addition, we must put pressure on those who are taking inflammatory actions that deliberately fuel tensions.

Just yesterday six countries submitted a resolution to UNESCO with the sole intention of delegitimizing Jewish history in our own Holy Land. This is disgraceful. I applaud the efforts of this administration to oppose this harmful and incendiary resolution.

We must unequivocally condemn terrorist attacks and actions wherever and whenever they take place. These violent attacks against Jews in Israel are part of growing anti-Semitism around the globe. Tragically, over the past few years in particular, we have seen a rise in anti-Semitism from the streets of Paris to the streets of Miami Beach in my district.

Around the world, we have seen the spread of a violent and depraved ideology aimed at crushing the values that we hold dear: the freedom to practice and celebrate our own diverse religions and cultures; the right to express ourselves in print and in speech; the right to live in our homelands and walk in our streets with dignity, respect, and safety. We must stand up and speak out whenever these rights are threatened.

As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, I am proud to advocate for strong funding and cooperation with Israel on matters of mutual interest.

As our strategic and democratic ally, we must bolster efforts to ensure that Israel has the necessary resources she needs to be secure and confront the violent threats against her. The rise in violence in Israel and of anti-Semitism more broadly is deeply troubling to me, as a lawmaker who values and respects the strong U.S.-Israel relationship; but it also impacts me more personally, as a Jew who feels a significant and historic connection to the land of Israel.

No nation on Earth can be expected to sit back and take these kinds of attacks on her citizens without responding.

President Abbas and Palestinian leaders must take clear and meaningful steps to stop this violence and encourage unity and a return to the path toward a peaceful two-state solution. There is absolutely no justification for violence against innocent civilians under any circumstances, and I call for those responsible for these vicious terrorist attacks to be brought to swift justice.

I proudly and firmly stand behind Israel's right to defend herself against malicious, brutal terrorist attacks from outside her borders and from within, and call on others here and around the world to do the same.

NDAА VETO THREAT

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

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the House for 5 minutes and talk about what the President is saying he is going to do on the NDAA.

The President is determined to end his second term on a spending spree, and that spending spree will threaten the national defense of this country and hold our military hostage. He is showing his lack of leadership by threatening to veto the NDAA, the National Defense Authorization Act.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, does this President not understand that the NDAA provides the resources for the military to do their jobs, to protect our great Nation and the freedom that we all enjoy?

The President is willing to jeopardize our national security in favor of more welfare programs. He threatens this reckless veto in spite of the fact that the NDAA has passed for 53 years in a row, a rare display of bipartisanship in this city.

The American people have had enough of political games. They are tired of them. Just turn on the radio and television, and see if you can't learn that. It is especially important when it jeopardizes the men and women of our military and our national security.

It is hard to find a worse example of leadership than a Commander in Chief who is so irresponsible that he is willing to deny his military resources and sacrifice the security of our Nation

simply for political games. Even more importantly is that, and that solid statement is exactly what is going on at the White House as he approaches this veto.

I would hope that he would realize that people—men and women, of all ages, from the chief of staff of the Army all the way down to the lowest private—have gone and risked their lives fighting for freedom and for liberty for the last 12 years; and they are being rewarded by a President that won't even back them up by passing the National Defense Authorization Act, something that has been passed by every House, every Senate, and every President for the last 53 years.

His reasoning is, I want more money for the welfare programs, which have been plussed-up over the years until some of them are out of control. Doesn't he think about the guys out there getting shot at or blown up and who must wonder why the Commander in Chief, the person who our military ultimately answers to, is not on his side, is not standing up for the soldier?

In my district, we have sent warfighters from Fort Hood to these actions now for 12 years. They deserve the support of this Congress. They deserve the support of the President of the United States.

This is a good bill. It is a bill that meets the President's standards that he set for this bill, gives him the increases he requested in this bill; yet, he is going to veto it for his political convenience. This is a shame, a shame on the country, a shame on the Presidency.

I hope that the President will reconsider. If not, I hope this body will have the strength to override this veto and stand up for the American soldier.

PALESTINIAN TERRORISM IN ISRAEL

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, at least nine Israelis have been killed and many wounded in the latest wave of Palestinian terror.

Nearly every day in the past few weeks, Palestinians have stabbed, shot, or run over innocent Israeli Jews. These terrorists do not care who their victims are. They want to kill as many Jews as possible.

Earlier this month, Palestinian terrorists murdered an Israeli couple driving in the West Bank right in front of their terrified children. This level of hate violence has not been seen in this region since the suicide bombings in the 2000s.

Why is this happening? What has caused this sudden outbreak of terror? The answer is really pretty simple: incitement by Palestinian leaders.

Just last month, Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas praised violent riots on the Temple Mount in Jerusalem; yet, the world press ignores

his doctrine of murdering Jews. He called Palestinians killed in the clashes "martyrs, fighting to keep the dirty feet of Jews out of the holy site."

The Temple Mount is the holiest place in the world for Jews, but according to Israeli law, only Muslims are able to pray there. Israel has no intention of changing the status quo on Temple Mount, but Abbas simply wants to create a charged atmosphere of violence. This incitement doesn't just come from his speeches.

Get this, Mr. Speaker: Palestinian leaders have turned their schools into virtual incubators to raise children as terrorists. School textbooks in Palestinian schools routinely teach students that Jews are evil and have no right to live in Israel. They are not just taught to hate; they are even instructed specifically how to stab Jews in these school textbooks.

As all of this incitement translates into real violence that kills Jews and injures Israelis, what has Israel done in response? Israel has reacted how any democratic country would react to defend its people. The policy is simple: if a terrorist is wielding a knife and is spotted, Israeli security is ordered to shoot that terrorist.

Israel has also increased its arrests of terrorists in the West Bank, including the cofounder of Hamas, a terrorist group. To deter more murderous attacks, Israel has destroyed the homes of terrorists who have attacked its citizens. Perhaps these terrorists will think twice about killing people: women, children, and men.

What exactly has our government said about this huge wave of Palestinian terrorism? When Israel is up against the wall, fending off daily attacks, the State Department says that Israel may be using excessive force. Is killing someone who tries to kill you considered excessive force? When did self-defense become excessive force?

Secretary Kerry went as far as to blame the current Palestinian violence on Israeli construction in the West Bank. Mr. Kerry is totally uninformed about what the facts are on the ground. Does Secretary Kerry mean to say that Israeli civilians deserve to be murdered? That is tantamount to saying that 9/11 occurred because of America's foreign policy in the Middle East.

This dangerous logic by the State Department only encourages more terrorist attacks. It does not stop the terrorism. Nothing can justify the killing of innocents.

Instead of our government supporting our Israeli allies, we are turning our backs on them. Instead, we should be standing side by side with Israel, condemning the terrorists. We should be pointing our fingers at the Palestinian leadership who have instigated all of this violence; hold those who preach hate and violence accountable, not give them a pass. Instead of calling out Israel, the State Department should be highlighting the incitement to hatred and violence in the Pal-

estinian curriculum, in their textbooks.

We must stop making excuses for terrorists and stand up for the victims. We must stand up for all of our values and our friends and not betray them. That includes standing with Israel.

And that is just the way it is.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 42 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 Rod Cannon, New Vision Worship Center, Zolfo Spring, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we are thankful for You and for the government that was built on Your foundation.

We thank You for our Representatives who are charged with focusing on the districts they represent and our Nation as a whole.

Bless them, Father. Let the burden that they have for their communities be shared by the people they represent. I pray for unity in their hearts. May they share one focus, and may that focus be pleasing to You.

Lord, open our eyes that we would see wondrous things from Your law.

Grant every official a strong desire for Your wisdom, the courage to say it, and the commitment to never turn from rectitude.

Father, let our Nation once again be a land pleasing and prosperous in Your sight.

Bless our military and law enforcement who lay their lives on the line every day on our behalf.

In Jesus' name we pray.

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 Nebraska (Mr. ASHFORD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. ASHFORD 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 ROD CANNON

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Reverend Rod Cannon of Zolfo Springs, Florida.

This afternoon, Reverend Cannon offered the opening prayer as the guest chaplain for the House of Representatives. I would like to thank Reverend Cannon for traveling to Washington for this honor and House Chaplain Father Conroy for providing this opportunity to a pastor from the 17th District of Florida.

Reverend Rod Cannon is the senior pastor at New Vision Worship Center in Zolfo Springs, Florida. He comes from a family devoted to the Church of God, where both his father and his son have been influential pastors in that community.

Reverend Cannon has been a leader in his church and the Zolfo Springs community since he arrived at the New Vision Worship Center in 2009. He has offered prayers across the State of Florida, and I am happy that he can add the House of Representatives to his extensive ministry.

I commend Reverend Cannon's commitment to his ministry and wish to thank him for offering the opening prayer today. It was my honor to invite him to Washington as guest chaplain.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

BLOCKING EPA REGULATION

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

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, the EPA is at it again. A few weeks ago, this runaway agency released its most expensive regulation in history. The new ozone rule joins a number of other costly, expansive, and crippling regulations put out by the EPA during the Obama administration. According to the EPA's own estimates, this new regulation will be one of the most crippling in history, at a cost of \$1.4 billion a year.

While no one disagrees that the protection of air quality is an essential responsibility, Hoosiers have a proven track record of being good stewards of the environment and good stewards of the economy. Yet the EPA continues to issue rules that overwhelm Hoosier companies and threaten job creation.

We should focus on policies that grow the economy, protect our environment, and not burying job creators under red tape and mandates.

It is time to end the EPA's assault on business. That is why, today, I am introducing a resolution of disapproval that would block this harmful regulation. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

GREAT LAKES RESTORATION INITIATIVE

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I recently joined my colleagues on the Great Lakes Task Force to ask the White House to support funding for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative next year.

The Great Lakes is the world's largest system of fresh surface water. It supports 1.5 million American jobs and \$62 billion in wages.

In western New York, Lake Erie is the focus of an amazing transformation of Buffalo's waterfront. Keeping the lake clean for recreation and fishing is essential to sustaining that economic growth.

The Great Lakes Restoration Initiative has also been instrumental in the next phase of Buffalo's waterfront renaissance, the Buffalo River. \$30 million in funding to clean up the river has leveraged \$20 million in private investment. Now the river that the Federal Government declared biologically dead in 1968 will be swimmable and fishable in 5 years.

The Great Lakes Restoration Initiative is creating jobs and improving environmental quality in my community, and it is producing returns for the national economy.

I encourage my colleagues to support the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative funding in the upcoming budget negotiations and to support the passage of the Great Lakes Restoration Act, which would authorize this program through 2020.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

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

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, defending the American people is the chief responsibility of our government, and it is a constitutional obligation that the House and the Senate take seriously.

This week, Congress put the National Defense Authorization Act on the President's desk. It is an important example of how Congress should work together to get the job done for the American people. This is bipartisan. We do it every year to fund our military. For 53 years, Congresses have passed and Presidents have signed this legislation.

Later today, President Obama will veto.

My district is home to Fairchild Air Force Base, and I know firsthand the importance of our defense funding. The National Defense Authorization Act funds vital military operations and equipment. Military families rely on it for salaries, medical care, and transitional resources.

Our Nation was built on service before self. We have an obligation—and the Commander in Chief has an obligation—to ensure military and defense remains our top priority. Mr. Speaker, the President must act. Stop playing politics. Support our troops. Keep America safe.

POTENTIAL DEFAULT

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

Mr. ASHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose any potential default on our Nation's fiscal obligations.

Treasury Secretary Lew stated that we must act before November 3 to avoid a default. If we default, we can't pay our obligations at home, and that means our veterans and seniors go without the benefits that they have earned.

There is no doubt that we must rein in spending, and we must work together—and I know we can—to do so. At the same time, we must keep the promises that we have made to our veterans, to our seniors, and to our Nation's bondholders.

President Ronald Reagan agreed that sacrificing our credit rating in the name of fiscal responsibility is not responsibility at all. He said of a potential default: "Brinkmanship threatens . . . those who rely on Social Security and veterans benefits. Interest rates would skyrocket, instability would occur in financial markets, and the Federal deficit would soar."

Colleagues, let's not bring the government again to the edge of a default. Rather, let's find a bipartisan pathway, which I know we can do, that will control our spending and prevent the devastating effects of default on our economy and our veterans.

RESTORING AMERICANS' HEALTHCARE FREEDOM RECONCILIATION ACT

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3762, the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act.

Over the past 10 months, the House has passed a budget, acted to defund Planned Parenthood and other abortion providers, and repealed ObamaCare; yet these actions by the House have been stonewalled in the Senate by its failure to garner the 60 votes necessary to deliver these important pieces of legislation to the President's desk. Now is our chance.

This bill provides an avenue for the Senate to pass what the House has already done. This bill prohibits Federal funding to entities like Planned Parenthood that engage in the practice of elective abortions. In turn, it provides funding to community health centers for improving women's health care.

It repeals the individual and employer mandates in ObamaCare. It repeals the medical device tax and the excise tax on high-cost health insurance plans. It achieves all of this and more, while saving almost \$79 billion in taxpayer dollars.

This bill finally provides a pathway to the President's desk for reforms that we in the House have long fought for.

HONORING ORTIZ FAMILY SERVICE IN U.S. ARMED FORCES

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a remarkable family of American heroes, men and women who since World War II have served in our Armed Forces to keep all of us and our way of life safe and secure.

The story begins with Mr. Esabel Parga Ortiz and his wife, Maria Montoya Ortiz, who migrated to the United States from Mexico in 1912 and, in 1915, moved to the Coachella Valley.

In the heart of our southern California desert, they put down roots—resilient roots, mind you—and raised their children to value the American Dream. It was those teachings that inspired and drove their sons, Pete and Joseph, to enlist in the U.S. armed services and defend our Nation. Ever since World War II, every generation of the Ortiz family, totaling over 50 family members, have bravely served in America's Armed Forces, putting their lives on the line to protect our freedoms.

For their selfless and honorable service, I am proud to recognize the valor and sacrifices of the Ortiz family.

Thank you for your service.

RECOGNIZING DEBBIE NYE SEMBLER

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

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of one of the longest serving trustees of the University of South Florida, Mrs. Debbie Nye Sembler. For 12 years, Mrs. Sembler served on the USF board of trustees; and, for 10 years, she served as chair of the campus board of USF St. Petersburg.

As Mrs. Sembler's term of service ends, I pay tribute to her many accomplishments, in particular, her contributions to excellence in higher education, not just for students from Pinellas County and the Tampa Bay area, but

for students across the State of Florida and, indeed, around the world.

When Mrs. Sembler became a trustee in 2003, USF St. Petersburg was just earning a reputation as a student-centric research institution. Today, it has over 7,000 students in 37 undergraduate and graduate programs.

As a trustee, Mrs. Sembler has led USF St. Petersburg through this remarkable growth, ensuring the USF system is recognized today as one of our Nation's leading higher education institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating and thanking Debbie Sembler for her hard work and dedication to USF, for her commitment to higher education, and, most importantly, for her passion for student success.

REAL SCHOOL GARDENS' 100TH LEARNING GARDEN

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize REAL School Gardens, an organization that works in over 40 elementary schools in my district, building gardens that engage the curiosity of students through STEM education.

As a member of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, I am proud of the work that REAL School Gardens has done in creating a pipeline, a STEM pipeline, in Texas that increases hands-on learning for all the students, including more than 100,000 students as of this year.

Additionally, REAL School Gardens has become a great equalizer for many students in the Grand Prairie, Dallas, Arlington, and Fort Worth Independent School Districts who have limited access to learning resources.

On November 14, 2015, REAL School Gardens will break ground to create its 100th garden in partnership with Sprouts Farmers Market.

I congratulate REAL School Gardens on this achievement and for their work in engaging the minds of our youngest members in the community.

□ 1215

NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS WEEK

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, each year since 1960, the third week in October has been proclaimed National Forest Products Week. It is a week in which we celebrate all of the ways that paper and wood products enhance our daily lives.

This industry is particularly important to the economic success of North Carolina, where nearly 60 percent of the total land area is forest and more than 18 million acres are dedicated to growing timber.

With nearly 250 manufacturing facilities, the State's forest products industry employs more than 40,000 men and women at a payroll of approximately \$2 billion per year. The value of the products produced in and shipped from North Carolina is more than \$10 billion.

America's forests keep our air and water clean while providing renewable energy, wildlife habitat, and recreation. They are also an economic generator, especially in the Nation's rural communities, delivering the paper and manufactured products we rely on every day.

We are grateful for this industry in North Carolina.

WHITE HOUSE FELLOWS PROGRAM

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

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, this week the White House Fellows Association is honoring the 50th anniversary of the creation of the White House Fellows Program, established by President Lyndon Johnson back in 1964.

Since its inception, there have been 738 young men and young women who have served the President and the Vice President of the United States and the Cabinet officers in various capacities in all the Federal agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I was honored in 1981 to be selected in the first class of President Reagan's White House Fellows Program. I served with the former Governor of South Carolina, James B. Edwards, the Secretary of Energy, in the Department of Energy.

Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent program open to all young Americans early in their careers who want to spend some time in Washington and then go back to their former careers with a better understanding of how our Federal Government works.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. Con. Res. 82 to recognize the White House fellows and their many contributions to our country. I urge Members to support this resolution if and when it comes to the floor.

HONORING INDIANA'S BLUE RIBBON SCHOOLS

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and honor two southern Indiana schools for their distinguished success. Farmersville Elementary School in Mt. Vernon and North Elementary School in Poseyville were recently selected as 2015 National Blue Ribbon schools by the U.S. Department of Education for their academic excellence.

Each school will be honored in November, along with 333 other schools from across the country, at a ceremony here in Washington, D.C. Both schools

were recognized as exemplary high-performing schools which is, without a doubt, due to the hard work of dedicated teachers and faculty and committed students.

Congratulations to Farmersville and North Elementary Schools. This is a well-deserved national recognition.

REMEMBERING RANDOLPH HOLDER

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday night, right after dark, Officer Randolph Holder of the NYPD heard on his radio, "Shots fired." He immediately rushed toward the gunfire in East Harlem. He arrived, but was gunned down by an outlaw. Holder was assassinated with a shot to the head.

Just 33 years old, Randolph Holder was an immigrant from Guyana. According to his aunt, his job was first in his life. He cherished the opportunity to become a policeman here in America.

He was a third-generation police officer, following in the footsteps of his father and grandfather, who served as peace officers in Guyana. Randolph was proud to be the first in his family to serve in that capacity in America. His killer was a hardened, violent criminal who shouldn't have been on our streets, according to the mayor.

Mr. Speaker, the war on police officers has resulted in 31 officers being killed in the line of duty just this year. The badge that represents safety for most is a target for some. Those in blue do a job that many of us would never do. So we owe them all, like Officer Holder, our extreme appreciation for taking care of the rest of us.

And that is just the way it is.

VETOING THE NDAA IS IRRESPONSIBLE

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

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a simple request. Every day across the globe men and women of the United States Armed Forces make grave sacrifices for our country and are courageously protecting us from a number of evils.

From an Iranian regime pursuing a nuclear weapon to the self-proclaimed Islamic State terrorizing the Middle East, to Russia looking to expand its influence in a world where American leadership is on the decline, we rely on the men and women in uniform to keep us safe.

In Congress, we are tasked with supporting our military, promoting legislation that will give them the tools they need and providing for their families stationed back home.

The House and Senate fulfilled these responsibilities by passing the National

Defense Authorization Act in an overwhelmingly bipartisan fashion, reassuring our military that, as they protect us, we will support them.

It is totally irresponsible for the President to veto this bill while our troops are in harm's way, and I call on all Members of Congress to join together to override the bill. There is nothing political or partisan about the support for our military, and it is outrageous that the President would take this action.

JASON SPRADLEY ATTAINS EAGLE SCOUT RANK

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, today I want to give special recognition to a special individual.

Jason Spradley was recently awarded the Eagle Scout designation, the highest rank in the Boy Scouting program. He is a senior at Airline High School in Bossier City and hopes to pursue law and become a JAG officer in the Navy.

While Jason is just 17 years old, he has worked over a decade to reach this Eagle Scout status. The qualifications state a Boy Scout must earn 21 merits to reach this level. Jason earned almost 40.

These young men earn merits by proving their skills in camping, first aid, and many more, but more than learning how to fish or start a fire, Boy Scouts learn about serving their community. Obedience, loyalty, and many other characteristics make up what we know to be a true leader.

The Boy Scouts motto is "Be prepared." I would say Jason and these young men have already built a solid foundation in their lives. I wish him, the rest of the members in troop 105 in Louisiana, and the many other young men across the country who have attained Eagle Scout the very best. I know that they all have a bright future ahead.

NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS WEEK

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

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, this week we celebrate National Forest Products Week, and I rise to recognize the important contributions of our wood products across Montana and the country.

In my home State alone, we have more than 20 million acres of timber. We have 12 sawmills that employ thousands of Montanans; yet, we can't cut a tree in Montana. The number of lumber products has gone down because we can't figure out in this body how to cut a tree without a lawsuit.

There is a bipartisan bill in the Senate, the Resilient Federal Forests Act, that passed out of this body bipartisan,

and the Senate is not picking it up. We are not going to hear about forest fires from now until the end of winter, but they are there, and it is time to act.

When a bipartisan bill comes out of this House and the Senate refuses to pick it up, it has consequences on Montana, and it has consequences on hard-working families that just want to make a living in the timber industry.

AMERICAN FAMILIES ARE LESS SAFE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday the President's Iranian nuclear deal, a tragic mistake, went into effect. Instead of making the world safer, as promised, American families have become less safe. As reported in *The Post and Courier* of Charleston, since the Iran deal was reached, the Iranian regime tested a ballistic missile that could reach Israel, in direct violation of U.N. resolutions.

After the test of the missile, the Iranian defense minister said: "We don't ask permission from anyone." This does not come as a surprise. We know the Iranian regime cannot be trusted. Sadly, it is shocking that the President has dismissed the Iranian regime's flagrant disregard of international rules and still insists that Iran will uphold their part of the deal.

The evidence is overwhelming that the Iranian regime will break the agreement, with billions of dollars for new attacks. The President's legacy is American families at risk of terrorist attacks by jihadists and a rogue regime oppressing the people of Iran.

In conclusion, God bless our troops. The President, by his actions, must never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism. Tomorrow is the gruesome 32nd anniversary of the murder of 241 Americans at the marine barracks in Beirut by Iran. Our sympathy for their families.

RAISING DOWN SYNDROME AWARENESS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this weekend I will be joining countless advocates in Centre County, Pennsylvania, for a Buddy Walk hosted by the National Down Syndrome Society. These walks have been held across the Nation for the past 20 years, raising awareness and promoting self-advocacy for those living with Down Syndrome. In spite of some extra challenges, many people with Down Syndrome attend school, work, and contribute to society in a wide variety of ways.

In order to provide those living with Down Syndrome and other disabilities

the best start possible, I was happy to cosponsor, along with a majority of my colleagues in the House, the Achieving a Better Life Experience, or ABLE, Act, which was signed into law last year.

This law allows people with disabilities and their families to create a flexible account to help save for medical and dental care, education, community-based support, employment training, housing, and transportation.

In my home State of Pennsylvania, State legislation that will allow deductions of account contributions from State taxable income has been introduced in the Commonwealth's house and senate. I urge their passage to complete the work the Federal Government has started.

DOWN SYNDROME AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, this month we recognize Down Syndrome Awareness Month. As we celebrate the abilities of more than 400,000 Americans living with Down Syndrome, it is important that we address some of the problems these individuals and their families face.

Families and patients who are affected by Down Syndrome face many related health issues. I had the privilege of meeting a very inspiring patient during the Energy and Commerce's work on 21st Century Cures legislation. Madison, a young girl diagnosed with Down Syndrome, had four major open-heart surgeries all before her 3rd birthday.

An estimated 50 percent of children born with Down Syndrome have some form of heart defect, like Madison; yet, her surgeries are still fairly new in the medical world. Our Cures legislation encourages additional research for medications and procedures that could benefit children like Madison. We must continue our work to promote a better quality of life for all patients across the Nation.

□ 1230

RECOGNIZING INTERNATIONAL DAY OF THE GIRL AND THE GIRL UP MOVEMENT

(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 recognize the International Day of the Girl and the Girl Up movement. Their mission is to raise awareness to the neglect and devaluation of girls around the world and to advance girls' lives and opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, in the Aw-Barre refugee camp in Ethiopia, girls under the age of 18 comprise about 30 percent of the

population. However, due to the lack of resources, many families of the Aw-Barre have stopped educating their girls. This leaves young women more vulnerable to be victims of sexual violence and significantly limits their lives and opportunities.

Girl Up, a local campaign in Illinois' Tenth Congressional District, is working to combat global crisis like the Aw-Barre refugee camp. Young women, like Celia Buckman of Glenview, are working with their high schools to provide resources like school uniforms, backpacks, and safe spaces to help young women succeed.

I am proud to work with Girl Up and recognize the International Day of the Girl to bring awareness to the complex challenges facing young women around the globe.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 22, 2015.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in clause 2(h) of rule II of the rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 22, 2015 at 10:47 a.m.:

That the Senate passed with amendments H.R. 208.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 774.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3762, RESTORING AMERICANS' HEALTHCARE FREEDOM RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2015; WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(A) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 483 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 483

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3762) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016. 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) two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. 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 through the legislative day of October 23, 2015.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of October 22, 2015, or October 23, 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. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), 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. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to start with the end of what our Reading Clerk read before I get to the excitement in the beginning.

At the end, what you heard was some blanket authority to consider what I will call housekeeping measures here in the House, and not because Republicans say so, not because Democrats say so, but because Republicans and Democrats come together, consult with one another, and try to find those issues on which we agree to bring forward.

I sit on the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker. The best thing that happens in this institution is when a bill comes through the Rules Committee, because my colleague Ms. SLAUGHTER and I always make it better. We always make it better.

But we include authority to avoid the Rules Committee for some of these issues that are going to come to the floor fast and furious. Here we are, at the end of a cycle. We are in a leadership change here in the House. You don't know what might happen. What the Rules Committee did last night was to create a pathway to allow the House to continue its business at a moment's notice, and I am glad that we included that provision in here. We also include same-day consideration authority.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that happened when the big freshman class that I was elected with in 2010 came is we said, for Pete's sakes, we need time to read the bills. We need to follow the rules and make sure that all Members have a chance to get deep into the information and legislation.

That persists still today. We have a process today that allows Members to get involved in that legislation. But we still have those emergency times here in this Chamber where something has to happen in a hurry. Whether we are talking about borrowing authority, spending authority, whether we are talking about something for our troops, something for our veterans, things still happen on a moment's notice.

What we have included in here is the ability to bring things more quickly to the floor here in the next short period of time. That is important from a housekeeping perspective, Mr. Speaker, but that is not what is important about this rule today.

What is important about this rule today is that 4½ years ago, the people of the great State of Georgia, its Seventh District, sent me to Congress. I was placed on the Budget Committee in this Congress, the Budget Committee, the committee that writes the framework by which the entire \$3.5 trillion Federal Government is funded. We got together and we worked hard here in the House, Mr. Speaker, and we produced a budget, but the Senate did nothing.

I came back that second year, 2012. We worked hard here in the House. Together, we produced a budget, but the Senate did nothing. We came back again 2013, worked hard here in the House, produced a budget, but the Senate produced nothing.

Mr. Speaker, what we are here today to do—what we are here today to do—is made possible for one reason, and one reason only. That is because, for the first time since 2001, Republicans and Democrats came together in the House; Republicans and Democrats came together in the Senate. We passed a budget; they passed a budget. We conferenced a budget, and America has a balanced budget which it lives under for the first time in 15 years—for the first time in 15 years.

Now, what does that mean?

It is not all that exciting to read the budget, Mr. Speaker. I recommend it to you if you haven't gotten into the details. I recommend it to anybody who hasn't gotten into the details.

But that is not what is exciting. It is not the numbers in the budget that are exciting. What is exciting is that, because we came together, not because we had our ideas and they had their ideas, but because we came together, we have triggered a process called reconciliation.

Now, I am saddened that reconciliation is now in the lexicon of the American people. It is not an important word that folks need to know ex-

cept for the fact that it gives us access to do things on their behalf that we wouldn't have been able to do before.

I am so pleased that the Secretary of the Senate sent that message over right before we got up to say that the Senate has just acted on two pieces of House legislation. One of those, enacted with no amendments, is going to be on its way to the President's desk. One, done with amendments, we are going to have to consider that again.

So often we do such good work, the 435 of us together in this Chamber, and it does not get past a Senate filibuster. Mr. Speaker, the filibuster is designed to protect the rights of the minority. Republicans use it when they are in the minority; Democrats use it when they are in the minority; but it prevents the people's business from moving forward.

Not so today. Not so today. Because we got together in the House with a budget and the Senate with a budget, because we brought a budget together, we are now in the process of reconciliation, which allows us to have the people's will be done. Fifty-one votes in the Senate now will move legislation forward, as it relates to balancing the budget.

You remember, Admiral Mullen, he said, Mr. Speaker, the greatest threat to American national security wasn't a military threat. He said it was our Federal budget deficit.

We have done such an amazing job collaboratively in this Chamber working on the one-third of the budget pie called discretionary spending. That is the spending that we have to work on here every year. What we have failed to do together is work on the two-thirds of the pie called mandatory spending, where the real growth in those budget programs occurs. But that failure ends today.

With the passage of this rule, we will move to consider the first reconciliation package that has come to Congress in the 4½ years that I have been here, made possible by the first balanced budget agreement that Congress has come to since 2001.

Mr. Speaker, this is why—this is why—I came to Congress, and we are doing it together here today.

Let me tell you what is in this bill. I have seen it described in the press as a complete and total repeal of the President's healthcare bill. That is nonsense. I would support such an effort if we could bring such an effort to the floor, but that is not what this bill is today. What this bill is today is a group of commonsense, budget-saving, spending-reprioritizing measures.

I will give you an example. There is a medical excise tax that the President's healthcare law put into effect. It is 2.3 percent. It is an excise tax, a gross receipts tax on all medical innovation in this country as it relates to devices. We all know the power to tax is the power to destroy. There is not one Member in this Chamber who supports destroying medical innovation, not one—not one.

But, back at the time when the Congressional Budget Office said the President's healthcare bill was going to cost \$1 trillion, the President said: I am not going to spend a penny more than \$1 trillion. I am going to make sure it is paid for.

He was out there looking hard for money. Turns out, medical innovation was a place he could look. We all see now, in retrospect, that was a terrible idea, much like the other nine bills that we have passed here in this House, that they have passed in the Senate, that the President has signed into law to repeal various unworkable parts of the President's healthcare bill. This is just yet another.

We can do this together here today, made possible by this first budget agreement that we have had since 2001.

The Cadillac tax it is called, Mr. Speaker, another provision that this bill will repeal. It is a Cadillac tax, Mr. Speaker.

As we all know, Cadillac is a fine American automobile. You get in a Cadillac, you feel good. We call it the Cadillac tax because it is on healthcare plans that are too good—too good. Turns out, Mr. Speaker, there are some labor unions in this country that are taking too good of care of their members. Turns out there are some businesses in this country that are looking after the healthcare needs of their employees too much. We want to keep that down. The last thing we want in this country, apparently, is folks having health care that is too good.

I tell people all the time, Mr. Speaker, I can make everybody in this country poor; I just can't pass a law to make everybody rich. We are so good at dumbing down the system for everybody. Well, that is what this Cadillac tax was designed to do.

The labor unions don't like it. Employers don't like it. We all know it is not the right thing to do, and in a bipartisan way we have introduced legislation to repeal it. This bill, this rule, gives us an opportunity to actually send that to the President's desk.

Mr. Speaker, I won't go on and on about all the good things that are in this bill. I am sure my colleague from New York is going to highlight a lot of those herself, and I don't want to steal all the thunder.

But we are here because 435 of us came together here, 100 came together there, and America is operating under a conferenced budget, and not just a budget, but a balanced budget for the first time since 2001.

A lot of disappointment has come out of Washington, D.C., Mr. Speaker, but we are here on the floor today talking about one of those things we get to celebrate, one of those successes on behalf of the families back home, that we have done together.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time

as I may consume. I really enjoy serving with him on the Rules Committee because he is always so cheerful and puts such a good face on everything, and heaven knows we can use that in the world.

But the truth is, Mr. Speaker, and my colleague knows it, that by taking away the funding for the healthcare act, you are killing the healthcare act. That means that people would go back to not having preexisting conditions covered.

That means that women in eight States and the District of Columbia would face the fact that their insurance companies consider domestic violence to be a preexisting condition, which translates out, if you are beaten up once, maybe they will cover you. The second time, it is obviously your fault. You have that propensity.

We can't go back to the rising cost of health care with so many Americans using the most expensive kind of health care in the world, the emergency room. We are told that if this were to pass, 13 million Americans would lose their health care.

But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, this is not going to pass, and we know that. As a matter of fact, I find myself saying over and over again the very same things. I remember saying this is the 35th vote, this is the 40th vote. This, Mr. Speaker, is the 61st vote, using tax money and wasting time, to take health care away from people.

Now, I have asked many, many times in the Rules Committee: What is this great urge to prohibit people from having access to health care?

□ 1245

The best I can come up with is it is not particularly that they don't care about those people, but they want to do something to upset the President. There was a good deal of talk yesterday that, if we could add a few amendments on here, it would really cause him grief.

It is not going to cause him any grief. If this should pass, if the Senate should pass it, which is in control of Republicans—and, you know, if you complain about not passing the bill, take it up with them—what we are going to be doing is, if it gets to the President, he is going to veto it, and you know very good and well that we don't have the votes here to override. So we are wasting time.

We are just wasting time and wasting money. I don't know how many millions of dollars of tax money it has taken with these 61 bills, but then they throw in a little something else here.

They say: Let's defund Planned Parenthood for 1 year. Why? I don't know. Three committees in the House of Representatives are studying Planned Parenthood, and we have got to look forward to one of those other new select committees which will go over the same thing over and over again and come up with the conclusion that Con-

gressman CHAFFETZ came up with after they grilled the president of Planned Parenthood, Cecile Richards, for 5 hours, that there was nothing there, that they broke no law.

I don't know why the American public is not outraged over the fact that none of their business is taken care of, but over and over and over again we talk about taking health care away from people.

One in five American women and a lot of men have used Planned Parenthood and do today. And then you add to that the 13 million people that will lose their health care if this should become law, 3 million of them children.

Now, what should we be doing? Well, how about the Export-Import Bank. It doesn't cost the taxpayers a dime, puts money back into the Treasury. It allows small companies in the United States to be able to afford to export their goods to other countries.

The loss of that bank has already received from both General Electric and Boeing words that they are going to take jobs out of the United States because we don't have it. There is no earthly reason not to have it. As I said, it doesn't cost us anything. It makes us money. It is just that for some Members of Congress they just don't like it.

Now, this is the same majority that has produced no highway bill. We really are on a road to nowhere. For the first time that I have been in Congress—a highway bill was always something everybody joined. It was always bipartisan.

But we have got roads and bridges crumbling. We have no high-speed rail. Airports are overcrowded. Everybody needs help. But we are working here to do something about the healthcare bill that is already working and Planned Parenthood.

Now, this is the same majority that brought us the 7 legislative days away from risking the full faith and credit of the United States. What that means is that we are refusing—the majority is—to bring up a bill here to pay the debt that they have already incurred. It is the Congress that spends the money, and now they decided they don't want to pay for it. So they are putting that off.

We have heard talks that tomorrow we are supposed to have a bill, but we all know—because we all hear everything that is going on—that there are only 170 votes for that bill, which won't pass it. So we may not see it.

So what we are going to do today is give everybody in the House of Representatives an opportunity to protect the full faith and credit of the United States and not risk another downgrade of our credit rating. To downgrade the credit rating of the United States was something that all previous Congresses felt was an impossible thing for them to allow.

But while this is all festering out there and nothing is being done about it, we are hurling toward another shutdown in mid-December.

So once again we find ourselves: Let's take away that health care. Let's shut down that thing over there. But let's not deal with the issues that we have been sent here, the things that we have been elected to do.

And one of those has to be to protect the full faith and credit of the United States of America, which has always been done and was a responsibility of all previous Congresses.

Now, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, the reconciliation bill before us will take health care away from 16 million people, 3 million children, and I might add most of them didn't have any health care at all before the ACA was passed. As I said, it would also defund Planned Parenthood and endanger the health of men and women across the country. If I haven't said it enough, again, this defunds Planned Parenthood.

A scant 3 weeks ago we stood on the floor as the House majority threatened to shut down the government over the funding for Planned Parenthood. The American public gave a very resounding message to Congress: Don't do it. In fact, nearly seven in ten Americans oppose a government shutdown over Planned Parenthood funding, according to a Quinnipiac poll.

With this 61st vote to dismantle the ACA—and make no mistake about it. It doesn't say in there we are going to kill this thing. We are just going to take the money away from it.

And if you are smart enough to be a Member of Congress of the United States, you know that, if you take the money away from it, you have killed that bill. We all understand that. But as the majority continues to beat their head up against the brick wall of health care, the American people get the headache.

This budget reconciliation bill before us does two things. One, it takes health care away from, as I said, 16 million Americans. Two, it attacks women's health by defunding Planned Parenthood.

I believe that governing this body is a serious job with serious consequences. The brinkmanship that this majority continues to display is dangerous to our economy and unsettling to our Nation. The last time the majority shut down the government over the debt limit, it took \$24 billion out of this economy.

The consequences of this kind of brinkmanship are real. They are not imagined. We have been through it once. Why in the world would we self-inflict that wound on ourselves again?

We should not be pushed to the edge over and over again. We should be planning what we need to do, follow regular order. My dear colleague Mr. WOODALL talked about how wonderfully well Democrats and Republicans work together. I don't know where that is.

I know that the chair of the Benghazi Committee kept talking about he had 7 members. There are actually 12 on there. But it just demonstrated again

that the 5 Democrats on there did not signify with them.

We need to focus on the urgent needs of the Nation, not manufactured crises that we are insisting on creating.

To address the real issues, we have got a plan to allow us to pay the bills that this Congress has incurred and to protect the full faith and credit of the United States. We always call for this on rules. We do something called the previous question, which everybody sort of glides over.

This today, what we are doing—when the previous question on this rule vote is called, I hope that every Member who wants to do something about the debt limit and the full faith and credit of the United States will vote “no” so that our side can bring this up and give everybody an opportunity to go home for a weekend without worrying about whether this is going away.

By the time we get back here next week, there will be even fewer legislative days to deal with it. But our troops, national security, the whole Federal Government, and most of the people in the United States are very much concerned with what will happen if it shuts down.

Let’s relieve us of that burden and vote today to deal with the debt limit. I invite all Members to vote for the Democrats’ clean, simple bill. It doesn’t do anything about taking away regulations from the government, nothing. It simply deals with the most important matter at hand at this point, and that is the full faith and credit of the United States.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I confess. I was sitting over here going through my papers. I was afraid I had come down here on the wrong bill here today, listening to my friend describe it. I tell you that, if you listen to that description and you believe it, you ought to vote “no.” But it is just not true. It is just not true.

In fact, I will go line by line just a little bit. You will not find a CBO document over there that says House Resolution 483 is going to take health care away from 16 million Americans. We are not going to find it.

In fact, you won’t find a CBO document that says the underlying bill of H.R. 3762 is going to take health care away from anybody because such a document does not exist.

CBO did say that the President’s healthcare bill would provide health care for 16 million Americans. Yet, the President has joined with this House and that Senate nine times so far to repeal errant provisions of that healthcare bill, and that is what we are going to do here in this legislation today.

You won’t find any language that suggests that House Resolution 483 is going to deal with preexisting conditions to set back preexisting conditions coverage in any way whatsoever, nor will you find any paper that suggests

the underlying bill, H.R. 3672, is going to set back the conversation on pre-existing conditions.

Why? Because the President led on the issue of preexisting conditions, Mr. Speaker, much like a great Georgia speaker of this House, Newt Gingrich, and Bill Clinton got together and did in 1996. They got together and outlawed all preexisting conditions for federally regulated plans.

What President Obama did in his healthcare bill has said: Well, as States haven’t done it on their own, we are going to do it for all State-regulated plans, too.

This bill doesn’t dial that back one iota, not one bit. The President, I believe, won that debate in America. I don’t think we are ever going to revisit that debate.

I think that is a success story for families with preexisting conditions and, again, something else we ought to be celebrating here today, Mr. Speaker, not holding our heads low about.

Mr. Speaker, when the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff tells you that the greatest threat to America’s national security is our budget deficit—and, at the time that I arrived here in Congress, Mr. Speaker, in 2010, America was running its largest budget deficit in American history, three times the size that they are today—I tell you a bill like this that goes after those deficit numbers is a critically important bill. It is the business that my constituents back home sent me to be about here in this institution.

Now, of course, in the 4½ years that the folks in the Seventh District have lent me their voting card, Mr. Speaker, we have brought budget deficits down each and every year—each and every year—year after year after year after year. But that has been primarily on that discretionary one-third of the pie I talked about, Mr. Speaker.

There is so much more work to be done, and reconciliation is the tool we use to get around the filibuster, to allow the people’s will to be done with simple majorities on both sides of the Hill.

Good news. If you don’t believe what is in the underlying bill is good for America, you can vote “no,” and if 51 percent of your colleagues agree with you, this bill will not go forward. But that is not going to happen because this is good policy.

And good news, Mr. Speaker. When it goes over to the Senate, if the Senate does not believe this is good policy for America and 51 Senators vote against it, this bill will not go to the President’s desk.

But that is not going to happen because there is good policy in the underlying bill. This will go to the President’s desk.

As the President sits today, Mr. Speaker, contemplating vetoing the National Defense Authorization Act—in fact, that may be happening even as we are standing here now, that bill that provides authorized funding for all

of our troops—I can’t possibly predict what he will do when this bill arrives on his desk.

But what my friend from New York fails to mention every time she mentions that 61 times in this House we have dealt with trying to clean up the messes that the Affordable Care Act has created is that 9 of those times the President agreed with us.

It is just so critically important, Mr. Speaker. We get wrapped around the partisan axle in this body in ways that are tremendously discouraging to me, as if it is always an us against them proposition. It is not. It is just a proposition about us—about us—320 million of us.

And nine times so far, Mr. Speaker, just in the short time that I have been in Congress, the House, the Senate, and the President have gotten together and said the Affordable Care Act is broken and together we can begin to fix it.

I believe this is going to be one of those opportunities as well, Mr. Speaker. It is going to be a tremendous vote, I hope, on passing this rule, which will allow us to begin debate. Pass that underlying resolution.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I just say once again, no, they don’t say: We are going to take away pre-existing conditions. They just say: We are taking away the funding for the bill.

When the funding is taken away, it dies. I think almost all Americans understand that.

I am pleased now to yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

□ 1300

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to discuss the rule for reconciliation, which I believe we are wasting on a doomed attempt to repeal ObamaCare for the 61st time. That we are doing this again for the 61st time is a problem. But that we are wasting our one shot at budget reconciliation on this is a tremendous shame. We should be using this opportunity to avoid the Senate filibuster to actually make law, not make a point to our bases. The way to do this is by focusing on a bipartisan issue: canceling the sequester.

Mr. Speaker, the sequester is a unique problem in American public policy, a program that is intentionally designed to be a bad idea. It cripples the programs that made the 20th century one of unprecedented progress, and it weakens the bravest military in the world. It is bad for us at home, and it is bad for us overseas.

Its blundering destructive approach to deficit reduction was supposed to push this Congress to compromise. Unfortunately, we have not gotten there

because a few intransigents refuse to give up this hostage. But it isn't this body that is paying the ransom for our inaction on the sequester; it is the American people of all walks of life. It is the millions of workers, businesses, public servants, and soldiers who are facing uncertainty and inadequate support.

Mr. Speaker, I would encourage us to stand up and use this one shot on something that matters and can pass, and canceling the sequester is something that both sides could actually agree on. So I urge my colleagues, please, to bring this theater to a close and to return to something we can all support. Let's use reconciliation to cancel the sequester once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

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

Mr. Speaker, if I could say to my friend from Michigan, I think there is a lot of wisdom in what he had to say. My friend has been here, Mr. Speaker, since 1965, I believe. I can't remember if he was elected in 1964 and began service in 1965. He has seen a lot of failures and a lot of successes in this institution.

Reconciliation exists for one reason and one reason only, and that is to do the really hard things that we can't get done in other times. I would say to my friend, Mr. Speaker, that the die has been cast on reconciliation for 2015. But as a member of the Budget Committee, I will commit to you that we are going to come back, and we are going to get a conferenced balanced budget next year as well. I hear that drumbeat beginning around this institution: What is it that we can get done together? I hope we get this done.

Make no mistake, I believe this is good underlying legislation. But the past, well, three decades now since 1980, as I think of the big reconciliation measures that have gone through have been things that have changed America for the better forever, and I am grateful to the gentleman for reminding us all of the power of this tool.

Mr. Speaker, 61 times we have had a vote on the President's healthcare bill, that is true. But it is because there are real problems there—again, nine times of which the President has agreed with us about those real problems.

The folks who crafted the President's healthcare bill were smart. I don't have any concerns about the funding that my friend from New York has, Mr. Speaker, because the bill has funding buried in it in such a way we don't have any access to it from this institution. That is why we passed 4½ years' worth of legislation here without getting our arms around that funding.

What we are talking about here, Mr. Speaker, are budget deficits. What we are talking about here is an opportunity to move the needle on mandatory spending. What we are talking about here is about \$81 billion in static scored money, closer to 130 in dynam-

cally scored money, moving the needle on the budget, as Admiral Mullen, then the Chair of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, encouraged us to do.

I don't know where the vote is going to come out, Mr. Speaker. I feel pretty good about it. I feel pretty good about it because it is good underlying policy. I feel pretty good about it because we did this the right way. We started in the Budget Committee. We conferenced it with the Senate. We then sent those reconciliation instructions out to the Energy and Commerce Committee, the Education and Labor Committee, and the Ways and Means Committee. Each committee did its work, sent that work back to the Budget Committee, and we then brought all that legislation together. Mr. Speaker, if you want a textbook case of how it is supposed to work around here, this is it.

Now, as a fellow who has been disappointed many times in 4½ years in this institution, I am just going to tell my colleagues that if any of my new colleagues believe they are going to have it their way every day of the week, the answer is no. I was disabused of that notion in week one.

But what we can do is bring the collective wisdom of the body together, the collective wisdom of the body and the collective wisdom from our committee structures, and this bill does that. There is only one way to get to this bill, though, Mr. Speaker, and that is to pass this rule today, House Resolution 483, and I encourage my colleagues to do that.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill. I do so as somebody who comes from a State which, unlike maybe the gentleman from Georgia, actually embraced this law. The Governor set up an exchange right away, and we have had what Forbes Magazine has described as the highest functioning exchange in the country. Our uninsured rate went from 8 percent down to 4 percent. We have more insurers in the marketplace today than we did before the ACA was passed.

On Labor Day, I was at a picnic with some friends, and there was a gentleman there who was the head of HR for the second largest employer in this community that I was at. It was about a 300-employee firm, a trash hauler, who was actually quite concerned about the ACA's definition of part-time and full-time in terms of raising his rates. For the last 2 years, his rates have gone down. He yelled from the pool where he was playing with his kids, splashing around in the water, saying: Tell President Obama thank you for the Affordable Care Act because our rates have gone down for the 275 people that worked there.

So, Mr. Speaker, then the question is: What does this bill do? The fact of

the matter is, by eliminating the individual mandate, by basically destroying the financing of tax subsidies, which is precisely the way that you broaden the insurance market so that you can implement an elimination of preexisting conditions, you, in fact, are totally capsizing the market.

I know that because the State of Connecticut insurance department and the exchange have looked at what this bill is going to do to the individual mandate, and that is precisely what they said the outcome would be, that it would send rates through the roof and basically shatter the success that our State has accomplished.

What is so ironic about this is that the design of this bill with an individual mandate and tax subsidies for insurance came from the Heritage Foundation. Stuart Butler was the mastermind of this back in the 1990s. I was chairman of the Public Health Committee back then, and I remember vividly that that was the Heritage Foundation, the conservative alternative to healthcare reform, to the Clinton healthcare plan. But, obviously, for political reasons, that is not mentioned very much by the majority as we again debate this ad nauseam.

What is sad is that 2 weeks ago we passed a bill, H.R. 1624, sponsored by my good friend, Mr. GUTHRIE from Kentucky, which amended the Affordable Care Act. It changed the definition of "small employer," and it was done on a bipartisan basis, completely unanimous. It sailed through the House, and President Obama signed it.

Why did that work? Because they did it surgically, because BRETT was smart enough to understand that if you want to get people to come together, you don't load it up with a bunch of poison pills, that you actually present an idea with focus and with logic behind it. Guess what will happen. You will actually get bipartisan support, the complete opposite of the bill that we have before us here today.

Now, I want to point out, though, that there are some signs of intelligent life in this reconciliation bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, section 305 does, as the gentleman from Georgia points out, eliminate the excise tax on high-class plans.

It is interesting to note that 5 years ago it was the House Members who pushed hard against that proposal with the administration, and we delayed that tax for 5 years. H.R. 2050, which I am the lead sponsor of, I am proud to say we have 166 bipartisan cosponsors. It is verbatim the language that was incorporated into the reconciliation bill.

So I point that out because I do think that it, in fact, will basically sharply increase people's out-of-pocket

deductibles because that is what actuaries tell us is the only way you can respond to that kind of tax. It is true that 83 organizations, including organized labor, business groups, and small-business groups have said this is not a workable plan. I mention that here because there is an opportunity here to do what Congressman GUTHRIE did, which is to take an individual component, an idea, and not load it up with a lot of other baggage which is going to capsize the insurance market, which we know is going to happen if other provisions of the reconciliation bill are passed, that we can actually get it done.

You are giving the White House a perfect excuse to veto this bill and robbing us of the ability to actually address this real problem, which section 305 does recognize, and H.R. 2050 is out there and is on standby for us to move forward on. So let's get rid of the blunt instruments, the baseball bats, and the butchering of this law, and let's focus on bipartisan surgical fixes to real problems.

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

Mr. Speaker, I say to my friend from Connecticut that the point that he made was made very well by the gentleman from Oklahoma last night while we were in the Rules Committee. You only get to use this procedure once—actually, you can use it three times; but for a variety of different reasons, it is only going to come together for us once this year—and you have to choose how to do that.

I am thrilled—thrilled—that the story that the gentleman from Connecticut tells is of success for his constituents back home in Connecticut. I think that is fabulous. I think that is fabulous.

Mr. Speaker, I don't get to tell as many of those stories. I tell stories of folks who had plans that they liked, and those plans were outlawed by their government. I tell stories about folks who have doctors that they had had relationships with for decades, who were promised that if they liked their doctor they could keep their doctor, who lost access to their doctor because their government told them "no more for you."

I tell stories of the small businesses in the district that were doing the right thing by providing health care for their employees who have now been priced out of that marketplace. They are not required by law to do it, but rates have gone up so much they can't do it themselves—not because of our efforts to provide health care to people, but because of our efforts to tell people what kind of health care is good for them and what kind isn't.

Mr. Speaker, you may not know, the chairman of the Budget Committee is Georgia Congressman Dr. TOM PRICE. Dr. TOM PRICE, in H.R. 2300, has a replacement plan. Dr. TOM PRICE wants to see preexisting conditions out of the marketplace. Dr. TOM PRICE, in H.R.

2300, wants to see individuals able to move their policies from business to business, from place to place.

Mr. Speaker, it is a doctor-patient relationship. It is not a Federal Government-patient relationship. It is not a Federal HHS, Health and Human Services-patient relationship, and it is not an insurance company-doctor relationship. It is about me and my physician, you and your physician, our families and our family physician, 320 million Americans at a time.

We have it right here in this institution. We have replacement options right here.

Do not let it be said that in the name of trying to bring sanity to our Federal spending, in the name of trying to fix the errors that were created in the Affordable Care Act, do not let it be said that any Member wants to trample on the healthcare opportunities that families have back home. Our goal is to expand those opportunities, not to contract them.

I celebrate what has happened in Connecticut. I only wish that folks in Connecticut, New York, and elsewhere would support us in Georgia with the challenges that we are having and help us get back to that very personal doctor-patient relationship that we believe is the right of every American.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the budget reconciliation bill avoids the real problems before us, including the debt limit, the Export-Import Bank, a highway bill, a looming shutdown, and more. Instead of addressing the urgent needs of the Nation, the bill doubles down on attacking women's health and marks the 61st time that the House majority has voted to repeal, to defund, or to undermine the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Speaker, let's try to salvage something from the money we have spent on this hour here at a time that we have literally wasted again, for the 61st time. Let's salvage something from it by voting "no" on the previous question. We can actually accomplish something then.

If the previous question is defeated, we will be able to vote to take care of the issue of debt limit, the full faith and credit of the United States of America.

□ 1315

A simple vote "no" allows us to bring that up, vote for that, go home this weekend not having to be chewing everybody's nails and then everybody in the country wonders what in heck is going to be going on here.

Why don't we for a change here on this day, on this Thursday, do something positive, do something that needs doing, do something we know sooner or later we will do. Do it today on a clean bill, no additions of any kind, just to do it. It is an opportunity that I certainly hope people will take advantage of. I urge them to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" so that we can vote "yes" on a vote to deal with the debt limit issue and a "no" vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe there is more that unites us than that divides us not just in this Chamber, but in this Nation.

As I have listened to my colleague from New York talk about some of the priorities that America has, I think she is spot on. I think she is spot on.

I am missing votes in the Transportation Committee right now where we are moving that long-term transportation bill so that I can be down here on the floor moving this reconciliation bill.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of rust in the gears around here. There is a lot of rust in the gears. It has been since the 1990s that Congress—House and Senate combined—have sent all the appropriations bills to the President before the end of the fiscal year. It has been since the 1990s.

Newt Gingrich ran this institution the last time we did that. Bill Clinton was in the White House the last time we did that. There is a lot of rust in the gears that has accumulated under both Republican and Democratic leadership in this place.

But this year we passed more appropriations bills earlier in the fiscal year than at any point since 1974. This year we are moving the first long-term highway bill that we have seen in almost a decade.

This year we have conferenced a balanced budget for America for the first time in a decade and a half. That is not just a notch to put on the belt of America to say this is what we have done. This is an opportunity to move this budget reconciliation bill.

Mr. Speaker, I do. I am saddened that reconciliation is a word that folks have to go and look up and learn, but it is the only way—the only way—in divided government that the people's voice can be heard.

There is no other procedure in the United States Congress that allows 51 percent of America to prevail. There is no other ability in the United States Congress for the majority of Americans who have lent their power to Washington to express their views and change the law of the land, save this one.

Mr. Speaker, budget deficits have gone down each and every year since Speaker JOHN BOEHNER stood right there where you are standing today

and NANCY PELOSI handed him the gavel—every year—from record high levels now to the lowest budget deficit in the Obama administration, and we have an opportunity today to do more.

I have heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, talk about those things that we can do together, and I agree. I agree.

I have heard my colleagues on the other side talk about their priorities in terms of raising the debt limit and not seeing the government shut down. I halfway agree.

I don't want to see the government shut down either. We avoided a government shutdown 2 weeks ago and got a little thank you note from a young lady who was in the office.

She said: Dear Congressman, It was good to see you today. Thank you for not letting the American History museum close down while my family was in Washington.

There are real impacts to that. But the fact is the reason we are having the conversation is not because anybody wants to shut the government down. It is because folks want to borrow more money. Mortgaging our children's future to the tune of \$18 trillion apparently is not mortgaging it enough. We are going to be back and make it \$19 trillion or \$19.5 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about a debt limit that is coming around today. We are talking about one that came around in the spring. The government has just been borrowing and borrowing and borrowing even beyond that debt limit, and they are borrowing because we are spending too much.

Mr. Speaker, look at the tax rolls right now. Do you realize, as we are standing here today, not only is America collecting more in constant dollars—not static dollars, but constant dollars adjusted for inflation—we are collecting more money than at any time in American history, any time.

Per capita in this country, Americans are paying more in taxes than they have ever paid in the history of the Republic, not in inflated 2015 dollars, but in constant dollars adjusted for inflation. The real impact on American families is greater today in taxes than ever before.

Mr. Speaker, the problem is not that we don't raise enough money. The problem is that we spend too much money. I can't count the number of good pieces of legislation that have gone to the Senate and failed not on their merits, but because a Democratic filibuster would not even allow the bill to be debated.

With this rule and with this underlying bill, we allow the people's voice to be heard, we allow the American majority's voice to be heard, and we have an opportunity to put a bill that will make a difference for American families on the President's desk for the very first time.

I encourage all of my colleagues' strong support of the rule. Upon pas-

sage of that rule, Mr. Speaker, I encourage their strong support for the underlying reconciliation measure. We have an opportunity today together to make a difference.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 483 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That 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. 3737) to responsibly pay our Nation's bills on time by temporarily extending the public debt limit, 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 Ways and Means. 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. 2. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3737.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a

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

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. 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.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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.

NATIONAL STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS PRODUCTION ACT OF 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 481 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on

the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1937.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1323

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1937) to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness, with Mr. MARCHANT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1937, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2015. This bill was introduced by my good friend and colleague, Representative MARK AMODEI of Nevada, and myself as the first cosponsor.

Not a day goes by when Americans don't use a product that is made from critical minerals. In fact, life as we know it in the 21st century would not be possible without these minerals.

There would be no computers, no BlackBerries, no iPhones. There would be no MRIs, CAT scans, or x-ray machines. There would be no wind turbines or solar panels. Mr. Chairman, the list is exhaustive of these things that depend on critical and strategic minerals that make our lives possible.

Rare earth elements, a special subset of strategic and critical minerals, are core components of these products in the 21st century. Yet, despite the tremendous need for rare earth elements, the United States has allowed itself to become almost entirely dependent on China and other foreign nations for these resources.

America has a plentiful supply of rare earth elements, but roadblocks to the development of these critical materials have resulted in China producing 97 percent of the world's supply. That is 97 percent.

Our current policies are handing China a monopoly on these elements, creating a dependence that has serious implications for American jobs, for our economy, and on our national security.

Burdensome red tape, duplicative reviews, frivolous lawsuits, and onerous regulations can hold up new mining projects here in the U.S. for more than 10 years. These unnecessary delays cost American jobs as we become more and more dependent on foreign countries, such as China, for these raw materials.

The lack of domestically produced strategic and critical minerals are prime examples of how the U.S. has regulated itself into a 100 percent dependency on at least 19 critical and unique minerals. It has also earned the United States the unique and unfortunate distinction of being ranked dead last when it comes to permitting mining projects.

The 2014 ranking of countries for mining investment out of 25 major mining countries found that the 7- to 10-year permitting delays are the most significant risk to mining projects in the U.S. We are dead last in that ranking. I can't speak for the other countries, but the reason the U.S. is so slow to issue new mining permits is very simple: government bureaucracy.

H.R. 1937, introduced by my colleague from Nevada, will help us end foreign dependence by streamlining government red tape that blocks America's strategic and critical mineral production. Instead of waiting for over a decade for mining permits to be approved, this bill sets a goal for the total review process for permitting at 30 months, 2½ years.

Now, this isn't a hard deadline, Mr. Chairman. It can be extended. But it is a goal to push the bureaucrats into action on these important infrastructure projects. It shouldn't take a decade to get a project built for minerals that we need in our everyday lives and for our national security. No company can reasonably forecast the price of minerals 10 years in advance.

Finally, above all, this is a Jobs bill. The positive economic impact of this bill will extend beyond just the mining industry. For every good-paying metal mining job created, an estimated 2.3 additional jobs are generated. For every nonmetal mining job created, another 1.6 jobs are created.

This legislation gives the opportunity for American manufacturers, small businesses, technology companies, and construction firms to use American resources to help make the products that are essential to our everyday lives.

As China continues to tighten global supplies of rare earth elements, we should respond with a U.S. mining renaissance that will bring mining and manufacturing jobs back.

The National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act, H.R. 1937, is important to our jobs and to our economy. We must act now to cut the Government red tape that is stopping American domestic production and furthering our dependence on foreign countries for our mineral needs.

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

□ 1330

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bill takes us in the wrong direction. It not only fails to make any meaningful reforms to our antiquated system of mining in this country, but it proposes to make them worse. We have a mining system that was put together in the 1870s when the number one goal for President Grant at that time was to get people to settle in the West. I am here to tell you, Mr. Chair, the West has been settled.

As a resident of southern California, we have this 150-year-old bill that really makes things as easy as possible for miners. We still have a law that doesn't require any royalties to be paid on the extraction of hard rock minerals on public lands. Let's be clear. If you drill for oil or gas on public lands or mine coal or soda ash or potash or a number of other minerals, what do you do? You pay a royalty to the American taxpayer, but not if you mine copper or silver or platinum or gold or other valuables. You get to mine royalty free.

When the Mining Law of 1872 was enacted, there was no such thing as environmental safeguards. There was no concept of the multiple uses of public lands to ensure that mining could coexist with grazing, with recreation or conservation. There were no requirements for miners to clean up after themselves when they were done mining. Simply mine as long as it is profitable, and when you are done, just pick up and leave, and don't worry about it, except that the people who live anywhere near the half million abandoned mines in this country need to worry about it. Communities located near the tens of thousands of miles of polluted rivers with toxic acid mine waste, they need to worry about it, and, certainly, the United States Congress needs to worry about it.

But, instead of tackling this problem, what does this bill do? It declares that the biggest problem we have with mining in this country is that we are not doing it fast enough.

So this bill proposes to undermine one of our bedrock environmental laws—the National Environmental Policy Act—and it makes land managers who are reviewing mine plans prioritize mineral production over every other potential use of the land, which threatens hunting, fishing, grazing, and conservation.

Mr. Chair, it would be one thing if the data showed that a large number of mines were being delayed for no good reason; but, in fact, according to the data from the Bureau of Land Management, mines are getting approved much faster. We just heard that it takes a decade, but let's be clear what the data says.

Between 2005 and 2008, on average, 54 percent of the plans were approved in less than 3 years. In 2009 to 2014, 69 percent of the plans were approved in less than 3 years. So, in reality, rather than

taking a decade, we are seeing that the Obama administration is permitting mines at a much faster rate than the Bush administration.

Now, I have an amendment that would address one of the key problems in this bill. This bill has an incredibly broad definition of what is a strategic and critical mineral. I have yet to hear anyone tell me—and we asked in committee—what mineral now doesn't qualify as strategic and critical under this bill. Certainly, none of the witnesses we had at our Natural Resources Committee hearing could, and the majority hasn't suggested anything. Now we are talking about expediting the process for sand and gravel, crushed stones, gold, silver, diamonds. All of these are now going to be considered strategic and critical by the definition in this bill. All get an expedited process for permitting, and they have weaker environmental reviews.

But, even if this bill were limited to the definition for critical minerals that the rest of the world goes by—basically, that those minerals be important, they be unique, and, most importantly, we are defining them as strategic and critical minerals because they are subject to a supply risk—it is clear that this bill does not help.

We had one rare earth element mine start up in this country a few years ago. The rare earth elements are ones that are truly critical. Two months ago, that mine stopped operating because prices were too low. That is what has happened. That one mine was already permitted, already built, and already operating, and it had to be shut down because of economics.

I don't think changing the environmental laws in any way solves the problem of economics, but it certainly would help major international mining conglomerates—companies based in Canada or Australia. It is going to help them grease the skids when they want to open their next giant copper mine or gold mine or uranium mine right next to a national park or a sensitive watershed.

Mr. Chair, this bill is bad policy. The outcomes here won't be any different than the outcomes over the past two Congresses. This bill is dead on arrival in the Senate, and the administration has already expressed its strong opposition.

What should we be doing?

We should be here today, discussing how to fix our outdated and antiquated mining laws, how to make mining companies pay their fair share, how to clean up the half million abandoned mines that litter our landscape from coast to coast. We shouldn't be here talking about a bill that is only going to make things worse.

I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 1937.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would point out to my friend and colleague from California that the National Research Council study has said: "All minerals and mineral products could be or could become critical to some degree depending on their importance and availability."

So you have to look at the total circumstances surrounding the current supply of a mineral and what that mineral is, and they all, literally, could fit that definition according to the National Research Council.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the great State of Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS), my colleague, who is also the vice chairman of the full Committee on Natural Resources.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I want to thank Chairman LAMBORN and my good friend and fellow Western Caucus member, Nevada Representative AMODEI, for their work on this important legislation.

Mr. Chairman, let me start by addressing why strategic minerals matter and why we ought to have a piece of legislation like this.

My home State of Wyoming is the headquarters for our Nation's nuclear intercontinental ballistic missile force. These missiles ensure that those who would do us harm are deterred from using nuclear weapons. These weapons are on call 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, but they need regular maintenance and replacement components. Rare earth elements are an important part of these components—from batteries, to computer chips, to display screens and engines. These components—components vital to our technological edge—would require elements that can be difficult to procure.

Now, China controls nearly 80 percent of rare earth production. As we know, China has used this leverage to bully our allies, to limit exports at a time of a dispute, especially recently, with Japan over the control of islands in the South China Sea. The U.S. Navy plans to conduct operations in the area to remind China of the importance of respecting maritime boundaries and the freedom of navigation; but China is using its 80 percent share of rare earth minerals to leverage our allies. They can do it anytime they want because they have such massive control of this resource.

The bill that Mr. AMODEI is sponsoring, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act, would simplify the permitting process for domestic mines that will provide resources used in components that are vital to our national security. That is why we need to do it.

Here is an example of the existing problem.

In my home State of Wyoming, the Bear Lodge Critical Rare Earth Project has been going through the current process since 2011. It will be the only large-scale production facility in the U.S. for some rare earth elements designated as critical by the U.S. Depart-

ment of Energy. They have to coordinate their permit application between the Forest Service, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the Department of Energy.

Under Mr. AMODEI's legislation, one Federal agency would become the lead agency and set project timelines for permit applications and decisions. The total review process would not be authorized to exceed 30 months unless extended by all parties involved. These parties would include State and local governments and local stakeholders. This ensures that local voices will be heard.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot emphasize enough how important I think this legislation is. I am a cosponsor of the legislation. It passed the House in previous Congresses on a bipartisan basis. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 1937. I thank Mr. AMODEI for his thoughtful consideration of this bill.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just like to point out that the proponent of the bill has said—I believe it was the National Research Council—that all minerals and products could be or could become critical to some degree. That is really what they said, but let's be clear what this bill says and what the National Research Council's definition is. That is, really, what we are talking about, and we are going to discuss that later on.

Just what is the definition?

In the bill that we see before us, in terms of strategic and critical minerals, the term "strategic and critical" means minerals that are necessary for national defense and national security requirements—there certainly are some of those—for the national energy infrastructure, including pipelines, refining capacity, electrical power generation, and transmission and renewable energy products, for supporting the domestic manufacturing of any mineral for agriculture, housing, telecommunications, health care, transportation and infrastructure, or for the Nation's economic security and balance of trade. For that reason, they are saying let's shorten the process, eviscerate NEPA—the National Environmental Policy Act—and let's expedite this process.

I ask you: What mineral is not included in this definition? They are including everything.

Let's see what, in actuality, the National Research Council said. They published the report in 2008. It was called: "Minerals, Critical Minerals, and the U.S. Economy," and it defined what should be our definition of strategic and critical minerals.

It states: "To be 'critical,' a mineral must be essential in use." We agree. They talk about strategic, and those proponents talk about essential minerals; but the National Research Council also says: "To be considered 'critical and strategic,' it must be subject

to supply restriction.” We do not see anything in this bill about supply restriction.

Therefore, what it is is a blank check for mining companies to mine anywhere, to have an expedited process so as not to protect communities; and I think that is a great mistake and takes us the wrong way and is exactly the opposite of what the National Research Council has called for.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), who is also a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. GOSAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1937, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act.

This commonsense legislation will streamline the permitting process and allow for better coordination amongst the relevant State and Federal agencies in order to foster economic growth, create jobs, and ensure a robust domestic supply of strategic and critical minerals.

People have been digging in Arizona for precious metals for centuries. In the 1850s, nearly one in every four people in Arizona was a miner. Without a doubt, mining fueled the growth that makes Arizona the State it is today. In fact, it is part of the five Cs that built Arizona with copper.

□ 1345

Today, the Arizona mining industry is alive. Minerals such as copper, coal, gold, uranium, lime, and potash are still mined throughout my district, but not at the levels they used to be.

These projects employ hundreds of my constituents with high-paying jobs, jobs that pay over \$50,000 to \$60,000 a year, plus benefits. In rural Arizona, these types of jobs are few and far between.

As I meet with companies that do business throughout my State, the message is clear: we could do better. The length, complexity, and uncertainty of the permitting process is stymieing development and discouraging investors from committing to U.S. mining.

The folks on the ground tell me that because of regulatory excessive overreach by the Federal Government and the cumbersome permitting process, that it can take as long as 10 years. It is becoming a bad business decision to even attempt to get a new U.S. mine off the ground, despite a bountiful supply of domestic resources. We must correct this problem and prevent more American jobs from leaving America.

Rare earth and other critical minerals have been discovered throughout rural Arizona, have been the main economic driver and provider of jobs for communities that otherwise probably wouldn't make it at all. The critical minerals produced in these areas are

resources our country badly needs to meet the demand for production of everyday items like cell phones, computers, batteries, and cars.

Let's lessen our dependency on importing critical minerals from countries like China and restore some sanity to our permitting and regulatory process so we can get American miners back to work. Imagine our slogan, “Made in the USA with materials mined in the USA.” Now, that is what this bill is all about.

I applaud Mr. AMODEI for his leadership on this critical issue and urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on H.R. 1937.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, today we are debating yet another Republican bill restricting access to the courts to only those with deep pockets. H.R. 1937 continues the alarming trend of Republican-sponsored legislation that proposes to limit the average American's access to the courts so businesses that line the pockets of these politicians with campaign contributions can continue to profit.

Misleadingly disguised as a bill stimulating the increased production of strategic minerals, this legislation is actually about shielding the mining industry's poor environmental practices from accountability to victims while simultaneously disenfranchising mining-impacted communities.

H.R. 1937 allows regulators to exempt mining projects from the Equal Access to Justice Act, EAJA. The EAJA allows average Americans access to legal representation to protect their communities. Without EAJA, impacted communities cannot afford lawyers, much less the litany of scientific and technical experts needed to mount a serious challenge to a multinational mining company. This exemption cripples the ability of those concerned with environmental protection to seek representation and redress in the courts.

For that reason, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this bill and preserve justice for all.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), a senior member of the Natural Resources Committee.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I am very proud of this bill, and I am a sponsor of this bill, and no one is lining my pockets. I resent that comment. I am thinking of the United States of America and how we are importing these 31 known minerals and the process that we have to go through to mine our own natural resources in our great Nation.

It impedes our capability to be secure, regardless of what one might say. You just don't do this overnight. You have to have time to develop, especially the rare earths. The rest of the minerals we are importing using out-

side people, countries to import those products from, which we live with. We have people in this Congress and across this place who say we don't need it. We have to follow the example.

By the way, if a miner tries to develop a mine, you have to go through so many different permits; and then when you get done, guess what we have. The lawyers from the big, big environmental organizations like the Safari Club, Sierra Club, and Friends of the Earth, all 58 different groups, file suit by a legal body that impedes the progress for this Nation.

We cannot continue to import all which we need to have this living style we have today, yet that is what a lot of people on that side of the aisle insist upon.

This is a good bill. Mr. AMODEI thought about this bill. How do we retain our security? But more than that, how do we keep jobs within the United States? His comment is “made in the United States by resources mined in the United States.” That is what we should be looking at as this Congress instead of following, I call it, the blind piper: We don't need to drill our oil; we will buy it from abroad. We don't need to mine our minerals; we will buy it from abroad. And, by the way, we will ship our jobs overseas, and we will be further in debt \$18 trillion.

We need our resources. That is what made this Nation great. Everything in this room, in these hallowed Halls, this body came from the earth. It was mined, it was cut, it was manufactured from the earth. Why should we buy it from abroad?

Let's be American. Let's mine for our resources. Let's cut our trees for our resources. Let's build our resources. As it says right up there: “Let us use our resources God has given for the benefit of mankind.” If we don't do that, we are abusing the job we have here.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would really like to discuss in a little bit more detail the idea that the permitting process is so onerous, that it takes so long to do it.

In 2012, 2013, and 2014, let's talk about the last 3 years of permitting of mines, of plans of operation, what really is the data? I will tell you that of all the plans of operation that were approved in 2012, 93 percent of them were done in 3 years or less; in 2013, 79 percent were done in 3 years or less; and in 2014, it was 68 percent. In summary, in the last 3 years, close to 80 percent of all plans of operation were permitted in less than 3 years. So we are not talking about an onerous time.

Also, let us remember that the same bill was twice introduced last year. It was twice introduced in the last session, and it was also introduced once in the 112th Congress. It never got taken up in the Senate.

This bill, if it ever did get through, let's see what the administration says. I read to you a Statement of Administration Policy:

“The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 1937, which would undermine existing environmental safeguards for, at a minimum, almost all types of hardrock mines on Federal lands. Specifically, H.R. 1937 would undermine sound Federal decision-making by eliminating the appropriate reviews under the National Environmental Policy Act if certain conditions are met, circumventing public involvement in mining proposals, and bypassing the formulation of alternatives to proposals, among other things. The Administration also opposes the legislation’s severe restrictions on judicial review. Although the legislation purports to limit litigation, its extremely short statute of limitations and vague constraints on the scope of prospective relief that a court may issue are likely to have the opposite effect.

“The Administration strongly supports the development of rare earth elements and other critical minerals, but rejects the notion that their development is incompatible with existing safeguards regarding the uses of public lands, environmental protection, and public involvement in agency decision-making.”

If we are really concerned about updating this old law, let’s work together and come up with a better definition of what is a critical and strategic mineral and let us not eviscerate the environmental protections and the public participation which we now afford people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD an exchange of letters between Chairman BISHOP and Chairman GOODLATTE of the Judiciary Committee on this bill.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, 28 July 2015.

Hon. ROBERT GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On July 9, 2015, the Committee on Natural Resources ordered favorably report H.R. 1937, National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2015. The bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Natural Resources, with an additional referral to the Committee on the Judiciary.

I ask that you allow the Committee on the Judiciary to be discharged from further consideration of the bill so that it may be scheduled by the Majority Leader. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support having the Committee on the Judiciary represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include this letter and your response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Natural Resources to memorialize our understanding, as well as in the Congressional Record when the bill is considered by the House. Thank you for your consideration of my request, and for your continued strong cooperation between our committees.

Sincerely,

ROB BISHOP,
Chairman,
Committee on Natural Resources.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, July 28, 2015.

Hon. ROB BISHOP,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BISHOP, I am writing with respect to H.R. 1937, the “National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2015,” which the Committee on Natural Resources recently ordered reported favorably. As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions in H.R. 1937 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I agree to discharge our Committee from further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1937 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and asks that you support any such request.

I would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration of H.R. 1937.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), chairman of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, they once asked the famous spitball pitcher Gaylord Perry if he put a foreign substance on the ball, and he calmly answered: No. Vaseline is 100 percent American product.

We used to only have to import a handful of rare earth minerals in this country, like eight. Today, we are importing dozens of them because we have, with this administration, a policy of trying to stockpile these resources. Hopefully, when we get through them, we will be able to find some other country that can help us to resupply those resources, kind of like Blanche in “A Streetcar Named Desire,” where we are dependent on the kindness of strangers at all times.

Would it not be wiser for us simply to have a consistent policy where we actually have a workforce that is developing, on a regular basis, these rare earth minerals that we can have for our use so that we can have the jobs from them, it can help our economy, and it could give us the security we desperately need? We don’t need to keep importing stuff into this country. I mean, we imported the Expos from Montreal to here in Washington. That should be sufficient. That is enough.

I read an article the other day about mining rare earth minerals in the Democratic Republic of the Congo where rare minerals, necessary for iPhones and the Samsung Galaxy phones, were being produced. Miners

used their bare hands to filter out the minerals in order to earn a whopping \$5 a day. If the miners use their hands to find the rare minerals, how do you think they handled environment protections and how do you think they reclaimed these projects?

What we need desperately is to use 21st century technology and pay our labor force 21st century wages to produce the strategic and critical minerals that are necessary for our way of life and not be dependent on other countries for these minerals and not take advantage of their miners. This is a no-brainer. Let’s do the right thing. As Satchel Paige said: Just throw strikes. Home plate don’t move.

We know what we are doing. Pass this bill. It is a good bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery in contravention of the law and rules of the House.

The Sergeant At Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK), who is also a member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1937, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act.

Over the past several decades, our Nation has lagged far behind much of the world in the development and extraction of domestic mineral resources. Falling behind on this front has made our Nation dependent on foreign sources of many vital mineral resources that our economy and national defense need to continue functioning.

Falling behind has also led to the loss of good-paying jobs throughout the country. We have seen this in my district in northern Michigan in the mines that have shut down and the mines that have not been permitted. There is a mine in the western part of my district that has been over 10 years in the permitting process and is still not near open. These jobs are critically needed in my district.

The mines of the U.P. have served our country in times of need, providing many of the raw minerals that we have needed for national defense. If the resources that we have beneath our feet were needed today, these mines would have to go through a significant permitting process that would likely take almost 20 years.

While I support making sure that we behave in an environmentally responsible manner, it is ridiculous that overly burdensome Federal regulations are keeping us from being competitive in the world economy. This bill will cut through some of the bureaucratic red tape that is holding our economy back, leading to a nation that is less dependent on foreign resources for vital natural resources and creating jobs.

I urge all my colleagues to support the responsible development of our domestic natural resources and to vote in favor of this commonsense and long-overdue legislation.

□ 1400

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from the Silver State, Nevada (Mr. AMODEI), a former member of the Committee on Natural Resources and the author of this bill.

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Chairman, God forbid we place dealing with bedrock American issues ahead of the culture of political cliché. It is always nice to be informed of what the status is in the Intermountain West by people from towns that end in the name "Beach."

I find it incredibly interesting that we have heard on several occasions that the administration's average for the supermajority of applications is 36 months or less and how we need to work together on things when the legislation on the floor right now calls for a 30-month timeframe, which is extendable, by the way, with the consent of both parties.

So instead of, Well, let's have an amendment to make it 36 months and put this on the suspension calendar, we are subjected to "This is bad" and "It disenfranchises the public" and all that.

Let's talk about what this is really about. There is an old saying in the law: When you have got the facts, you argue the facts. When you have got the law, you argue the law. When you don't have either, you just argue.

Here we are. Because everybody in the room knows, depending on what side of the issue you are on, the big tool in this thing is, if we can outwait them, the capital will go elsewhere. Guess what. The folks that believe in that are winning.

When we talk about those bedrock American issues, things like jobs, things like public participation—you know, 30 months, that is longer than we get to hang out here after the people of our district give us their voting card. That is longer—used to be—than somebody would take to try to talk you into voting for them for Governor or President.

Nobody can accuse this legislation, at 2½ years, extendable by stipulation, of forcing the public to sit on their hands. Jobs, participation of the public, balance of trade, that is not important.

I mean, why should we be concerned about balance of trade and exporting the minerals that this country is wealthy with? You want to talk about abandoned mines? In my State, those folks happen to be doing a great job. If you want to talk about the culture of the 1870s, yeah, but it has come a long way.

God forbid, when we talk about paying your fair share, in my State, the

industry pays north of \$80,000 a year. Those people pay Federal income taxes. They buy goods and services that are federally taxed: gasoline, tires, all that stuff. But, no, let's send those jobs overseas where none of that happens. None of that happens. That is smart policy. I simply disagree.

God forbid we talk about commercial supplies, national security, strategic supplies. Other speakers have talked about that. This is not some dream job for the minerals extraction industry.

Oh, by the way, let's not look at the folks down in the Palmetto State right now who are experiencing phenomenal floods that might need materials to kind of rebuild their State.

God forbid we talk about sand and gravel for those folks in the Golden State after the Loma Prieta earthquake and they needed to rebuild things called freeways lickety-split.

This is not about supplying sand for your kid's sandbox. This is not about gravel for your driveway in your subdivision. This is about having flexibility to address issues that are mineral related. Because you know what, nobody has called this place, regardless of who is running it, nimble.

When one of these issues comes up, God forbid you give them: That is right, folks. Hang on to your hats. Thirty months to try to get the permission from the Federal Government to extract minerals on that.

With all due respect, what this is all about is: Do you continue to let folks who are opposed to things try to starve them out and wait and wait and wait until the capital goes elsewhere or do you take the folks and the administration's word: Nice job. Takes you 36 months? You want us to change it to 33 months and put it on the suspension calendar? I will do it. But short of that, me thinks thou doth protest too much.

I solicit your earnest support, and I am looking forward to the Senate work on it this time because we are nimble compared to those folks on the north end of the building.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, we have heard in this discussion that we should have a sweeping definition, every mineral should be under the definition of a critical mineral, and that we should not be beholden to foreign sources if we don't do that. Well, I agree in many ways. We should not be.

This bill doesn't really deal with that issue because, if the authors were really concerned about restrictions to the supply, they would make the definition of "critical" and "strategic minerals" much narrower. We would not give up our environmental protections. We would not give up our public participation. We would not give up our legal protections when, in fact, there is no

danger to the Nation's supply of this mineral.

The problems are really that we are now broadly including everything under this definition, and the bill that is in the Senate under—I think it is Senator MURKOWSKI—has a much more limited definition of what is a strategic and critical mineral.

I urge the authors here, the proponents, to really amend this bill so that we can all work together on this to really restrict the two very specific occasions of when we would enable a change in the protections that we already have under NEPA. Right now, everything is included. This eviscerates all of our protections. I urge a "no" vote.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, much has been debated here on the floor about what is strategic and what is not strategic. Let me suggest two ways that you could define strategic minerals.

You could define it by making a definition so narrow that, in effect, the legislation picks winners and losers or you could write law that says that certain conditions that require certain elements will be the driver of what is strategic and critical. That means the marketplace will decide what is strategic and critical.

I think that is a much better approach when I talk about this because I recall hearing that, in the late 1890s, the U.S. Patent Office issued a statement—I think I have this correct here—saying that we ought to close down the U.S. Patent Office because everything that can be invented has been invented.

That was in the 1890s. That was before airplanes. That was before cars were commercially available. That was before most telecommunications. This means all the minerals that go into these things weren't even thought of at that time.

What we do in this bill is just very straightforward. We say that the strategic and critical minerals will meet any of the following four criteria—and, by the way, you can find these on page 5, section 3, under "Definitions":

A, for national defense and national security. That is so evident, it hardly needs to be debated.

B, for the Nation's energy infrastructure, including pipelines and refining. That is because of the importance of energy. That certainly should not be debated because we have to have a good energy source if we are going to have a growing economy.

Also, C, to support domestic manufacturing. That includes, obviously, agriculture and housing as well. In other words, to support our economy. Doesn't that make good sense to have a source of strategic and critical minerals for that?

Finally, D, for the Nation's economic security and balance of trade. That

makes such good sense because we are seriously out of balance now with China.

This approach is more of a long-term solution because 25 years from now there will be a mineral that somebody will find that will be used for new technology. But if we have defined it so narrowly, as the other side would suggest, that we don't know what that technology is, we have, in fact, been picking winners and losers, and that is the wrong approach.

The right approach is what is embodied in this bill to say that these four conditions will be the ones that define strategic and critical minerals.

Finally, let me close on this: Some people make fun of sand and gravel as being strategic. I guarantee you that, after a major earthquake in northern or southern California, when the freeways collapse, I can tell you that cement and sand and gravel will absolutely fit that definition.

In this bill, strategic and critical minerals are not defined, as some have suggested, as all minerals all the time. Instead, H.R. 1937 allows any mineral to be deemed strategic and critical at a given time when the appropriate situation warrants it. This is vital to protecting our economy, our jobs, and our way of life.

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

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule, and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1937

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 "National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The industrialization of developing nations has driven demand for nonfuel minerals necessary for telecommunications, military technologies, healthcare technologies, and conventional and renewable energy technologies.

(2) The availability of minerals and mineral materials are essential for economic growth, national security, technological innovation, and the manufacturing and agricultural supply chain.

(3) The exploration, production, processing, use, and recycling of minerals contribute significantly to the economic well-being, security and general welfare of the Nation.

(4) The United States has vast mineral resources, but is becoming increasingly dependent upon foreign sources of these mineral materials, as demonstrated by the following:

(A) Twenty-five years ago the United States was dependent on foreign sources for 45 nonfuel mineral materials, 8 of which the United States imported 100 percent of the Nation's requirements, and for another 19 commodities the United States imported more than 50 percent of the Nation's needs.

(B) By 2014 the United States import dependence for nonfuel mineral materials in-

creased from 45 to 65 commodities, 19 of which the United States imported for 100 percent of the Nation's requirements, and an additional 24 of which the United States imported for more than 50 percent of the Nation's needs.

(C) The United States share of worldwide mineral exploration dollars was 7 percent in 2014, down from 19 percent in the early 1990s.

(D) In the 2014 Ranking of Countries for Mining Investment (out of 25 major mining countries), found that 7- to 10-year permitting delays are the most significant risk to mining projects in the United States.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS.—The term "strategic and critical minerals" means minerals that are necessary—

(A) for national defense and national security requirements;

(B) for the Nation's energy infrastructure, including pipelines, refining capacity, electrical power generation and transmission, and renewable energy production;

(C) to support domestic manufacturing, agriculture, housing, telecommunications, healthcare, and transportation infrastructure; or

(D) for the Nation's economic security and balance of trade.

(2) AGENCY.—The term "agency" means any agency, department, or other unit of Federal, State, local, or tribal government, or Alaska Native Corporation.

(3) MINERAL EXPLORATION OR MINE PERMIT.—The term "mineral exploration or mine permit" includes—

(A) Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service authorizations for pre-mining activities that require environmental analyses pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

(B) plans of operation issued by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service pursuant to 43 CFR 3809 and 36 CFR 228A or the authorities listed in 43 CFR 3503.13, respectively, as amended from time to time.

TITLE I—DEVELOPMENT OF DOMESTIC SOURCES OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS

SEC. 101. IMPROVING DEVELOPMENT OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS.

Domestic mines that will provide strategic and critical minerals shall be considered an "infrastructure project" as described in Presidential order "Improving Performance of Federal Permitting and Review of Infrastructure Projects" dated March 22, 2012.

SEC. 102. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE LEAD AGENCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The lead agency with responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit shall appoint a project lead within the lead agency who shall coordinate and consult with cooperating agencies and any other agency involved in the permitting process, project proponents and contractors to ensure that agencies minimize delays, set and adhere to timelines and schedules for completion of the permitting process, set clear permitting goals and track progress against those goals.

(b) DETERMINATION UNDER NEPA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To the extent that the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) applies to the issuance of any mineral exploration or mine permit, the requirements of such Act shall be deemed to have been procedurally and substantively satisfied if the lead agency determines that any State and/or Federal agency acting pursuant to State or Federal (or both) statutory or procedural authorities, has addressed or will address the following factors:

(A) The environmental impact of the action to be conducted under the permit.

(B) Possible adverse environmental effects of actions under the permit.

(C) Possible alternatives to issuance of the permit.

(D) The relationship between local long- and short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity.

(E) Any irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources that would be involved in the proposed action.

(F) That public participation will occur during the decisionmaking process for authorizing actions under the permit.

(2) WRITTEN REQUIREMENT.—In reaching a determination under paragraph (1), the lead agency shall, by no later than 90 days after receipt of an application for the permit, in a written record of decision—

(A) explain the rationale used in reaching its determination;

(B) state the facts in the record that are the basis for the determination; and

(C) show that the facts in the record could allow a reasonable person to reach the same determination as the lead agency did.

(c) COORDINATION ON PERMITTING PROCESS.—The lead agency with responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit shall enhance government coordination for the permitting process by avoiding duplicative reviews, minimizing paperwork, and engaging other agencies and stakeholders early in the process. For purposes of this subsection, the lead agency shall consider the following practices:

(1) Deferring to and relying upon baseline data, analyses and reviews performed by State agencies with jurisdiction over the proposed project.

(2) Conducting any consultations or reviews concurrently rather than sequentially to the extent practicable and when such concurrent review will expedite rather than delay a decision.

(d) MEMORANDUM OF AGENCY AGREEMENT.—If requested at any time by a State or local planning agency, the lead agency with responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit, in consultation with other Federal agencies with relevant jurisdiction in the environmental review process, may establish memoranda of agreement with the project sponsor, State and local governments, and other appropriate entities to accomplish the early coordination activities described in subsection (c).

(e) SCHEDULE FOR PERMITTING PROCESS.—For any project for which the lead agency cannot make the determination described in 102(b), at the request of a project proponent the lead agency, cooperating agencies, and any other agencies involved with the mineral exploration or mine permitting process shall enter into an agreement with the project proponent that sets time limits for each part of the permitting process, including for the following:

(1) The decision on whether to prepare a document required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(2) A determination of the scope of any document required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

(3) The scope of and schedule for the baseline studies required to prepare a document required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

(4) Preparation of any draft document required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

(5) Preparation of a final document required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

(6) Consultations required under applicable laws.

(7) Submission and review of any comments required under applicable law.

(8) Publication of any public notices required under applicable law.

(9) A final or any interim decisions.

(f) **TIME LIMIT FOR PERMITTING PROCESS.**—In no case should the total review process described in subsection (d) exceed 30 months unless extended by the signatories of the agreement.

(g) **LIMITATION ON ADDRESSING PUBLIC COMMENTS.**—The lead agency is not required to address agency or public comments that were not submitted during any public comment periods or consultation periods provided during the permitting process or as otherwise required by law.

(h) **FINANCIAL ASSURANCE.**—The lead agency will determine the amount of financial assurance for reclamation of a mineral exploration or mining site, which must cover the estimated cost if the lead agency were to contract with a third party to reclaim the operations according to the reclamation plan, including construction and maintenance costs for any treatment facilities necessary to meet Federal, State or tribal environmental standards.

(i) **APPLICATION TO EXISTING PERMIT APPLICATIONS.**—This section shall apply with respect to a mineral exploration or mine permit for which an application was submitted before the date of the enactment of this Act if the applicant for the permit submits a written request to the lead agency for the permit. The lead agency shall begin implementing this section with respect to such application within 30 days after receiving such written request.

(j) **STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS WITHIN NATIONAL FORESTS.**—With respect to strategic and critical minerals within a federally administered unit of the National Forest System, the lead agency shall—

(1) exempt all areas of identified mineral resources in Land Use Designations, other than Non-Development Land Use Designations, in existence as of the date of the enactment of this Act from the procedures detailed at and all rules promulgated under part 294 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations;

(2) apply such exemption to all additional routes and areas that the lead agency finds necessary to facilitate the construction, operation, maintenance, and restoration of the areas of identified mineral resources described in paragraph (1); and

(3) continue to apply such exemptions after approval of the Minerals Plan of Operations for the unit of the National Forest System.

SEC. 103. CONSERVATION OF THE RESOURCE.

In evaluating and issuing any mineral exploration or mine permit, the priority of the lead agency shall be to maximize the development of the mineral resource, while mitigating environmental impacts, so that more of the mineral resource can be brought to the marketplace.

SEC. 104. FEDERAL REGISTER PROCESS FOR MINERAL EXPLORATION AND MINING PROJECTS.

(a) **PREPARATION OF FEDERAL NOTICES FOR MINERAL EXPLORATION AND MINE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.**—The preparation of Federal Register notices required by law associated with the issuance of a mineral exploration or mine permit shall be delegated to the organization level within the agency responsible for issuing the mineral exploration or mine permit. All Federal Register notices regarding official document availability, announcements of meetings, or notices of intent to undertake an action shall be originated and transmitted to the Federal Register from the office where documents are held, meetings are held, or the activity is initiated.

(b) **DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW OF FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICES FOR MINERAL EXPLORATION AND MINING PROJECTS.**—Absent any extraordinary circumstance or except as otherwise required by any Act of Congress, each Federal Register notice described in subsection (a) shall undergo any required reviews within the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture and be published in its final form in the Federal Register no later than 30 days after its initial preparation.

TITLE II—JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY ACTIONS RELATING TO EXPLORATION AND MINE PERMITS

SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS FOR TITLE.

In this title the term “covered civil action” means a civil action against the Federal Government containing a claim under section 702 of title 5, United States Code, regarding agency action affecting a mineral exploration or mine permit.

SEC. 202. TIMELY FILINGS.

A covered civil action is barred unless filed no later than the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date of the final Federal agency action to which it relates.

SEC. 203. RIGHT TO INTERVENE.

The holder of any mineral exploration or mine permit may intervene as of right in any covered civil action by a person affecting rights or obligations of the permit holder under the permit.

SEC. 204. EXPEDITION IN HEARING AND DETERMINING THE ACTION.

The court shall endeavor to hear and determine any covered civil action as expeditiously as possible.

SEC. 205. LIMITATION ON PROSPECTIVE RELIEF.

In a covered civil action, the court shall not grant or approve any prospective relief unless the court finds that such relief is narrowly drawn, extends no further than necessary to correct the violation of a legal requirement, and is the least intrusive means necessary to correct that violation.

SEC. 206. LIMITATION ON ATTORNEYS' FEES.

Sections 504 of title 5, United States Code, and 2412 of title 28, United States Code (together commonly called the Equal Access to Justice Act) do not apply to a covered civil action, nor shall any party in such a covered civil action receive payment from the Federal Government for their attorneys' fees, expenses, and other court costs.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. SECRETARIAL ORDER NOT AFFECTED.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed as to affect any aspect of Secretarial Order 3324, issued by the Secretary of the Interior on December 3, 2012, with respect to potash and oil and gas operators.

The CHAIR. No amendment to this bill is in order except for those printed in House Report 114-301. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 114-301.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, strike lines 1 through 15 and insert the following:

(1) **STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS.**—The term “strategic and critical minerals”—

(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), means—

(i) minerals and mineral groups identified as critical by the National Research Council in the report titled “Minerals, Critical Minerals, and the U.S. Economy” and dated 2008; and

(ii) additional minerals identified by the Secretary of the Interior based on the National Research Council criteria in such report; and

(B) does not include sand, gravel, or clay. Page 5, line 25, after “ties” insert “for strategic and critical minerals”.

Page 6, line 3, after “operation” insert “for strategic and critical mineral mines”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 481, the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would fix a critical problem with this bill, namely, that the name of the bill doesn't match the substance of the bill.

When you read the title, you would think this bill has something to do with critical and strategic minerals, but, in fact, as currently written, the bill would define practically every mined substance—and that is every mined substance in the United States—as being strategic and critical. Sand, gravel, gold, copper, clay, all of these, are strategic and critical under this bill, and I think that is going too far.

In fact, I am still waiting for someone to explain to me what mineral wouldn't fall under the definition of this bill. Certainly none of the witnesses at our June Committee on Natural Resources could name one.

The National Research Council published a 2008 report called “Minerals, Critical Minerals, and the U.S. Economy,” and it states: To be critical, a mineral must be both essential in use and subject to supply restriction.

They go on to point out some specific examples of minerals that are essential, but not critical, such as copper, iron ore, and construction aggregates, such as sand and gravel, except that this bill would completely ignore the National Research Council and many other organizations that know what criticality means and define all of these—copper, iron ore, sand, gravel, and more—as strategic and critical minerals.

There is no doubt that these minerals are essential, but they are widely produced in the United States, and there is no danger of a break in the supply chain. Let me state that again. There is no danger of a break in the supply chain.

Let's talk about the sand and gravel that was just mentioned before. There are roughly 6500 sand and gravel quarries in the United States. We are not

going to run out of gravel by not permitting one more gravel mine.

Gravel is important, but no one from the National Research Council or the Department of Energy or any organization that knows the real definition of critical minerals would consider sand and gravel to fall in that category, period, end of discussion.

My amendment would ensure that the scientifically vetted definition determined by the NRC is what the Secretary of the Interior uses to assess the criticality of minerals to be mined under this bill. It would ensure that the bill actually addresses the intent that is suggested by its own title: critical minerals.

□ 1415

It puts no time limits on the identification of these minerals. So, as conditions change over time, the Secretary would be able to add or remove items from the list of critical minerals, as necessary.

Republicans in the Senate understand this. Senator MURKOWSKI, the chair of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, which oversees mining, has introduced a bill that requires a methodology for determining which minerals would qualify as critical.

That methodology is to be based on an assessment of—I quote in her bill—“whether the materials are subject to potential supply restrictions and also important in use.”

I may not agree with everything that is in Senator MURKOWSKI’s bill, but I believe that she at least understands the definition of a critical mineral and is making a serious attempt to expand the production of minerals that are actually critically important and strategic.

But without my amendment, this bill is just a guise for mining interests to loosen public review, judicial review, and environmental protections for all hardrock mining.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In response, I just have to say one word: earthquake.

During the 2008 Great Southern California ShakeOut, which studied and analyzed the potential effects of a major earthquake, the USGS discovered that there would be a shortfall of building materials, namely, sand and gravel, if there was a major earthquake, God forbid, causing significant damage in the L.A. basin and the surrounding areas.

This amendment, if we accept it, would preclude that sand and gravel would be defined as critical, hindering expedited development of these resources.

Furthermore, by explicitly excluding sand, gravel or clay, this amendment is at fundamental odds with the National Research Council study—I have quoted it earlier—which stated: “All minerals and mineral products could be or could become critical to some degree, depending on their importance and availability.”

The California Geological Survey recently released information forecasting a continuing shortage in California of permitted aggregate resources so as to meet only one-third of demand over the next 50 years in the State of California.

So we have a shortage coming, whether people like it or not, and that is without a major earthquake. Once again, God forbid.

The bill, as currently structured, does allow the market and the Nation’s needs to define a mineral as critical, thereby allowing the flexibility necessary for carrying out the provisions of the act.

However, this amendment would hinder the efficiency and fluidity this bill seeks to inject into the permitting process for critical and strategic minerals by imposing an extra bureaucratic determination to be made by the Secretary of the Interior. It also picks winners and losers in the mining industry.

So for those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say, in conclusion, that we are talking about a definition of critical and strategic minerals that comes from the NRC, or the National Resource Council, that really talks about things that are essential.

But it also says that, to be declared critical, it must have a danger of disruption in the supply chain. We must have a limit to where we can access other materials.

As it was just pointed out, what happens if there is an earthquake in Southern California? God help us. Let’s hope that there is not going to be an earthquake in Southern California. And there is a limitation on the supply.

I would like to urge us to say that the Secretary has the ability to change what is on that list or not under my amendment.

I urge support of my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. DINGELL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 114-301.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Beginning at page 7, strike line 5 and all that follows through page 8, line 18, and insert the following:

(b) TREATMENT OF PERMITS UNDER NEPA.— Issuance of a mineral exploration or mine permit shall be treated as a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment for purposes of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4331 et seq.).

Beginning at page 9, strike line 19 and all that follows through page 12, line 21.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 481, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

There are several troubling positions in this legislation, many of which my other colleagues have already addressed this afternoon. But I am particularly concerned with how H.R. 1937 treats the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, as it has become known.

If this bill were to become law, public comment would be severely limited and, in some instances, a proper environmental review may not be conducted at all.

The underlying bill employs a functional equivalence standard, which would permit the lead agency to circumvent a NEPA review if other agencies have performed reviews that are determined to be equivalent. There are several problems with this approach.

First, it is not clear that the six factors listed in the bill compromise all that a NEPA document would explore. So if functional equivalence was applied, the public may not have the complete story about the environmental impacts of a specific project.

Second, case law demonstrates that functional equivalence has historically not been extended to other agencies beyond the EPA because they are simply not equipped to do that kind of work.

That is why the committee heard testimony earlier this year that this provision ignores Congress’ choices in NEPA, as well as the judiciary’s struggle with functional equivalence.

My amendment strikes the functional equivalence provisions and replaces it with the language that makes it clear that all mine explorations or mine permits are major Federal actions and would require an environmental impact statement under NEPA.

It is well known that hardrock mining can have adverse health impacts, and these projects deserve a formal environmental review.

NEPA has a simple premise: Look before you leap. This landmark law gives the public an opportunity to review and comment on actions proposed by

the government, adding to the evaluation process unique perspectives that highly specialized, mission-driven agencies might otherwise ignore.

We should be preserving and protecting this important tool for public participation rather than undermining it.

I urge my colleagues to support the Dingell amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would urge rejection of this amendment because it would make the permitting process for critical and strategic minerals even worse than it currently is. It is already 7 to 10 or more years. It is dead last in the 25 major mineral-producing countries in the world, according to that recent study we cited earlier.

This amendment would strike several key sections of the bill, including the NEPA provisions, the expedited schedule provision, the time limit provision, and the applicability of this law to existing permit application provision.

First, this amendment seeks to remove the NEPA provisions. Our provision does not sidestep or avoid the NEPA process in any way; rather, it codifies a judicial determination for NEPA known as the functional equivalence doctrine.

This doctrine provides that, when an agency action, whether State or Federal, has addressed the substantive requirements of NEPA, such action may be substituted as sufficient rather than having to prepare an entirely new and duplicative environmental study.

This amendment rejects the functional equivalence doctrine and mandates that the issuance of every mineral exploration or mine permit constitutes a "major Federal action," thereby requiring the development of costly and time-consuming environmental impact statements, regardless of a proposed project's size.

Furthermore, this amendment strikes the provisions of the bill that requires the authorizing agency to develop a schedule for the permit process, and it removes the 30-month time constraints that would be put on said authorizing agency.

In other words, it restores the current 7- to 10-year permit process that plagues the mining industry and the production of jobs and the growth of our economy.

Let me mention one thing about automobile manufacturing in particular. An automobile contains rare earths for magnets, copper, aluminum, platinum, and many other critical minerals and elements.

According to Rare Earth Technology Alliance, the average hybrid car contains 61 pounds of rare earth metals. So it is important that we pass this bill.

This amendment unfortunately guts the bill. I would urge opposition to it.

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

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to quickly respond to some of the points made by my friends on the other side of the aisle.

I do recognize the importance of those metals in auto production. It is important to me. But this bill isn't going to impact them.

To be frank, I think this bill is a solution in search of a problem. NEPA is often a scapegoat for permitting delays, but this does not hold up when you closely examine the facts.

In fact, since 2008, the approval time for hardrock mines has decreased. Last year the average time it took to approve a plan of operations for a hardrock mine was 17 months—17 months—not 10 years.

I want jobs as much as my colleagues do on the other side of the aisle, but I want to protect people. Project complexity, local opposition, and the lack of funding are almost always the culprits for a project being delayed, but everybody wants to blame NEPA unfairly.

Hardrock mines could pose significant threats to public health, water, and the environment. We must ensure that every mining application is properly reviewed under NEPA, as my amendment proposes.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to remind us all that America has a plentiful supply of rare earth elements, but there are roadblocks to developing them, such that China produces 97 percent of the world's supply and there are at least 19 unique minerals that the U.S. has zero supply of.

So if we continue the current regime of 7 to 10 years to permit a mine project—and that is what will happen if we don't pass this bill—then we are going to be dependent on other countries and automobile and all kinds of manufacturing will be affected.

The 2014 ranking of countries for mining investment, out of the 25 major mining companies, found that the delays that we have in this country are the worst in the world; yet, we have such tremendous resources if we were only to use them.

So I think this bill is a good faith and reasonable effort to strike the balance between proper environmental protection by keeping functional equivalence and, yet, producing the minerals that will give us the jobs we need.

Mr. Chairman, I urge rejection of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1430

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CARTWRIGHT

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 114-301.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Beginning at page 14, line 1, strike title II.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 481, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, just off the floor of the House of Representatives, steps outside the door, we have a magnificent statue of one of our Founding Fathers, Thomas Jefferson.

Thomas Jefferson said: "I consider trial by jury as the only anchor ever yet imagined by man, by which a government can be held to the principles of its constitution."

The amendment I offer today, Mr. Chair, ensures that an important right of the American people is preserved: the right to hold the government accountable for their actions, the right of ordinary Americans to go into court and hold the government accountable.

The right to challenge the government in court should not be limited to large groups that are well funded and have the financial ability to pay for a lawyer, and that is exactly what this bill would do. This right should be extended to every American citizen, every small business, every nonprofit organization regardless of the size and scope of their wallets.

Now, as a lifetime courtroom lawyer, I know the importance of being able to access the court system. For many years, I fought to make sure that ordinary Americans could have their day in court and hold wrongdoers accountable.

Access to the courts is a key right envisioned by not only Thomas Jefferson, but all of the Founding Fathers, and is protected by the Equal Access to Justice Act, the EAJA, which allows eligible individuals to recover fees and expenses from the government if they win their day in court. As a Congressman and former trial attorney, I cannot and will not stand by silently and watch this bill chip away at this American right without standing up and speaking out.

By exempting exploration and mining permits from the Equal Access to Justice Act, this bill prevents valid

claims from reaching the courts by prohibiting the government from reimbursing legal expenses to parties that win in court. This overturns 30 years of legal precedent aimed at opening the court's doors to the public.

What I can't understand is why any of my colleagues across the aisle would want to limit review of the government's actions, given the fairly consistent message we hear that government has gotten too big and continues to come up with unnecessary rules and rulings.

EAJA allows average citizens to challenge this kind of thing in court, challenge the very kind of supposed overreach that the majority always likes to talk about.

We have heard time and time again from the majority that blocking access to the courts is necessary to halt frivolous and unnecessary litigation, as if judges are incapable or lack the intellectual rigor to be able to figure it out for themselves; but it is this bill that is frivolous and unnecessary, and the Congressional Budget Office proves it.

The Congressional Budget Office, the CBO, estimates that this bill, H.R. 1937, would reduce direct spending by less than \$50,000 a year. We are throwing up a barrier to access the courts for a paltry \$50,000 a year.

But the larger point is this is money that is awarded to successful claimants against the government. Why would you want to punish the successful claimants in the name of cutting down on frivolous litigation? Frivolous litigation, by definition, is claims that are so bad, they couldn't possibly win in court and never do.

The only reason I can see for the EAJA exemption in this bill is that it further solidifies industry's free pass to mine on U.S. public lands. First, this bill limits public and agency consideration by waiving the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, and setting unrealistic time limits. Then title II puts the nail in the coffin by eliminating the public's last opportunity to review a mine's permit by challenging it in open court.

My amendment today would strike all of title II, including the EAJA exemption, in order to maintain this vital, time-honored American public right to challenge the government's decisions in court.

I urge the adoption of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes title II of the bill, which addresses the judicial review of agency actions relating to exploration and mine permits. This title is designed to address one of the primary contributors to the long permitting timelines and delays we have been talking about this afternoon: relentless litigation brought by environmental organizations.

Regulatory agencies routinely try to craft a lawsuit-proof NEPA document. However, that is impossible. They are going to get sued no matter what. So title II seeks to provide some certainty in the litigation process. Rather than prohibit or block litigation, it does several reasonable things:

It expedites the judicial process by requiring timely filings no later than 60 days after a final agency action. It just keeps the ball rolling. That is entirely reasonable.

It requires the court to proceed expeditiously on reaching a determination in the case. That also is entirely reasonable.

Furthermore, title II provides the project proponent a guaranteed right to intervene. If a company has invested millions or even billions of dollars in a project, they deserve an opportunity to go to court on something that could adversely impact their investment. That, too, is entirely reasonable.

Also, title II limits certain prospective attorneys' fees under the Equal Access to Justice Act. This provision affects all parties to the lawsuit, including permitholders, and has as its purpose dissuading frivolous suits that would harm the Nation's ability to provide these vital resources. That, too, is entirely reasonable.

So for those reasons, I would say, let's reject this amendment. Let's keep title II in the bill. It is essential to have a predictable and reasonable permitting timeline so that we can explore and develop these resources to make our economy stronger. I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I acknowledge my colleague from Colorado. However, his silence on the point I was making is deafening.

The point I made is that cutting out EAJA from this act means that you are attacking successful claims. If your point is to attack frivolous lawsuits, you don't cut out reimbursing legal fees and costs for successful claims. What are we really up to by doing that?

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chair, just in answer to the gentleman's question, I would point out that what happens right now is that the EAJA is actually gamed. People can put in 15 or 20 frivolous claims, but if they have a finding on one substantial thing—and always, those lawsuits have a multitude of claims, but then one thing will be tucked in that is simply procedural that the agency forgot the deadline, it didn't have a meeting—and if the judge finds on one, then all are paid for. So they are allowed to bring frivolous actions with one substantiating claim, and it is those frivolous things that tie up and hold up development.

No one objects to the fact that sometimes the agencies are wrong. People do object to the fact that frivolous lawsuits come under the cover of one thing that is just almost inane in the whole discussion.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I have a simple question.

Name one Federal judge who has granted all of the attorneys' fees where there are 15 frivolous claims and one successful one.

I have never heard of such a thing.

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. PEARCE. I would be happy to respond. I will provide the documentation to the gentleman afterwards. I don't have it right here. But we see these things in New Mexico.

Mr. LAMBORN. Reclaiming my time, I will just conclude, Mr. Chairman, by saying that this amendment is not a good amendment for the bill because it guts title II.

We need some predictability in the litigation process as well as in the government bureaucratic process. This allows parties to go to court. It prevents the abuse of EAJA.

It is not the legitimate use of that law that we are after; it is the abuse of that particular law. That is why it is addressed in this bill.

I would urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 114-301.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike title III (page 15, beginning at line 15) and insert the following:

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS
SEC. 301. SECRETARIAL ORDER NOT AFFECTED.

This Act shall not apply to any mineral described in Secretarial Order 3324, issued by the Secretary of the Interior on December 3, 2012, in any area to which the Order applies.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 481, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chair, in the Permian Basin, which the Second District

of New Mexico falls just in the corner of that, two or three counties have tremendous assets. It is home to some of the most prolific and purest forms of potash, which is used for fertilizer, and then it also has significant oil and gas.

When I was elected to Congress in 2002, one of the first things that next year that we began to discover is that the oil and gas and potash industries have had an approximately 50-year running battle against each other. We began to try to sort through the differing opinions, working with the agency, the Interior Department, and over the next 10 approximate years, worked out an agreement with the Secretary of the Interior and the two different industries on how to both get along in the same area. That was a significant undertaking. It was a significant finding by the Interior Department and, again, took almost 10 years of very delicate negotiations. So my amendment to this bill, H.R. 1937, is simply to clarify that nothing in the bill overturns that agreement that has been reached.

Again, this agreement came under the Obama administration but dated back through the Bush administration, so it has been pretty well looked at by both sides, both parties, and has been functioning very well.

It is my desire to simply get the clarifying language that nothing in the bill is going to change that Secretarial order, and, likewise, the amendment does nothing to change the language in the bill. It is just clarifying that this is what we are going to do.

It is extremely important for New Mexico, but also for the Nation, because the potash provides the fertilizer for food sources across the Nation; but also, the oil and gas industry is providing much of the oil and gas that is coming into America's supply right now and driving down the price. The discoveries in that particular region will produce more oil and gas in one county than has been produced in the entire State for its entire history. So it is not as if these questions are insignificant.

Again, my amendment is very straightforward. It just seeks to clarify that nothing is going to affect that Secretarial order.

□ 1445

Mr. LAMBORN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEARCE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. We support the amendment and commend the author for offering it.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time that is allotted to the opposition to this amendment, although I do not intend to oppose it.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I think it is interesting that this amendment is coming up, as it has in the past, because it simply proves the point we have been trying to make.

The larger point is that this bill is simply too broad. It covers every possible mineral you could mine, including potash. I think the gentleman from New Mexico would agree that potash is not a strategic and critical mineral. It does not need the environmental review waivers that this bill would provide.

What many of my colleagues and I are saying is that potash is no different from many other minerals. The concern for southeastern New Mexico is that potash development and oil and gas drilling should be able to occur without conflict. This bill would threaten that.

Well, we want to make sure that mineral development doesn't conflict with other things as well throughout the country, like hunting, fishing, camping, grazing, recreating, conserving, and other legitimate uses. Unfortunately, this bill threatens that, and we are likely not going to grant exemptions for these purposes like we are for the oil and gas industry.

I would certainly like it if sportsmen were protected from hastily adopted and permitted sand and gravel quarries the same way you want your oil and gas drillers to be protected from hastily permitted potash mines.

Interestingly, potash is a mineral where we import over 80 percent of our supply. We are entirely self-sufficient in sand and gravel. So, by that standard, you could say that potash is more critical and strategic than sand and gravel. But the majority will allow this amendment to be adopted because it benefits oil and gas producers.

Mr. Chairman, meanwhile, the Lowenthal amendment, which takes sand and gravel out of this bill for the benefit of everyone else in this country, is likely to get voted down. I think that is unfortunate.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, again, this is an amendment that does not change the underlying language of the bill. It simply seeks to clarify to all parties that no change was intended and no change will occur to the existing order from the Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge everyone to support the amendment and the underlying bill.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 114-301.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE _____MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 01. LIMITATION ON APPLICATION.

This Act shall not apply with respect to a proposed strategic and critical minerals mining project unless the project proponent demonstrates that the combined capacity of existing mining operations in the United States producing the same mineral product that will be produced by the project, whether currently in operation or not, but not including mining operations for which a reclamation plan is being implemented or has been fully implemented, is less than 80 percent of the demand for that mineral product in the United States.

SEC. 02. PUBLICATION OF NOTICE REGARDING TRANSPORTATION AND SALE OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.

If any intermediate or final mineral product produced by a strategic and critical minerals mining project is to be transported or sold outside the United States, and the project proponent cannot demonstrate that the annual production of such product in the United States exceeds 80 percent of the demand for that product in the United States, the project proponent shall publish at least once prior notice of their intent to make such transport or sale in national newspapers or trade publications, by electronic means, or both, and on any Internet site that is maintained by the project proponent.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 481, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, when I saw H.R. 1937 as submitted, I agreed with the minority on the Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee that it was in need of a significant amendment, in particular, in the definition of "strategic and critical minerals."

The amendment submitted by Congressman LOWENTHAL is also a good basis and would correct the bill. However, as this has been rejected in the past, I took a less stringent approach that I believe would be a basis that would at least eliminate the most egregious aspects of the definition.

This bill addresses a real problem, which is that long permitting delays for mining projects in the United States, especially in remote or environmentally sensitive areas, can reach 7 to 10 years in some cases.

This represents a significant project risk for potential investors, which makes them historically more likely to develop projects outside of the United States when there are opportunities to produce the same mineral products.

Increasing international government scrutiny on environmental issues for mining projects outside of the United States along with civil instability in many mineral resource-rich countries

has prompted project proponents to look to the United States as a safer alternative, given that projects can be developed in a reasonable timeframe.

That said, Mr. Chairman, the majority's claims of mining permit delays for all kinds of mining projects that prompted this bill are unfounded. Last year the average time it took to approve a plan of operations for a hardrock mine was 17 months, and since 2008, the approval time has actually decreased. As of last year, the Obama administration had approved 69 percent of hardrock mines within 3 years.

Rather than addressing the problem directly with the responsible agencies, as President Obama did in his Presidential order "Improving Performance of Federal Permitting and Review of Infrastructure Projects" dated March 22, 2012, this bill is an end run around the permitting process, the authority of the permitting agencies, and the courts.

H.R. 1937 includes a very broad definition of "strategic and critical minerals" that does not take into account whether these minerals are actually in short supply in the United States. Under the definition as written, cement, and wallboard, as well as gold and diamonds would qualify. It makes one wonder if there is a strategic and critical shortage of jewelry in the United States.

The authors of this bill say that they do not wish to identify which mineral products are "strategic and critical" since this may change over time with changes in national priorities. Therefore, this amendment adds a simple test. This amendment requires proposed "strategic and critical minerals" projects to demonstrate that domestic capacity to produce strategic and critical minerals is less than 80 percent of domestic requirements. This would eliminate mineral products such as sand and gravel, which the authors claim the bill was never meant to encompass.

The amendment also requires that unless or until the domestic capacity for a "strategic and critical mineral" product exceeds 80 percent of domestic requirements, the public will be notified of the intent to transport or sell any final or intermediate strategic and critical mineral products outside of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of my amendment.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I am having a little trouble understanding where this amendment is headed and what it is really trying to do. If I understand correctly, it proposes to limit export of strategic and critical minerals if the supply of those minerals is greater than 80 percent of domestic de-

mand. As I am trying to figure that out, one thing that jumps out at me is why is 80 percent a significant milestone? It seems sort of plucked out of thin air. It seems arbitrary.

How would you measure and find that 80 percent of something that is used in many ways around the country, I am not sure how that would be done, by advertising in national newspapers or something? I am just a little unsure.

Also, the amendment appears to be internally inconsistent. On one hand, the amendment seeks to prevent the use of the bill's provisions if the supply is greater than 80 percent of domestic demands. On the other hand, the amendment says that the project proponent cannot show that production exceeds 80 percent of domestic demand, the project proponent must advertise that fact in a national newspaper, trade publications, or Web site.

I am just a little confused as to what this amendment is really trying to get at. But it does seem to be, in the final analysis, a continuation of the over-regulation that has produced this problem in the first place. We have so many regulatory obstacles to producing minerals that it does take 7 to 10 years.

Now, if you take a certain slice out of that process, it may sound like a smaller period of time. But when you add in litigation and everything else that accompanies the process, it is literally 7 to 10 years, especially for hardrock mine projects that produce rare earth minerals and things like that.

There might be a few exceptions for clay or other items that are of less concern, but for hardrock mining, there is no way to avoid the 7 to 10 years, unfortunately, in our country today. This would be another example of the kind of regulation that just gums up the whole process.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would urge the rejection of this amendment.

I urge a "no" vote.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. MARCHANT, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1937) to require the Secretary of

the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 3:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1532

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT) at 3 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.

NATIONAL STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS PRODUCTION ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 481 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1937.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) kindly take the chair.

□ 1533

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1937) to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness, with Mr. BOST (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 114-301 offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114-301 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. LOWENTHAL of California.

Amendment No. 2 by Mrs. DINGELL of Michigan.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. CARTWRIGHT of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 253, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 560]

AYES—176

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

NOES—253

Abraham	Amodei	Barton
Aderholt	Babin	Benishek
Allen	Barletta	Bilirakis
Amash	Barr	Bishop (GA)

Bishop (MI)	Hartzler	Poe (TX)
Bishop (UT)	Heck (NV)	Poliquin
Black	Hensarling	Pompeo
Blackburn	Herrera Beutler	Posey
Blum	Hice, Jody B.	Price, Tom
Bost	Hill	Ratcliffe
Boustany	Holding	Reed
Brady (TX)	Hudson	Reichert
Brat	Huelskamp	Renacci
Bridenstine	Huizenga (MI)	Ribble
Brooks (AL)	Hultgren	Rice (SC)
Brooks (IN)	Hunter	Rigell
Buchanan	Hurd (TX)	Roby
Buck	Hurt (VA)	Roe (TN)
Bucshon	Issa	Rogers (AL)
Burgess	Jenkins (KS)	Rogers (KY)
Byrne	Jenkins (WV)	Rohrabacher
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Rokita
Carter (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Rooney (FL)
Carter (TX)	Jolly	Ros-Lehtinen
Chabot	Jones	Roskam
Chaffetz	Jordan	Ross
Clawson (FL)	Joyce	Rothfus
Coffman	Katko	Rouzer
Cole	Kelly (MS)	Royce
Collins (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Ruppersberger
Collins (NY)	King (IA)	Russell
Comstock	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Conaway	Kinzinger (IL)	Salmon
Cook	Kline	Sanford
Costa	Knight	Scalise
Costello (PA)	Labrador	Schweikert
Cramer	LaHood	Scott, Austin
Crawford	LaMalfa	Sensenbrenner
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Sessions
Cuellar	Lance	Shimkus
Culberson	Latta	Shuster
Curbelo (FL)	LoBiondo	Simpson
Davis, Rodney	Long	Smith (MO)
Denham	Loudermilk	Smith (NE)
Dent	Love	Smith (NJ)
DeSantis	Lucas	Smith (TX)
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Stefanik
Diaz-Balart	Lummis	Peters
Dold	MacArthur	Stivers
Donovan	Marchant	Stutzman
Duffy	Marino	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (SC)	Massie	Thornberry
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy	Tiberi
Ellmers (NC)	McCaul	Tipton
Emmer (MN)	McClintock	Titus
Farenthold	McHenry	Trott
Farr	McKinley	Turner
Fincher	McMorris	Upton
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	Valadao
Fleischmann	McSally	Vela
Fleming	Meadows	Wagner
Flores	Meehan	Walberg
Forbes	Messer	Walden
Fortenberry	Mica	Walker
Fox	Miller (FL)	Walorski
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Walters, Mimi
Frelinghuysen	Moolenaar	Weber (TX)
Garrett	Mooney (WV)	Webster (FL)
Gibbs	Mullin	Wenstrup
Gibson	Mulvaney	Westerman
Gohmert	Murphy (PA)	Westmoreland
Goodlatte	Neugebauer	Whitfield
Gosar	Newhouse	Williams
Gowdy	Noem	Wilson (SC)
Graves (GA)	Nugent	Wittman
Graves (LA)	Nunes	Womack
Graves (MO)	Olson	Woodall
Griffith	Palazzo	Yoder
Gruthman	Palmer	Yoho
Guinta	Paulsen	Young (AK)
Guthrie	Pearce	Young (IA)
Hanna	Perry	Young (IN)
Hardy	Peterson	Zeldin
Harper	Pittenger	Zinke
Harris	Pitts	

NOT VOTING—5

Beatty	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Granger	Payne	Visclosky

□ 1606

Messrs. BARR, TURNER, SCALISE, NEWHOUSE, BARTON, and COFFMAN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. COURTNEY and CAPUANO changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. DINGELL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 248, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 561]

AYES—181

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

NOES—248

Abraham	Amodei	Barton
Aderholt	Babin	Benishek
Allen	Barletta	Bilirakis
Amash	Barr	Bishop (MI)

Bishop (UT) Heck (NV) Pitts
 Black Hensarling Poe (TX)
 Blackburn Herrera Beutler Poliquin
 Blum Hice, Jody B. Pompeo
 Bost Hill Posey
 Boustany Holding Price, Tom
 Brady (TX) Hudson Ratcliffe
 Brat Huelskamp Reed
 Bridenstine Huizenga (MI) Reichert
 Brooks (AL) Hultgren Renacci
 Brooks (IN) Hunter Ribble
 Buchanan Hurd (TX) Rigell
 Buck Hurt (VA) Roby
 Bucshon Issa Roe (TN)
 Burgess Jenkins (KS) Rogers (AL)
 Byrne Jenkins (WV) Rogers (KY)
 Calvert Johnson (OH) Rohrabacher
 Carter (GA) Johnson, Sam Rokita
 Carter (TX) Jolly Rooney (FL)
 Chabot Jones Ros-Lehtinen
 Chaffetz Jordan Roskam
 Clawson (FL) Joyce Ross
 Coffman Katko Rothfus
 Cole Kelly (MS) Rouzer
 Collins (GA) Kelly (PA) Royce
 Collins (NY) King (IA) Russell
 Comstock King (NY) Ryan (WI)
 Conaway Kinzinger (IL) Salmon
 Cook Kline Sanford
 Costa Knight Scalise
 Costello (PA) Labrador Schweikert
 Crawford LaHood Scott, Austin
 Crenshaw LaMalfa Sensenbrenner
 Culberson Lamborn Sessions
 Curbelo (FL) Lance Shimkus
 Davis, Rodney Latta Shuster
 Denham LoBiondo Simpson
 Dent Long Sinema
 DeSantis Loudermilk Smith (MO)
 DesJarlais Love Smith (NE)
 Diaz-Balart Lowey Smith (NJ)
 Dold Lucas Smith (TX)
 Donovan Luetkemeyer Stefanik
 Duffy Lummis Stewart
 Duncan (SC) MacArthur Stivers
 Duncan (TN) Marchant Stutzman
 Ellmers (NC) Marino Thompson (PA)
 Emmer (MN) Massie Thornberry
 Farenthold McCarthy Tiberi
 Fincher McCaul Tipton
 Fitzpatrick McClintock Titus
 Fleischmann McHenry Trott
 Fleming McKinley Turner
 Flores McMorris Upton
 Forbes Rodgers Valadao
 Fortenberry McSally Wagner
 Foxx Meadows Walberg
 Franks (AZ) Meehan Walden
 Frelinghuysen Messer Walker
 Garrett Mica Walorski
 Gibbs Miller (FL) Walters, Mimi
 Gibson Moolenaar Weber (TX)
 Gohmert Mooney (WV) Webster (FL)
 Goodlatte Mullin Wenstrup
 Gosar Mulvaney Westerman
 Gowdy Murphy (PA) Westmoreland
 Granger Neugebauer Whitfield
 Graves (GA) Newhouse Williams
 Graves (LA) Noem Wilson (SC)
 Graves (MO) Nugent Wittman
 Griffith Nunes Womack
 Grothman Olson Woodall
 Guinta Palazzo Yoder
 Guthrie Palmer Yoho
 Hanna Paulsen Young (AK)
 Hardy Pearce Young (IA)
 Harper Perry Young (IN)
 Harris Peterson Zeldin
 Hartzler Pittenger Zinke

NOT VOTING—5

Castor (FL) Kelly (IL) Rice (SC)
 Cramer Payne

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1610

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CARTWRIGHT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the

gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 245, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 562]

AYES—184

Adams Fudge Napolitano
 Aguilar Gabbard Neal
 Ashford Gallego Nolan
 Bass Garamendi Norcross
 Beatty Graham O'Rourke
 Becerra Grayson Pallone
 Bera Green, Al Pascrell
 Beyer Green, Gene Pelosi
 Bishop (GA) Grijalva Perlmutter
 Blumenauer Gutierrez Peters
 Bonamici Hahn Pingree
 Boyle, Brendan Hastings Pocan
 F. Heck (WA) Polio
 Brady (PA) Higgins Price (NC)
 Brown (FL) Himes Quigley
 Brownley (CA) Hinojosa Rangel
 Bustos Honda Rice (NY)
 Butterfield Hoyer Richmond
 Capps Huffman Roybal-Allard
 Capuano Israel Ruiz
 Cárdenas Jackson Lee Ruppertsberger
 Carney Jeffries Rush
 Carson (IN) Johnson (GA) Russell
 Cartwright Johnson, E. B. Ryan (OH)
 Castro (TX) Kaptur Sanchez, Linda
 Chu, Judy Keating T.
 Cicilline Kennedy Sanchez, Loretta
 Clark (MA) Kildee Sarbanes
 Clarke (NY) Kilmer Schakowsky
 Clay Kind Schiff
 Cleaver Kirkpatrick Scott (VA)
 Clyburn Kuster Scott, David
 Cohen Larsen (WA) Serrano
 Connolly Conyers Larson (CT)
 Conyers Cooper Lawrence
 Costa Lee
 Courtney Levin
 Crowley Lewis
 Cuellar Lieu, Ted
 Cummings Lipinski
 Davis (CA) Loeb sack
 Davis, Danny Lofgren
 DeFazio Lowenthal
 DeGette Lowey
 Delaney Lujan Grisham
 DeLauro (NM)
 DeBene Luján, Ben Ray
 DeSaulnier (NM)
 Deutch Lynch
 Dingell Maloney,
 Doggett Carolyn
 Doyle, Michael Maloney, Sean
 F. Matsui
 Duckworth McCollum
 Edwards McDermott
 Ellison McGovern
 Engel Mc Nerney
 Eshoo Meeks
 Esty Meng
 Farr Moore
 Fattah Moulton
 Foster Murphy (FL)
 Frankel (FL) Nadler

NOES—245

Abraham Barton
 Aderholt Benishek
 Allen Billirakis
 Amash Bishop (MI)
 Amodei Bishop (UT)
 Babin Black
 Barletta Blackburn
 Barr Blum
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Clawson (FL)
 Coffman
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Comstock
 Conaway
 Cook
 Costello (PA)
 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
 Fincher
 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

Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurd (TX)
 Hurt (VA)
 Issa
 Jenkins (KS)
 Jenkins (WV)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 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
 Fincher
 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

NOT VOTING—5

Castor (FL) Payne
 Kelly (IL) Rice (SC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1615

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 246, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 563]

AYES—183

Adams	Fudge	Napolitano
Aguilar	Gabbard	Neal
Ashford	Gallego	Nolan
Bass	Garamendi	Norcross
Beatty	Graham	O'Rourke
Becerra	Grayson	Pallone
Bera	Green, Al	Pascarell
Beyer	Green, Gene	Pelosi
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Gutiérrez	Peters
Bonamici	Hahn	Peterson
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hastings	Pingree
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)	Pocan
Brown (FL)	Higgins	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Himes	Price (NC)
Bustos	Hinojosa	Quigley
Butterfield	Honda	Rangel
Capps	Hoyer	Rice (NY)
Capuano	Huffman	Richmond
Cardenas	Israel	Ros-Lehtinen
Carney	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Ruiz
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Chu, Judy	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Ciçilline	Keating	Sánchez, Linda T.
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clay	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kind	Schiff
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Kuster	Scott, David
Connolly	Langevin	Serrano
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Sewell (AL)
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Courtney	Lawrence	Sires
Crowley	Lee	Slaughter
Cuellar	Levin	Lieu, Ted
Cummings	Lewis	Smith (WA)
Curbelo (FL)	Lipinski	Speier
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Swalwell (CA)
Davis, Danny	Lofgren	Takai
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Takano
DeGette	Lowey	Thompson (CA)
Delaney	Lujan Grisham	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	(NM)	Tonko
DelBene	Luján, Ben Ray	Torres
DeSaulnier	(NM)	Tsongas
Deutch	Lynch	Van Hollen
Diaz-Balart	Maloney,	Vargas
Dingell	Carolyn	Veasey
Doggett	Maloney, Sean	Vela
Doyle, Michael F.	Matsui	Velázquez
Duckworth	McCollum	Vislosky
Edwards	McDermott	Walz
Engel	McGovern	Wasserman
Eshoo	McNerney	Schultz
Esty	Meeks	Waters, Maxine
Farr	Meng	Watson Coleman
Fattah	Moore	Welch
Foster	Moulton	Wilson (FL)
Frankel (FL)	Murphy (FL)	Yarmuth
	Nadler	

NOES—246

Abraham	Black	Burgess
Aderholt	Blackburn	Byrne
Allen	Blum	Calvert
Amash	Bost	Carter (GA)
Amodi	Boustany	Carter (TX)
Babin	Brady (TX)	Chabot
Barletta	Brat	Chaffetz
Barr	Bridenstine	Coffman
Barton	Brooks (AL)	Cole
Benishkek	Brooks (IN)	Collins (GA)
Billirakis	Buchanan	Collins (NY)
Bishop (MI)	Buck	Comstock
Bishop (UT)	Bucshon	Conaway

Cook	Jones	Rigell
Costa	Jordan	Roby
Costello (PA)	Joyce	Roe (TN)
Cramer	Katko	Rogers (AL)
Crawford	Kelly (MS)	Rogers (KY)
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Rohrabacher
Culberson	King (IA)	Rokita
Davis, Rodney	King (NY)	Rooney (FL)
Denham	Kinzinger (IL)	Roskam
Dent	Kline	Ross
DeSantis	Knight	Rothfus
DesJarlais	Labrador	Rouzer
Dold	LaHood	Royce
Donovan	LaMalfa	Russell
Duffy	Lamborn	Ryan (WI)
Duncan (SC)	Lance	Salmon
Duncan (TN)	Latta	Sanford
Ellison	LoBiondo	Scalise
Ellmers (NC)	Long	Schrader
Emmer (MN)	Loudermilk	Schweikert
Farenthold	Love	Scott, Austin
Fincher	Lucas	Sensenbrenner
Fitzpatrick	Luetkemeyer	Sessions
Fleischmann	MacArthur	Shimkus
Fleming	Marchant	Shuster
Flores	Marino	Simpson
Forbes	Massie	Sinema
Fortenberry	McCarthy	Smith (MO)
Fox	McCaui	Smith (NE)
Franks (AZ)	McClintock	Smith (NJ)
Frelinghuysen	McHenry	Smith (TX)
Garrett	McKinley	Stefanik
Gibbs	McMorris	Stewart
Gibson	Rodgers	Stivers
Gohmert	McSally	Thompson (PA)
Goodlatte	Meadows	Thornberry
Gosar	Meehan	Tiberi
Gowdy	Messer	Tipton
Granger	Mica	Titus
Graves (GA)	Miller (FL)	Trott
Graves (LA)	Miller (MI)	Turner
Graves (MO)	Moolenaar	Upton
Griffith	Mooney (WV)	Valadao
Grothman	Mullin	Wagner
Guinta	Mulvaney	Walberg
Guthrie	Murphy (PA)	Walker
Hanna	Neugebauer	Walorski
Hardy	Newhouse	Walters, Mimi
Harper	Noem	Weber (TX)
Harris	Nugent	Webster (FL)
Hartzer	Nunes	Wenstrup
Heck (NV)	Olson	Westerman
Hensarling	Palazzo	Westmoreland
Herrera Beutler	Palmer	Whitfield
Hice, Jody B.	Paulsen	Williams
Hill	Pearce	Wilson (SC)
Holding	Perry	Wittman
Hudson	Pittenger	Womack
Huelskamp	Pitts	Woodall
Huizenga (MI)	Poe (TX)	Yoder
Hultgren	Poliquin	Yoho
Hunter	Pompeo	Young (AK)
Hurd (TX)	Posey	Young (IA)
Hurt (VA)	Price, Tom	Young (IN)
Issa	Ratcliffe	Zeldin
Jenkins (KS)	Reed	Zinke
Jenkins (WV)	Reichert	
Johnson (OH)	Renacci	
Johnson, Sam	Ribble	
Jolly	Rice (SC)	

NOT VOTING—5

Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Payne
Clawson (FL)	Lummis	

□ 1620

Ms. MOORE changed her vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) having assumed the chair, Mr. BOST, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1937) to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more effi-

ciently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness, and, pursuant to House Resolution 481, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PETERS. I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Peters moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1937 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 01. CLIMATE CHANGE IS REAL.

Nothing in this Act limits the authority of the lead agency with responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit from assessing the extent to which the activity proposed to be conducted under the permit may contribute to climate change.

Mr. PETERS (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 gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PETERS. 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.

I have been a clear proponent for reducing regulatory burdens and streamlining the environmental review process in ways that make sense.

Before I entered public service, I practiced environmental law for 15 years in large firms, in a government office, and in my own firm. Through that experience, I learned firsthand of the frustration that many businesses and local governments face when they try to navigate a sometimes overly complex and underly responsive permit process.

I also know from experience that time is money. Often a business seeking a permit is paying dearly to hold a property or service a loan while it waits for that permit to be issued, and

that is why I have often said that, for applicants, no is the second-best answer. Tell us “no” or tell us how, but don’t string us along.

Unfortunately, the approach that the underlying bill takes is not to streamline the process for analyzing the significant impacts of hardrock mining, which I might support; it just eliminates the review process altogether.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment would not solve that problem but would make an important clarification. As these critical mineral mining projects undergo environmental review, agencies should be able to assess how the project may contribute to climate change.

Recently, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or NOAA, reported that the first 7 months of this year had been the hottest such period on record. Globally, average surface temperatures have increased substantially in the last century, and nearly twice as fast in the last 50 years alone. We know that the vast majority of climate scientists, including numerous leading scientific and academic organizations across the world, agree that the planet is warming due to human activities.

How many national academies reject the science of global warming? None. Between November 2012 and December 2013, there were 9,137 peer-reviewed papers written on climate change. Of those 9,137 papers, how many did not agree that climate change is happening because of human activity? One. That is right. Only 1 out of more than 9,000.

So it seems to me that when scientific organizations, including the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Chemical Society, the American Geophysical Union, the American Meteorological Society, the American Physical Society, the Geological Society of America, the National Academy of Sciences, and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change all agree that climate change is happening because of human activity, we ought to be listening.

If 99 doctors told you that you had diabetes and 1 said he wasn’t sure, wouldn’t you still do something?

Now, for too long, we have heard that we have to choose between a prosperous economy and a clean environment. San Diegans and people around the country know that is a false choice. We can and we must provide economic opportunity and clean air and water for future generations.

Given the high stakes associated with carbon emissions and climate change on coastal property, energy, defense, our food supply, and our quality of life, shouldn’t we at least understand the long-term costs associated with a project?

By allowing agencies to take a full environmental consideration of a project, including its potential contributions to climate change, my amendment rejects the false choice between a prosperous economy and a

healthy climate. We can and we must have both.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1630

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit is a procedural motion designed to slow down consideration of this important jobs bill. It is a purely procedural motion, not a substantive motion. I urge us to reject the motion.

It is important to pass this bill. Right now it takes 7 to 10 years to approve a mining project in the U.S. Mr. Speaker, this is dead last among major mining countries. The critical and strategic minerals we mine in this country go into vital infrastructure and manufacturing to improve our way of life.

Mr. Speaker, when we use American resources to create American jobs, we reduce our dependency on foreign countries like China. This bill will reduce bureaucratic red tape, speed up the legal and permitting process, and create certainty so that mining projects will stay here in America.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment and support H.R. 1937 to use American resources for American jobs.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to 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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-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 483; and adoption of House Resolution 483, if ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 246, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 564]

AYES—184

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
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
Dingell
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
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsock
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
Pascarell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters

Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—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
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
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
Huiזenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Garrett
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long

Loudermilk	Pittenger	Smith (NJ)	Fitzpatrick	Lamborn	Rogers (KY)	Lowenthal	Perlmutter	Sires
Love	Pitts	Smith (TX)	Fleischmann	Lance	Rohrabacher	Lowe	Peters	Slaughter
Lucas	Poe (TX)	Stefanik	Fleming	Latta	Rokita	Lujan Grisham	Pingree	Smith (WA)
Luetkemeyer	Poliquin	Stewart	Flores	LoBiondo	Rooney (FL)	(NM)	Pocan	Speier
Lummis	Pompeo	Stivers	Forbes	Long	Ros-Lehtinen	Lujan, Ben Ray	Polis	Swalwell (CA)
MacArthur	Posey	Stutzman	Fortenberry	Loudermilk	Roskam	(NM)	Price (NC)	Takai
Marchant	Price, Tom	Thompson (PA)	Fox	Love	Ross	Lynch	Quigley	Takano
Marino	Ratcliffe	Thornberry	Franks (AZ)	Lucas	Rothfus	Maloney,	Rangel	Thompson (CA)
Massie	Reed	Tiberi	Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer	Rouzer	Carolyn	Rice (NY)	Thompson (MS)
McCarthy	Reichert	Tipton	Garrett	Lummis	Royce	Maloney, Sean	Richmond	Tonko
McCaul	Renacci	Trott	Gibbs	MacArthur	Russell	Matsui	Roybal-Allard	Torres
McClintock	Ribble	Turner	Gibson	Marchant	Ryan (WI)	McCollum	Ruiz	Tsongas
McHenry	Rice (SC)	Upton	Gohmert	Marino	Salmon	McDermott	Ruppersberger	Van Hollen
McKinley	Rigell	Valadao	Goodlatte	Massie	Sanford	McGovern	Rush	Vargas
McMorris	Roby	Wagner	Gosar	McCarthy	Scalise	McNerney	Ryan (OH)	Veasey
Rodgers	Roe (TN)	Walberg	Gowdy	McCaul	Schweikert	Meeks	Sánchez, Linda	Vela
McSally	Rogers (AL)	Walden	Granger	McClintock	Scott, Austin	Meng	T.	Velázquez
Meadows	Rogers (KY)	Walker	Graves (GA)	McHenry	Sensenbrenner	Moore	Sanchez, Loretta	Visclosky
Meehan	Rohrabacher	Walorski	Graves (LA)	McKinley	Sessions	Moulton	Sarbanes	Walz
Messer	Rokita	Walters, Mimi	Graves (MO)	McMorris	Shimkus	Murphy (FL)	Schakowsky	Wasserman
Mica	Rooney (FL)	Weber (TX)	Griffith	Rodgers	Shuster	Nadler	Schiff	Schultz
Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Webster (FL)	Grothman	McSally	Simpson	Napolitano	Schrader	Waters, Maxine
Miller (MI)	Roskam	Westrup	Guinta	Meadows	Smith (MO)	Neal	Scott (VA)	Watson Coleman
Moolenaar	Ross	Westerman	Guthrie	Meehan	Smith (NE)	Norcross	Scott, David	Welch
Mooney (WV)	Rothfus	Westmoreland	Hanna	Messer	Smith (NJ)	O'Rourke	Serrano	Wilson (FL)
Mullin	Rouzer	Whitfield	Hardy	Mica	Smith (TX)	Pallone	Sewell (AL)	Yarmuth
Mulvaney	Royce	Williams	Harper	Miller (FL)	Stefanik	Pascrell	Sherman	
Murphy (PA)	Russell	Wilson (SC)	Harris	Miller (MI)	Stewart	Pelosi	Sinema	
Neugebauer	Ryan (WI)	Wittman	Hartzler	Moolenaar	Stivers			
Newhouse	Salmon	Womack	Heck (NV)	Mooney (WV)	Stutzman			
Noem	Sanford	Woodall	Hensarling	Mullin	Thompson (PA)			
Nugent	Scalise	Yoder	Herrera Beutler	Mulvaney	Thornberry			
Nunes	Schweikert	Yoho	Hice, Jody B.	Murphy (PA)	Tiberi			
Olson	Scott, Austin	Young (AK)	Hill	Neugebauer	Tipton			
Palazzo	Sensenbrenner	Young (IA)	Holding	Newhouse	Titus			
Palmer	Sessions	Young (IN)	Hudson	Noem	Trott			
Paulsen	Shimkus	Zeldin	Huelskamp	Nolan	Turner			
Pearce	Shuster		Huizenga (MI)	Nugent	Upton			
Perry	Smith (MO)		Hultgren	Nunes	Valadao			
Peterson	Smith (NE)		Hunter	Olson	Wagner			
			Hurd (TX)	Palazzo	Walberg			
			Hurt (VA)	Palmer	Walden			
			Issa	Paulsen	Walker			
			Jenkins (KS)	Pearce	Walorski			
			Jenkins (WV)	Perry	Walters, Mimi			
			Johnson (OH)	Peterson	Weber (TX)			
			Johnson, Sam	Pittenger	Webster (FL)			
			Jolly	Pitts	Wenstrup			
			Jones	Poe (TX)	Westerman			
			Jordan	Poliquin	Westmoreland			
			Joyce	Pompeo	Whitfield			
			Kaptur	Posey	Williams			
			Katko	Price, Tom	Wilson (SC)			
			Kelly (MS)	Ratcliffe	Wittman			
			Kelly (PA)	Reed	Womack			
			King (IA)	Reichert	Woodall			
			King (NY)	Renacci	Yoder			
			Kinzinger (IL)	Ribble	Yoho			
			Kline	Rice (SC)	Young (AK)			
			Knight	Rigell	Young (IA)			
			Labrador	Roby	Young (IN)			
			LaHood	Roe (TN)	Zeldin			
			LaMalfa	Rogers (AL)	Zinke			

NOT VOTING—4

Castor (FL) Payne
Kelly (IL) Simpson

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1636

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 254, nays 177, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 565]

YEAS—254

Abraham	Bridenstine	Costello (PA)
Aderholt	Brooks (AL)	Cramer
Allen	Brooks (IN)	Crawford
Amash	Buchanan	Crenshaw
Amodei	Buck	Cuellar
Ashford	Bucshon	Culberson
Babin	Burgess	Curbelo (FL)
Barletta	Byrne	Davis, Rodney
Barr	Calvert	Denham
Barton	Carter (GA)	Dent
Benishkek	Carter (TX)	DeSantis
Bilirakis	Chabot	DesJarlais
Bishop (GA)	Chaffetz	Diaz-Balart
Bishop (MI)	Clawson (FL)	Dold
Bishop (UT)	Coffman	Donovan
Black	Cole	Duffy
Blackburn	Collins (GA)	Duncan (SC)
Blum	Collins (NY)	Duncan (TN)
Bost	Comstock	Ellmers (NC)
Boustany	Conaway	Emmer (MN)
Brady (TX)	Cook	Farenthold
Brat	Costa	Fincher

Adams	Courtney	Grijalva
Aguilar	Crowley	Gutiérrez
Bass	Cummings	Hahn
Beatty	Davis (CA)	Hastings
Becerra	Davis, Danny	Heck (WA)
Bera	DeFazio	Higgins
Beyer	DeGette	Himes
Blumenauer	Delaney	Hinojosa
Bonamici	DeLauro	Honda
Boyle, Brendan	DelBene	Hoyer
F.	DeSaulnier	Huffman
Brady (PA)	Deutch	Israel
Brown (FL)	Dingell	Jackson Lee
Brownley (CA)	Doggett	Jeffries
Bustos	Doyle, Michael	Johnson (GA)
Butterfield	F.	Johnson, E. B.
Capps	Duckworth	Keating
Capuano	Edwards	Kennedy
Cárdenas	Ellison	Kildee
Carney	Engel	Kilmer
Carson (IN)	Eshoo	Kind
Cartwright	Esty	Kirkpatrick
Castro (TX)	Farr	Kuster
Chu, Judy	Fattah	Langevin
Ciilline	Foster	Larsen (WA)
Clark (MA)	Frankel (FL)	Larson (CT)
Clarke (NY)	Fudge	Lawrence
Clay	Gabbard	Lee
Cleaver	Gallego	Levin
Clyburn	Garamendi	Lewis
Cohen	Graham	Lieu, Ted
Connolly	Grayson	Lipinski
Conyers	Green, Al	Loeb sack
Cooper	Green, Gene	Lofgren

NAYS—177

Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Payne
-------------	------------	-------

NOT VOTING—3

Castor (FL) Kelly (IL) Payne

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1642

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. 3762, RESTORING AMERICANS' HEALTHCARE FREEDOM RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2015; WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(A) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES; 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 resolution (H. Res. 483) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3762) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016; waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules; 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.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 185, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 566]

YEAS—244

Abraham Griffith Paulsen
 Aderholt Grothman Pearce
 Allen Guinta Perry
 Amash Guthrie Pitts
 Amodei Hanna Poe (TX)
 Babin Hardy Poliquin
 Barletta Harper Pompeio
 Barr Hartsis Posey
 Barton Hartzler Price, Tom
 Benishek Heck (NV) Ratcliffe
 Bilirakis Hensarling Reed
 Bishop (MI) Herrera Beutler Reichert
 Bishop (UT) Hice, Jody B. Renacci
 Black Hill Ribble
 Blackburn Holding Rice (SC)
 Blum Hudson Rigell
 Bost Huelskamp Roby
 Boustany Huizenga (MI) Roe (TN)
 Brady (TX) Hultgren Rogers (AL)
 Brat Hunter Rogers (KY)
 Bridenstine Hurd (TX) Rohrabacher
 Brooks (AL) Hurt (VA) Rokita
 Brooks (IN) Issa Rooney (FL)
 Buchanan Jenkins (KS) Ros-Lehtinen
 Buck Jenkins (WV) Roskam
 Bucshon Johnson (OH) Ross
 Burgess Johnson, Sam Rothfus
 Byrne Jolly Rouzer
 Calvert Jones Royce
 Carter (GA) Jordan Russell
 Carter (TX) Joyce Ryan (WI)
 Chabot Katko Salmon
 Chaffetz Kelly (MS) Sanford
 Clawson (FL) Kelly (PA) Scalise
 Coffman King (IA) Schweikert
 Cole King (NY) Scott, Austin
 Collins (GA) Kinzinger (IL) Sensenbrenner
 Collins (NY) Kline Scents
 Comstock Knight Sessions
 Conaway Labrador Shimkus
 Cook LaHood Shuster
 Costello (PA) LaMalfa Simpson
 Cramer Lamborn Smith (MO)
 Crawford Lance Smith (NE)
 Crenshaw Latta Smith (NJ)
 Culberson LoBiondo Smith (TX)
 Curbelo (FL) Long Stefanik
 Davis, Rodney Loudermilk Stewart
 Denham Love Stivers
 Dent Lucas Stutzman
 DeSantis Luetkemeyer Thompson (PA)
 DesJarlais Lummis Thornberry
 Diaz-Balart MacArthur Tiberi
 Dold Marchant Tipton
 Donovan Marino Trott
 Duffy Massie Turner
 Duncan (SC) McCarthy Upton
 Duncan (TN) McCaul Valadao
 Ellmers (NC) McClintock Wagner
 Emmer (MN) McHenry Walberg
 Farenthold McKinley Walden
 Fincher McMorris Walker
 Fitzpatrick Rodgers Walorski
 Fleischmann McSally Walters, Mimi
 Fleming Meadows Weber (TX)
 Flores Meehan Webster (FL)
 Forbes Messer Westerman
 Fortenberry Miller (FL) Westmoreland
 Foxx Miller (MI) Whitfield
 Franks (AZ) Moolenaar Williams
 Frelinghuysen Mooney (WV) Wilson (SC)
 Garrett Mullin Wittman
 Gibbs Mulvaney Womack
 Gibson Murphy (PA) Woodall
 Gohmert Neugebauer Yoder
 Goodlatte Newhouse Yoho
 Gosar Noem Young (AK)
 Gowdy Nugent Young (IA)
 Granger Nunes Young (IN)
 Graves (GA) Olson Zeldin
 Graves (LA) Palazzo Zinke
 Graves (MO) Palmer

NAYS—185

Adams Boyle, Brendan Cartwright
 Aguilar F. Castro (TX)
 Ashford Brady (PA) Chu, Judy
 Bass Brown (FL) Cicilline
 Beatty Brownley (CA) Clark (MA)
 Becerra Bustos Clarke (NY)
 Bera Butterfield Clay
 Beyer Capps Cleaver
 Bishop (GA) Capuano Clyburn
 Blumenauer Cárdenas Cohen
 Bonamici Carney Connolly
 Carson (IN) Carson (IN) Conyers

Cooper Kaptur Poliss
 Costa Keating Price (NC)
 Courtney Kennedy Quigley
 Crowley Kildee Rangel
 Cuellar Kilmer Rice (NY)
 Cummings Kind Richmond
 Davis (CA) Kirkpatrick Roybal-Allard
 Davis, Danny Kuster Ruiz
 DeFazio Langevin Ruppertsberger
 DeGette Larsen (WA) Rush
 Delaney Larson (CT) Ryan (OH)
 DeLauro Lawrence Sánchez, Linda
 DelBene Lee T.
 DeSaulnier Levin Sanchez, Loretta
 Deutch Lewis Sarbanes
 Dingell Lieu, Ted Schakowsky
 Doggett Lipinski Schiff
 Doyle, Michael Loeb sack
 F. Lofgren Schrader
 Duckworth Lowenthal Scott (VA)
 Edwards Lowey Scott, David
 Ellison Lujan Grisham Serrano
 Engel (NM) Sewell (AL)
 Eshoo Luján, Ben Ray Sherman
 Esty (NM) Sinema
 Farr Lynch Sires
 Fattah Maloney, Slaughter
 Foster Carolyn Smith (WA)
 Frankel (FL) Maloney, Sean Speier
 Fudge Matsui Swalwell (CA)
 Gabbard McCollum Takai
 Gallego McDermott Takano
 Garamendi McGovern Thompson (CA)
 Graham McNerney Thompson (MS)
 Grayson Meeks Titus
 Green, Al Meng Tonko
 Green, Gene Moore Torres
 Grijalva Moulton Tsongas
 Gutiérrez Murphy (FL) Van Hollen
 Hahn Nadler Vargas
 Hastings Napolitano Veasey
 Heck (WA) Neal Vela
 Higgins Nolan Velázquez
 Himes Norcross Visclosky
 Hinojosa O'Rourke Walz
 Honda Pallone Wasserman
 Hoyer Pascrell Schultz
 Huffman Pelosi Waters, Maxine
 Israel Perlmutter Watson Coleman
 Jackson Lee Peters Welch
 Jeffries Peterson Wilson (FL)
 Johnson (GA) Pingree Yarmuth
 Johnson, E. B. Pocan

NOT VOTING—5

Castor (FL) Mica Pittenger
 Kelly (IL) Payne

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1649

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 187, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 567]

YEAS—240

Abraham Bishop (MI) Brooks (AL)
 Aderholt Bishop (UT) Brooks (IN)
 Allen Black Buchanan
 Amodei Blackburn Buck
 Babin Blum Bucshon
 Barletta Bost Burgess
 Barr Boustany Byrne
 Barton Brady (TX) Calvert
 Benishek Brat Carter (GA)
 Bilirakis Bridenstine Carter (TX)

Chabot Hurd (TX) Reichert
 Chaffetz Hurt (VA) Renacci
 Clawson (FL) Issa Ribble
 Coffman Jenkins (KS) Rice (SC)
 Cole Jenkins (WV) Rigell
 Collins (GA) Johnson (OH) Roby
 Collins (NY) Johnson, Sam Roe (TN)
 Comstock Jolly Rogers (AL)
 Conaway Jordan Rogers (KY)
 Cook Joyce Rohrabacher
 Costello (PA) Katko Rokita
 Cramer Kelly (MS) Ros-Lehtinen
 Crawford Kelly (PA) Roskam
 Crenshaw King (IA) Ross
 Culberson King (NY) Rothfus
 Curbelo (FL) Kinzinger (IL) Rouzer
 Davis, Rodney Kline Royce
 Denham Labrador Russell
 Dent LaHood Ryan (WI)
 DeSantis LaMalfa Salmon
 DesJarlais Lamborn Sanford
 Diaz-Balart Lance Scalise
 Dold Latta Schweikert
 Donovan LoBiondo Scott, Austin
 Duffy Long Sensenbrenner
 Duncan (SC) Loudermilk Sessions
 Duncan (TN) Love
 Ellmers (NC) Lucas Shimkus
 Emmer (MN) Luetkemeyer Shuster
 Farenthold Lummis Simpson
 Fincher Fincher MacArthur Smith (MO)
 Fitzpatrick Marchant Smith (NE)
 Fleischmann Marino Smith (NJ)
 Fleming McCarthy Smith (TX)
 Flores McCaul Stefanik
 Forbes McClintock Stewart
 Fortenberry McHenry Stivers
 Foxx McKinley Stutzman
 Franks (AZ) McMorris Thompson (PA)
 Frelinghuysen Rodgers Thornberry
 Garrett McSally Tiberi
 Gibbs Meadows Tipton
 Gibson Meehan Trott
 Gohmert Messer Turner
 Goodlatte Miller (FL) Upton
 Gosar Miller (MI) Valadao
 Gowdy Moolenaar Wagner
 Granger Mooney (WV) Wittman
 Graves (GA) Mullin Womack
 Graves (LA) Mulvaney Woodall
 Graves (MO) Murphy (PA) Yoder
 Griffith Neugebauer Yoho
 Grothman Newhouse Young (AK)
 Guinta Noem Young (IA)
 Guthrie Nugent Young (IN)
 Hanna Nunes Zeldin
 Hardy Olson Westerman
 Harper Palazz Westmoreland
 Harris Palmer Whitfield
 Hartzler Paulsen Williams
 Heck (NV) Pearce Wilson (SC)
 Hensarling Perry Wittman
 Herrera Beutler Pittenger Womack
 Hice, Jody B. Pitts Woodall
 Hill Poe (TX) Yoder
 Holding Poliquin Yoho
 Hudson Pompeio Young (AK)
 Huelskamp Posey Young (IA)
 Huizenga (MI) Price, Tom Young (IN)
 Hultgren Ratcliffe Zeldin
 Hunter Reed Zinke

NAYS—187

Adams Chu, Judy Doggett
 Aguilar Cicilline Doyle, Michael
 Amash Clark (MA) F.
 Ashford Clarke (NY) Duckworth
 Bass Edwards
 Beatty Cleaver Ellison
 Becerra Clyburn Engel
 Bera Cohen Eshoo
 Beyer Connolly Esty
 Bishop (GA) Conyers Farr
 Blumenauer Cooper Fattah
 Bonamici Bonamici Foster
 Boyle, Brendan Courtney Frankel (FL)
 F. Crowley Fudge
 Brady (PA) Cuellar Gabbard
 Brown (FL) Brownley (CA) Gallego
 Bustos Bustos Garamendi
 Butterfield Butterfield Davis, Danny
 Capps DeFazio Graham
 Capuano DeGette Grayson
 Cárdenas Delaney Green, Al
 Carney DeLauro Green, Gene
 Carson (IN) Carney Grijalva
 Cartwright Carson (IN) Hahn
 Castro (TX) Castro (TX) DeSaulnier
 Dingell Dingell Hastings
 Heck (WA) Heck (WA)

Higgins	Maloney, Sean	Schakowsky
Himes	Massie	Schiff
Hinojosa	Matsui	Schrader
Honda	McColum	Scott (VA)
Hoyer	McDermott	Scott, David
Huffman	McGovern	Serrano
Israel	McNerney	Sewell (AL)
Jackson Lee	Meeks	Sherman
Jeffries	Meng	Sinema
Johnson (GA)	Moore	Sires
Johnson, E. B.	Moulton	Slaughter
Jones	Murphy (FL)	Smith (WA)
Kaptur	Nadler	Speier
Keating	Napolitano	Swalwell (CA)
Kennedy	Neal	Takai
Kildee	Nolan	Takano
Kilmer	Norcross	Thompson (CA)
Kind	O'Rourke	Thompson (MS)
Kirkpatrick	Pallone	Titus
Kuster	Pascrell	Tonko
Langevin	Pelosi	Torres
Larsen (WA)	Perlmutter	Tsongas
Larson (CT)	Peters	Van Hollen
Lawrence	Peterson	Vargas
Lee	Pingree	Veasey
Levin	Pocan	Vela
Lewis	Polis	Velázquez
Lieu, Ted	Price (NC)	Visclosky
Lipinski	Quigley	Walz
Loebsack	Rangel	Wasserman
Lofgren	Richmond	Schultz
Lowenthal	Roybal-Allard	Waters, Maxine
Lowey	Ruiz	Watson Coleman
Lujan Grisham	Ruppersberger	Welch
(NM)	Rush	Wilson (FL)
Luján, Ben Ray	Ryan (OH)	Yarmuth
(NM)	Sánchez, Linda	
Lynch	T.	
Maloney,	Sánchez, Loretta	
Carolyn	Sarbanes	

NOT VOTING—7

Castor (FL)	Mica	Rooney (FL)
Kelly (IL)	Payne	
Knight	Rice (NY)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1656

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.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

DEPUTY SANDBERG, WE ARE FOREVER GRATEFUL

(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 remember fallen Deputy Steven Sandberg, who was shot and killed in the line of duty this past Sunday in St. Cloud, Minnesota.

Deputy Sandberg's death was both senseless and tragic, but we must remember him for the heroic way he chose to live his life.

Deputy Sandberg was an honorable man who served his community for 24 years. He began working for the Aitkin County Sheriff's Office in 1991 and worked as an investigator for the past 20 years.

Every day for more than two decades Deputy Sandberg put his life on the

line to protect others, and we will be forever grateful for his service.

Our community has suffered a major loss, and we will never forget what this exceptional man has done for us. Our thoughts and prayers are with Steven's wife Kristi and daughter Cassie as well as his many friends and colleagues during this difficult time.

□ 1700

DEPUTY STEVEN SANDBERG

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

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Minnesota suffered a terrible tragedy when we lost Deputy Sheriff Steven Sandberg of Aitkin, Minnesota, in the line of duty last weekend.

Deputy Sandberg, a 20-year veteran of the Sheriff's Office, was loved and cherished by his family, by all who knew him, and by the entire region.

His daughter, Cassie, recently said, "I want everyone to know that my dad was so proud to do his job and to serve the entire community."

Cassie, we want you to know that we are proud, too. We are proud to have had your dad's great service in our community. His bravery and his service will never be forgotten.

Today I ask my colleagues to please keep his wife, Kristi, and his daughter, Cassie, in their thoughts and in their prayers.

Please remember to thank and to honor all of the law enforcement officers who put themselves in harm's way every day to keep us safe.

HONORING MAJOR GREG TRUITT

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Coral Gables native Major Greg Truitt on his retirement from the Miami-Dade Police Department.

Starting off as a rookie corrections officer in his early twenties, Greg has held many roles throughout his 40 years in law enforcement before retiring as Commander of the Village of Palmetto Bay's Policing Unit.

The mayor and city manager of Palmetto Bay are here in D.C. today to help honor his years of service and to join me in wishing Major Truitt good health, happiness, and all the best in the years ahead.

Major Truitt's profound leadership and commitment to south Florida have allowed him to shape the lives of countless individuals throughout his impressive career. Greg has shown that there is no greater reward than the satisfaction of serving one's fellow neighbor. For having embraced this most noble of endeavors with such lofty principles, I thank him so very much.

Not one to rest on his laurels since his retirement, Greg continues to volunteer his time to serve our community through his church, the Boy Scouts of America, and as a police reserve officer with the Miami-Dade Police Department.

Godspeed to Greg Truitt.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE MINNESOTA LYNX

(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, the word "dynasty" gets thrown around loosely these days, but with three championships in 5 years, the Minnesota Lynx fit the bill.

Led by Maya Moore, who averaged over 23 points in the playoffs, the Lynx won the title with a hard-fought victory over the Indiana Fever in game 5. Coached by Cheryl Reeve, the Lynx overcame injuries and fatigue to clinch the top seed in the West during the regular season and set up their path to the title.

Mr. Speaker, as the WNBA continues to grow, the players often are called upon to do more than just play basketball. In that vein, the Lynx players have been tremendous ambassadors to the community and are heroes to numerous girls who are pursuing their athletic dreams.

I congratulate the Minnesota Lynx players and the coaches on yet another WNBA title.

FEDERAL-STATE CYBERSECURITY COOPERATION

(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, today, here on Capitol Hill, I visited with various National Guard units from different States to learn more about the innovative ways they are keeping us safe in cyberspace. I appreciate their efforts and their service.

The House has passed several measures to protect our cybersecurity this year, and the Senate is now working to do the same. There is a clear, bipartisan consensus that more needs to be done to protect us from data breaches, malicious hackers, and those who would inflict harm on the American people in using our cyber networks.

Several high-profile data breaches include a hack of the Office of Personnel Management, which accessed highly sensitive information that puts our national security at risk as well as that of many people's private lives.

We must act now to protect our cybersecurity before an even more catastrophic attack occurs. More integration and cooperation is needed among Federal, State, and local levels to be on the same page for the cybersecurity Americans expect of us in government

and are promised. I feel we are falling woefully short should another attack occur. We must be prepared better than we are.

PREGNANCY DISCRIMINATION
AMENDMENT ACT

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

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members of our House today to join me in support of H.R. 2800, the Pregnancy Discrimination Amendment Act.

This important piece of legislation expands upon existing law to help protect pregnant women from workplace discrimination, and I am proud to be a cosponsor.

Women account for nearly half of the workforce in our country, so it is particularly hard to believe, in today's society, women are still denied jobs or lose their jobs because they are pregnant. Every time this happens to a mom, it hurts her, it hurts her family, and it hurts our economy.

We must ensure that hardworking moms and moms-to-be are protected from unfair employment decisions. As a society, we should encourage and support all workers. We should help ensure that moms and dads are physically and financially healthy and secure as they approach parenthood.

As a single father myself, who raised my son from the time he was in diapers, I know firsthand how important it is to have a support system. That includes a supportive work environment where soon-to-be parents are not worried about being fired or about being overlooked for jobs or promotions because they have decided to have children.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-70)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLY of Mississippi) laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To The House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 1735, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016." While there are provisions in this bill that I support, including the codification of key interrogation-related reforms from Executive Order 13491 and positive changes to the military retirement system, the bill would, among other things, constrain the ability of the Department of Defense to conduct multi-year defense planning and align military capabilities and force structure with our national defense strategy, impede the closure of the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay, and prevent the implementation of essential defense reforms.

This bill fails to authorize funding for our national defense in a fiscally re-

sponsible manner. It underfunds our military in the base budget, and instead relies on an irresponsible budget gimmick that has been criticized by members of both parties. Specifically, the bill's use of \$38 billion in Overseas Contingency Operations funding—which was meant to fund wars and is not subject to budget caps—does not provide the stable, multi-year budget upon which sound defense planning depends. Because this bill authorizes base budget funding at sequestration levels, it threatens the readiness and capabilities of our military and fails to provide the support our men and women in uniform deserve. The decision reflected in this bill to circumvent rather than reverse sequestration further harms our national security by locking in unacceptable funding cuts for crucial national security activities carried out by non-defense agencies.

I have repeatedly called upon the Congress to work with my Administration to close the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and explained why it is imperative that we do so. As I have noted, the continued operation of this facility weakens our national security by draining resources, damaging our relationships with key allies and partners, and emboldening violent extremists. Yet in addition to failing to remove unwarranted restrictions on the transfer of detainees, this bill seeks to impose more onerous ones. The executive branch must have the flexibility, with regard to those detainees who remain at Guantanamo, to determine when and where to prosecute them, based on the facts and circumstances of each case and our national security interests, and when and where to transfer them consistent with our national security and our humane treatment policy. Rather than taking steps to bring this chapter of our history to a close, as I have repeatedly called upon the Congress to do, this bill aims to extend it.

The bill also fails to adopt many essential defense reforms, including to force structure, weapons systems, and military health care. Our defense strategy depends on investing every dollar where it will have the greatest effect. My Administration's proposals will accomplish this through critical reforms that divest unneeded force structure, slow growth in compensation, and reduce wasteful overhead. The restrictions in the bill would require the Department of Defense to retain unnecessary force structure and weapons systems that we cannot afford in today's fiscal environment, contributing to a military that will be less capable of responding effectively to future challenges.

Because of the manner in which this bill would undermine our national security, I must veto it.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 22, 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the veto

message and the bill will be printed as a House document.

Pursuant to the order of the House of October 21, 2015, further consideration of the veto message and the bill are postponed until the legislative day of Thursday, November 5, 2015, and that on that legislative day, the House shall proceed to the constitutional question of reconsideration and dispose of such question without intervening motion.

SYRIAN DISPLACEMENT CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the Syrian displacement crisis has consumed seven nations in the Middle East, among them Lebanon, Jordan, Turkey, obviously, and Syria itself, and has spawned the largest refugee crisis Europe has faced since World War II.

The scope of the damage is incredible. This protracted conflict has decimated Syria's infrastructure and has already taken the lives of over 250,000 civilians, has displaced over 4 million people, and has subjected tens upon thousands of children in that nation to Assad's horrific barrel bombs. Most everyone who remains in Syria endures power and water cuts, the threat of shelling, galloping inflation, and rampant speculation about: What will happen next? Who will help us, the innocents?

With roads often subject to ambush, freedom to travel has been heavily curtailed. Checkpoints and concrete blast barriers have become accepted adornments of daily life. Institutions such as schools, hospitals, and offices remain open in government-held areas, though many schools have become shelters for the legions of war injured and homeless. Truly, it is grim. Often, classes are held in double shifts to make room for the extra students. This is everyday life in Syria.

Five years into the conflict that has ravaged this once-modern nation, more than half of the Syrian population is displaced, with over 4 million refugees in neighboring countries and tens of thousands moving toward Europe. We see this on television every evening.

My hometown of Toledo has taken in 8 weary Syrian families—refugees who have now again found hope in the liberty that America offers—but fewer than 2,000 Syrians have come to the United States, though the war has displaced more than 12 million since 2011. The free world simply cannot allow this savage slaughter and dislocation to continue.

We ask ourselves: Where is the leadership for resolution?

□ 1715

Now, in addition to daily airstrikes against civilians by the Syrian Government violating international humanitarian law, Russian warplanes are

striking medical facilities and residential areas in non-ISIL areas where rebel forces are fighting to overthrow the Assad regime while Russia publicly proclaims its aim of eliminating ISIL targets.

I brought a map to the floor here that essentially shows most of Syria, who holds it. If one looks at these red dots here, the Russian planes are mainly bombing in the rebel-held areas, not in the ISIL-held areas. So we see a complex situation that has developed on the ground.

As Putin moves with defiance to maintain the Syrian dictatorship, his actions simply must be checked because it tells us that, in the future, there will be more slaughter with what remains if those moderate forces are not allowed to survive.

Since Russia began airstrikes at the end of September, at least 127 civilians, including 36 children and 34 women, have been killed by Russian airstrikes, according to the opposition Syrian Observatory for Human Rights.

For the sake of liberty in Syria, in Europe, and around the world, America, NATO, the Transatlantic Alliance, and our allies in the Middle East must lead the region to peaceful settlement.

I happen to represent a region in America where Syrian Americans have lived for over a century. I can't even explain to you how they feel about the total destruction of their homeland, its artifacts, and its history. I am not even able to contain it in words here.

They came to see me last week, and they asked if I would read some of their words into the RECORD, which I promised I would do this evening. They want the American people and the world to know:

The biggest killer of civilians in Syria is the Assad regime's use of barrel bombs. Packed with TNT and shrapnel, these dumb bombs have no target and are just dropped from helicopters on civilian neighborhoods. These bombs cause massive destruction and casualties. Thousands upon thousands of children have been killed and injured by these helicopter flights.

And they said to me: Congresswoman, if you can say one thing to the Congress and to those in Washington who can make a difference, please tell them to disrupt and stop these helicopter flyovers. So the barrel bombs aren't coming out of the F-16s obviously flying over Syria, but they are coming from helicopters that the Assad regime is dispatching across that country.

The most important step that can be done to save lives would be the imposition of a no-fly zone. A no-fly zone will turn the tide of war, and bring down the regime of terror and force Assad to negotiate his exit.

We know there is resistance to that, but the world community must meet this latest test in order to secure a better life for the people that remain in Syria, those who may wish to return, and, obviously, the millions that have fled and are in refugee camps throughout that region and now as far as Western Europe.

I would urge the President of our country to consider the appointment of a special envoy without portfolio for Syrian peace to work full-time to bring all relevant nations together to resolve this unfolding tragedy and aim at a civil military strategy for transition and settlement.

I include for the RECORD Anthony Cordesman's writings.

[From the Center for Strategic & International Studies, Oct. 1, 2015]

THE LONG WAR IN SYRIA: THE TREES, THE FOREST, AND ALL THE KING'S MEN

(By Anthony H. Cordesman)

Clichés are clichés, but sometimes it really is hard to see the forest for the trees. In the case of Syria, the "trees" include the UN debate between Obama and Putin over Syria and the fight against Islamic extremism, Russia's sudden military intervention in Syria, the failure of the U.S. training and assist missions in both Syria and Iraq, and the developing scandal in USCENTCOM over exaggerated claims of success for the U.S.-led air campaign in Syria and Iraq.

The most important "tree," however, is trying to negotiate an end to the fighting from the outside, as if Assad was the key issue and as if it would be possible for some diplomatic elite or mix of power brokers to bring Syria back to some state of stability if only Assad would agree to leave and the United States and Russia could agree on how to approach the negotiations.

FOCUSING ON THE TREES WHEN THE FOREST IS BURNING

The problem is that the "forest" is dying, burning, and occupied by four broad sets of fighters that have little reason to cooperate with any UN-led negotiating effort, outside agreement over Assad—with or without U.S. and Russian cooperation.

To shift from one cliché to another, Syria presents far more problems than Humpty Dumpty. "All the king's horses and all the king's men" couldn't put Syria back together by negotiating a solution from the outside even if there was one King instead of a divided mix of the United States, Russia, Iran, Turkey, Iraq, the other states surrounding Syria, the Arabian Gulf states, Egypt, and France and the other interested European powers.

It shouldn't take a child's nursery rhyme to point out the obvious—although it is one whose origins may date back to England's civil wars and first appeared in print shortly after it became fully clear that there was no way English could ever bring the 13 colonies back under its control. To begin with, there is no equivalent of Humpty.

PUTTING FOUR HUMPTYS TOGETHER WITH NO KING AND NO UNITY AMONG THE KING'S MEN

The problem is not simply ISIS or Assad. ISIS is one of the four "Humptys" in a shattered Syria, but ISIS controls only a limited part of Syria's population even in the east. ISIS occupies both parts of Syria and Iraq. It continues to systematically purge any religious and ideological dissent while neither government in Damascus or the government in Baghdad have shown any clear ability to gain support from a major portion of the Sunnis in the area that ISIS controls.

So far, neither the forces of the Syrian or Iraqi government have had much military success against ISIS, and U.S. claims that Iraq has regained some 35% of the territory it lost to ISIS are little more than dishonest spin. They are based on the maximum line of ISIS advance before any fighting took place and before ISIS established any level of governance or control. They include vast areas

of unpopulated desert: areas where no one controls anything because no one is there.

THE KURDS

The second Humpty consists of the Syrian Kurds—who have gone from a partially disenfranchised minority to the equivalent of a mini-state in the north and east of Syria, and have been the only real U.S. military train and assist success. They have no reason to support Assad or any of those who support Assad. They too are divided, and some have ties to Turkish Kurds, some to Iraqi Kurds, some to both, and some are independent.

At the same time, they have no clear economic viability as a state, face growing water problems, and would need to grab a significant part of Syria's limited oil and gas resources in the East to be viable unless they somehow united in a broader Kurdish entity—one that included Turkish and/or Iraqi Kurds and would be likely to create a new set of regional conflicts.

Furthermore, these Administration claims and maps that talk about liberating 35% of the area that ISIS occupied ignore the fact that control of much of the disputed populated areas in Anbar remains undecided, and that it was the Iraqi Kurds which not only recovered much of the lost populated areas that did matter, but grabbed a large additional part of Iraq—including Kirkuk and its oil fields—and created a whole new dimension of the Kurdish problem and its tensions with Iraq's Arab and the Turks while the corrupt government in the Kurdish zone of Iraq has divided and threatened to create a new round of internal power struggles.

THE OTHER SUNNI FIGHTERS

The third Humpty consists of an uncertain coalition of other Sunni fighters. They control—or are fighting for control—in many of the most populated areas in Syria. There are no reliable unclassified estimates of the number, strength, and ideological character of these factions but there are well over 20 groups—and some estimates go well over 30.

Some, like the Al Nusra Front—one of the most successful in military terms—are linked to Al Qaeda. Others are less radical Islamist factions, but are scarcely secular or moderate, also have no ties to the hollow outside efforts to create moderate governments in exile, and are being backed by Arab states like Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and the UAE. The small groups being given limited support with U.S. weapons and Special Forces assistance are at best petty and uncertain players.

This is also a group of fighters that is fighting the pro-Assad forces in what is increasingly becoming a wasteland. The fighting on the ground, Assad's barrel bombs and the threat of poison gas, deliberate isolation and efforts to starve out rebel held areas have created one of them most serious humanitarian disasters in any one country in modern history.

Many of the more than 4 million Syrian refugees that had left Syria lived in the area where this fight takes place. The same is true of the well over 7 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) that no longer have a real home, job, business, or access to key services like health and education.

Many of the more than 250,000 Syrian civilian dead, and at least 500,000 seriously wounded are the product of this fighting—although it is important to note that the UN ceased to be able to make meaningful casualty estimates well over half a year ago, and the estimates of refugees and IDPs have ceased to increase because (a) there no longer is a basis for guesstimating the increase, and (b) many of the remainder are simply too poor to leave.

To go back to cliché number one, this is the area where the forest has now been burning for some four years. This was one of the

most populated and developed parts of Syria. It is an area where Syria's already poor economy probably now has a GDP around 20% of what it was in 2011 and has no clear basis for recovery. It is an area where no top down negotiation between Assad or his backers and any outside faction can begin to put even one Humpty back together again.

THE ASSAD FACTION(S)

The fourth version of Humpty is the group of factions and fighters supporting Assad. It is important to note that this is not a unified group. No one has given most of those in the area Assad control a choice as to who controls them. The majority of the population is Sunni and other non-Alawites. The Alawites are not Shi'ite, and are a gnostic religious group that may have political ties to Iran and the Hezbollah, but Alawites are not Muslims in the normal sense of the term.

There are no reliable data on Syria's population. The CIA estimates, however, that some 17–18 million people remain in Syria, it estimates that 87% are Muslim (official; includes 74% Sunni 74% and 13% that are a mix of Alawi, Ismaili, and Shia). Some 10% are Christian (includes Orthodox, Uniate, and Nestorian), and the final 3% are Druze and some small number of Jews who remain in Damascus and Aleppo).

If one looks at the maps of Syria's sectarian and ethnic divisions before the fighting, they are also distributed into a series of small enclaves, many near the coast. They have no clear "region," and it is far from clear how many of the Sunnis in the regular Syrian forces, the real Shi'ites and other minorities in Syria, or the more secular Sunni businesspersons and civilians would support either Assad or any mix of Assad supporters if they had a choice.

It is also important to note that the World Bank rated the Assad regime as having some of the worst governance in the world before the uprising began in 2011. It was also rated as deeply corrupt. Transparency International rated it as the 159th most corrupt country in the world—out of 175—in 2014. The Arab and UN development reports warned that the younger Assad was no better in moving the country towards real economic development than his father, and that the massive population increase in Syria had created a "youth bulge" for which there were often no real jobs.

The Syrian GDP per capita was at best around \$5,100 even in Purchasing Power Parity P terms in 2011 before the upheavals began—and ranked a dismal 165th in the world. It now may average half that level. Some 33% of the population is 0–14 years of age; 14% is 15–24, and over 500,000 young Syrian men and women now reach job age each year in a country where direct (ignoring disguised) unemployment is estimated to be 33–35%, and the poverty level was well over 12% before the fighting started.

A TIME FOR HONESTY, TRANSPARENCY, AND REALISM

One cannot ignore trees, anymore than one can ignore the forest. The failure of U.S. policy and military efforts, Russian and Iranian support of Assad and major Russian military intervention, and the conflicting ways in which other states intervene will all make things worse. The impact of religious warfare and extremism, and failed Syrian secularism, are even more serious problems.

It is time, however, to stop focusing on either ISIS or Assad, to pretend that Syrian "moderates" are strong enough to either affect the security situation or negotiate for Syria's real fighters, and act as if a shattered nation could be united by some top down negotiation between groups that hate each other and have no competence in dealing with the economic, social, and governance challenges Syria now faces.

The first step in solving a problem is to honestly assess it. No negotiation can work that does not deal with grim realities and divisions created by years of fighting. No amount of U.S. and Russian intervention and argument can bring security or stability. No UN effort at conventional negotiation can survive encounter with reality, and no effort of any kind that does not address the sheer scale of Syrian recovery and reconstruction.

Ms. KAPTUR. Anthony Cordesman, probably one of the most respected thinkers on this subject, ends a very significant analysis of the situation in Syria and greater Europe with this admonition. He tells America: "We face a moment of facing up to honesty, transparency, and realism."

And he tells us, "One cannot ignore trees anymore than one can ignore the forest," related to Syria. "The failure of U.S. policy and military efforts, Russian and Iranian support of Assad and major Russian military intervention, and the conflicting ways in which other states intervene will all make matters worse. The impact of religious warfare and extremism, and failed Syrian secularism, are even more serious problems.

"It is time, however, to stop focusing on either ISIS or Assad, to pretend that Syrian 'moderates' are strong enough to either affect the security situation or negotiate for Syria's real fighters, and act as if a shattered nation could be united by some top-down negotiation between groups that hate each other and have no competence in dealing with the economic, social, and governance challenges Syria now faces.

"The first step in solving a problem is to honestly assess it. No negotiation can work that does not deal with grim realities and divisions created by years of fighting. No amount of U.S. and Russian intervention and argument can bring security or stability. No U.N. effort at conventional negotiation can survive encounter with reality, and no effort of any kind that does not address the sheer scale of Syrian recovery and reconstruction" can work.

I commend his writings to my colleagues and the major studies that have been done this year by the Center for Strategic and International Studies as providing a glimmer of the road that we must walk toward.

I want to just thank my colleagues for the opportunity to place this in the RECORD tonight.

I want to thank the Syrian Americans that live in northern Ohio for their patriotic citizenship and their deep concern about what more the United States of America could do to bring resolution to this deeply troubling conflict in Syria that has precipitated such unrest, not just through that region but, indeed, to all of greater Europe.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

PRESIDENTIAL VETO OF NDAA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMMER of Minnesota). Under the

Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Fifty-three years ago is a long time. In 1962, John F. Kennedy was President. Gas was 28 cents a gallon. The first Walmart opened. The U.S. Navy SEALs were created, and the Cuban Missile Crisis was on everyone's minds.

Now, we have gone through a lot as a nation since then, but one thing has remained constant: the U.S. Congress and the President of the United States have fulfilled one of our primary obligations according to the Constitution of providing for the common defense by passing a National Defense Authorization Act. You may say that Congress hasn't always passed legislation that is needed, but on the National Defense Authorization Act, we have gotten it right. For 53 years in a row now, our Nation's national security needs have been taken care of.

Sadly, that might not be the case this year. The reason? Not because the Representatives of the people did not do their work. It is because the Commander in Chief has chosen to use the military as political pawns to advance his domestic agenda by choosing to veto the NDAA.

Never before in our Nation's history has a President vetoed the National Defense Authorization Act in order to leverage concessions on other areas of government spending. Let me say that again. President Obama's veto stems not from defense policy but, rather, from his desire for more domestic spending unrelated to national defense. This is unprecedented.

Four times during the past 53 years, Presidents have vetoed the NDAA, but it was over specific defense-related provisions in the NDAA itself. Differences were able to be worked out with Congress and concerns quickly addressed so the bill could move forward and our men and women in uniform would have the tools, equipment, and resources they need to keep us safe. Not this year.

Just minutes ago, our President vetoed our Nation's most important bill, which provides for full funding for our military.

Let me share with you what provisions are in this bill and why it is so important. It provides: a 1.3 percent pay raise for our troops; retirement benefits for the 83 percent of our troops who currently see none; the authority for commanders to allow soldiers to

carry guns on base to defend themselves, their colleagues in arms, and their families; vital resources and new tools to combat cyber attacks on our critical infrastructure; restrictions on Guantanamo detainee transfers to address the potential illegality of the President's previous unilateral transfers; 12 new F-18 Super Hornets to be built in my home State of Missouri; \$300 million of assistance in lethal aid so the people of Ukraine can defend themselves; \$330 million in funding for the iron dome missile defense system for Israel; and it directs the deployment of a new advanced ballistic missile defense system to defend against the threat of an Iranian intercontinental ballistic missile.

In short, at home and abroad, the NDAA ensures our military has funding for national defense and overseas operations. These are the selfless individuals who we rely upon for our safety and freedom that we are talking about. And in a strongly bipartisan fashion, Congress has authorized that funding at the exact level that the President requested.

In this unprecedented move, the Commander in Chief is using the very troops he commands as pawns in a very dangerous political game. It is wrong to add to the uncertainty our men and women in uniform face as they stand on the front lines of an increasingly uncertain world.

Let us remember, the President recently made a decision to keep almost 10,000 of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines in Afghanistan. On the heels of such a serious decision, asking them to leave their families and lives on hold for another year or more, how could he justify not signing the bill that provides the pay and benefits for our troops?

I am thankful for my colleagues who stand with me here today to tell you why this is such a critical piece of legislation and why this veto cannot stand. We are here to make sure the men and women who put themselves in harm's way for our freedom are a priority to our Nation and not held hostage to political games.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE), a Navy veteran and currently lieutenant commander in the United States Navy Reserve.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) for all her hard work on these issues.

Just as a point of maybe disagreement, I am no longer in the Navy Reserve. I joined the Oklahoma National Guard, and I will be flying with the Oklahoma Air National Guard.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for hosting this Special Order, and I would like folks to understand really what my friend from Missouri just said.

The President of the United States vetoed the Defense Authorization because he wants more spending for other

domestic programs. This is unprecedented and, quite frankly, it is scary for this country. I am still dumbfounded by it, that you are going to hold defense hostage for a domestic agenda. We don't do that in the United States of America. This President somehow doesn't understand that you don't take the defense of this country hostage for a domestic agenda, and yet that is what he has just done.

I want to share with my colleagues why we do an authorization every year, because the world changes. Things get more dangerous year after year after year.

As a Navy pilot and now as a National Guard pilot, we utilize space. I am on the Strategic Forces Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. We hear all kinds of things about space.

I can tell you, as somebody who has used it, we use space for over-the-horizon communications with our space-based communication architecture. We use it for weather so that we can make sure we can get to the target on time. We use it for intelligence. We use it for missile warning. We use it for a whole host of things: the position, navigation, timing, our GPS satellites, for actually hitting our targets.

Space is critical, yet something has changed drastically in the last few years. The Russians have been launching various things that were not registered with the International Telecommunication Union, the ITU.

□ 1730

What are we discovering that these objects are doing? Well, they are doing very sophisticated co-orbital maneuvers, demonstrating that they can do proximity and rendezvous operations, which means—guess what—ultimately that could be an antisatellite capability.

Friends, if we lose our satellites, we could have even more risk. Imagine your ATM not working. Imagine the food in the grocery store not being there when you go shopping. National security in this country is critically important, and the President is holding it hostage for a different domestic agenda that has absolutely nothing to do with national security. This is absolute craziness.

So what did we do in the NDAA? We plussed up spending on space protection, which is critically important; and we not only plussed up spending on space protection, but we provided authorities, critically necessary authorities so the Department of Defense can actually protect this country in ways that it hasn't had the opportunity to do so before.

For our communications architecture, we are doing Pathfinder programs, and we are purchasing communications in space in ways that we have never done it before. Why? Because we need to distribute the architecture so it complicates the targeting solution for our enemies. We are not doing this

because it is fun or because we like it. We are doing it because it is critical for national security.

When the President of the United States vetoes it, it puts all of us in jeopardy. I want to be clear. This is about the troops, there is no doubt about that, but when we are talking about somebody's ATM working, this is about the security of the United States of America, and the President is holding it hostage for a domestic agenda.

When it comes to the troops, just a few items. We talk about the authorities in the NDAA. Well, those of us who have served understand that there are special pays that we receive: combat pay, hazardous duty pay, bonuses for reenlistments, flight pay for those of us who fly. There are pays that are going to be in jeopardy now that otherwise wouldn't be in jeopardy.

By the way, a lot of these pays are for people who are right now serving this country overseas. Do we not understand that, Mr. President? I should say, Mr. Speaker, the President should understand that.

This is a momentous day in American history and not for good reasons—for tragic reasons.

I would like to thank my colleague from Missouri for hosting this Special Order and giving somebody like me and all these colleagues behind me the opportunity to make sure that America understands what is at stake here. The gentlewoman's leadership on these issues is critical, and America is in jeopardy.

We need to understand what happened today is not the norm. It must not be the norm, and future Presidents must never hold hostage American national security for a domestic agenda.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. BRIDENSTINE for his service to our Nation and his firsthand perspective on how vital this is and what a tragic day it is for our Nation that our Commander in Chief would do this.

Now I would like to turn to another friend and hero to our Nation in many ways, who served both in the Army and the Marine Corps, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN).

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Missouri, VICKY HARTZLER, for her leadership on the Armed Services Committee and on this critical issue.

I rise today in strong support of the National Defense Authorization Act, and I urge my colleagues to override President Obama's veto. This bipartisan bill provides essential pay and benefits to the men and women serving in our military today. Expanded retirement options for our troops, greater protections against sexual assault in the military, and increased cybersecurity defense funding are among some of the most important authorizations included in the NDAA.

For the Sixth Congressional District of Colorado, the NDAA also contains provisions and language that help

Buckley Air Force Base. Buckley not only plays a critical role in our Nation's defense, but it is the largest employer in my district.

Finally, the NDAA also includes language to prevent the transfer of GTMO detainees to U.S. soil. Last week, a delegation from the administration surveyed potential locations for GTMO detainees in Colorado. Along with most Coloradans, I remain adamantly opposed to this move and strongly support the language in the NDAA. There is absolutely no reason to close the Guantanamo Bay detention camp only to finance the incarceration of enemy combatants in the United States.

This legislation is too important to our Nation and to Colorado to become the subject of political games by the White House. Once again, this bill must become law, and I urge my colleagues in the House to override the President's veto.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. COFFMAN made several excellent points, not only about the importance to Colorado, but certainly to our Nation. He raised a very important point that hasn't been brought up yet: how it prevents the transfer of the prisoners at Guantanamo Bay from coming to our soil; and that is what the administration wants to do is to put them in our backyards and our prisons, and we do not support that, and this NDAA prevents that.

Now I would like to turn to another friend and colleague from the Armed Services Committee, Mr. WILSON. He is quite a hero to this Nation in many ways, but certainly having four sons who have served in the military is one of his major contributions. We are so proud of him and his family and his service.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. I thank Congresswoman VICKY HARTZLER for her leadership for military families, and I thank her for referencing my four sons. Of course, I want to give all credit to my wife, Roxanne. She did a great job raising four sons who truly know how important it is to serve our country.

Sadly, President Obama has vetoed this year's National Defense Authorization Act, even though it allocates the same amount of funding as the Department of Defense request that he made himself. The President does not support the bipartisan NDAA because it utilizes wartime funds. Despite utilizing these funds himself, the President accepted this fabrication to veto the NDAA and put servicemembers, military families, and veterans at risk.

On October 3, The Washington Post editorialized: "Refusing to sign this bill would make history, but not in a good way. Mr. Obama should let it become law."

I believe the veto underscores the President's legacy of weakness. This is leading to instability. It is leading to aggression, mass murders, and it is leading to citizens fleeing the violence causing children to drown at sea.

This year's NDAA provides for servicemembers and equips our troops to fight serious threats to American families, like the murderous Islamic State. It supports our allies, like Ukraine and Israel, to defend themselves from aggression. The NDAA establishes meaningful reforms to the Department of Defense acquisition process and creates commonsense improvements to the military retirement system. It fully staffs and resources Cyber Command, which I appreciate as chairman of the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, to protect American families.

American families deserve peace through strength. The National Defense Authorization Act gives our military critical resources to defend us as we constantly face new threats. It is sad for the President to weaken these reforms and funds and put American families at risk.

Fellow Members, I strongly urge you to override the President's veto. As the appreciative son of a World War II Flying Tigers veteran, as a 31-year veteran of the Army myself, and as the grateful father of four sons serving in the military, I know firsthand that your bipartisan vote will help protect and better serve our troops, military families, veterans, and all American families by promoting and ensuring peace through strength.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I really appreciate the gentleman's service to this Nation as a 31-year veteran; but also serving as chairman of the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, he has a unique perspective on the inherent dangers facing our Nation now that our President has vetoed this important bill. I thank him for sharing his insights.

Now I will yield to another member of the Armed Services Committee, but more than that, he is a decorated Navy SEAL, and I look forward to hearing his thoughts on this very important moment in our Nation's history. I turn to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ZINKE).

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to the President's veto and ask my colleagues to override it. I come before this body not only as a Representative of the great State of Montana, but also a former commander of SEAL Team Six and a former deputy- and acting commander of Naval Special Warfare's efforts in the Persian Gulf.

The job of the Commander in Chief is bound by the Constitution to support the troops, to be the leader, and yet this President vetoes a bipartisan bill to defend our country.

I talk not only as a former commander, but also a father. My daughter is a Navy diver, and my son-in-law is an Active-Duty Navy SEAL. My wife watched her daughter, her husband, and her son-in-law all deploy.

I have seen the consequences of war. I am probably the last individual that would advocate for war. I have seen the

consequences and the pain. But when we go to war, the Commander in Chief is obligated to make sure we go to war to win. He has to make sure that our troops have the right training, the right equipment, the right leadership to win decisively on the field of battle. Before this Commander in Chief sends them into harm's way, it is his obligation and duty to make sure that we know the conditions to bring them home.

His actions today are a dereliction of his duty. It affects every soldier, sailor, airman, and marine in harm's way. A veto and the subsequent continuing resolution causes harm to our troops. I call it garrisoning, where our troops don't train, our fleet can't go in and receive the maintenance necessary. Above all, it gives a message to the troops that are in harm's way that their Commander in Chief does not have their back.

This isn't a Republican or Democratic issue. This is an American issue, because it is America's sons and daughters that we put in harm's way. It is the obligation of a great nation to make sure when we do that we give them everything they need to come home safely.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I don't know of a more articulate way to say how important and imperative it is that we override this veto. I thank Mr. ZINKE for sharing his very real and heartfelt and expert thoughts on this issue.

Now I have a friend who is going to share who is passionate about lots of things and competent on many issues, but I tell you, serving on Armed Services Committee with the gentlewoman from Indiana, JACKIE WALORSKI, I can tell you her main passion is for the men and women in uniform, for our national defense.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Indiana.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman and my friend from Missouri, VICKY HARTZLER.

The NDAA, as we have heard tonight, is the largest single authorization bill that Congress considers and one of this body's most significant pieces of legislation and accomplishments this year. This legislation is critical to our national security. It continues to fund the entire national defense of this country.

For 54 years, Republicans and Democrats in both Houses in this body have come together to pass this defense bill. This year was no different. This Congress sent a bipartisan bill to President Obama. Today, though, the President vetoed this defense budget in order to gain leverage for additional increased spending, his demands of spending, a process of a budgetary procedure that is completely unrelated to this bill.

This defense bill helps our men and women in uniform by adjusting pay and retirement benefits. It removes barriers that prevent access to urgent

medical care for members of the armed services while also expanding employment opportunities for those exiting the service. It helps us retain our most experienced servicemembers. It makes those individuals safer by enhancing and improving military training and modernizing our resources and programs.

Lastly, this bill provides very real authorities, such as the ability to protect Americans by keeping terrorists secured in the detention facility known as GTMO, or Guantanamo Bay. For 54 years, this defense bill has transited party lines and Washington dysfunction. As a candidate, President Obama promised to do the same. But with this veto, he has threatened to end this staple of bipartisanship in this Chamber.

Our servicemen and -women put their lives on the line every day. The least we can do is offer them the security of knowing that they can provide for their families and plan for their own futures.

□ 1745

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank the gentlewoman. I appreciate that.

Next we have another member of the Armed Services Committee, who is a decorated Army commander, who led soldiers in Iraq, and whose unit was responsible for finding Saddam Hussein, to share his thoughts on this day when the President has vetoed the NDAA and why it is so important that we override this veto.

I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL).

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for all of her hard work on the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I served my country 21 years in the Infantry in the United States Army and have deployed operationally to Kosovo, Kuwait, Afghanistan and Iraq.

As a combat Infantry veteran, I know firsthand the hardships and dangers that our warriors face. The question that we have to ask is: Why has the President increased the hardship and danger to our troops? Has he forgotten that we have troops in the field that are still fighting?

Has he forgotten that he has committed to contingency operations that created new hardships, new deployments, unscheduled training, unscheduled maintenance? And now, after asking them to turn everything on their heads, he is not even going to support it.

A Presidential veto blocks needed funds for our ongoing combat operations and for our emergency operations and contingencies.

The President claims that we need to do this right; yet, he has created the foreign policy mess that has required our troops to deploy on contingencies and then has asked this body to get additional Congressional authorization for those efforts. And now he adds to their burden.

The veto eliminates crucial planning time just for normal peacetime operations in training from 3 to 6 months, forcing the military to waste millions of dollars as they play a catch-up game, usually in the spring, by having to deal with such efforts to try to make up for lost time.

The veto reduces certainty in our overall national security posture. The veto also blocks a revised retirement program benefiting 83 percent of our warriors that are not currently covered, and it denies expanded access to health care and blocks access to needed drugs.

It continues to leave our warriors defenseless at recruiting stations, camps, posts, and bases by denying their ability to carry firearms in their defense against terror threats.

The veto also blocks a mediocre pay raise that the President himself already reduced by 1 percent, and now they will not even get that pathetic 1 percent pay raise, 1.3 percent.

Mr. Speaker, a Presidential veto makes one thing crystal clear: Nothing is too good for our troops and nothing is what he is going to give them. That is why we will fight to overturn this veto, so that he can hear the people of the United States and our constitutional requirement to defend this republic.

We will overturn this veto, and we ask, Mr. Speaker, that the Nation join us in this fight.

I thank the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I couldn't agree more with the gentleman. Thank you for your leadership, service to our country, and your call for the American people to join us and come alongside us as we fight for the defense of our Nation and for the men and women in uniform.

The thing that I feel is so important tonight is that the American people and everyone here in the House has had an opportunity to hear from people who not only care about their Nation, who are today's patriots, but many of them who have either served themselves on the front line and who have experienced danger and put themselves in harm's way because of it or they have family members that they are supporting in that line of duty.

Our next speaker I want to turn to is certainly one of those, not only a colleague on the Armed Services Committee, but a father who has three sons who are serving in the military, and he knows firsthand the dangers, the sacrifice, and how important this NDAA is to our Nation.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT).

Mr. NUGENT. Congresswoman HARTZLER, I really appreciate you taking the time to do this today on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, it is an outrage that the President would veto, as the Commander in Chief of our military in general.

Think about this. I have three sons that have served in the military, that currently serve in United States Army, that have served in Iraq and Afghanistan, that have done trips to Haiti to help during reconstruction as it related to an earthquake.

The President of the United States has made them political pawns.

One of the things that my wife and I felt when they were deployed to Iraq or Afghanistan was that they were the best equipped, best led, best trained troops on the face of the earth. By vetoing the National Defense Authorization Act, we are putting a dagger in the heart of what we are supposed to be holding up.

The Constitution of the United States says that this Congress has the obligation to stand up an Army, to stand up a Navy, to support the President of the United States and the actions that we must take to protect this Nation.

The actions today are strictly a political action when you do a press conference to hold up the fact that he vetoed the National Defense Authorization Act.

You have heard so many members here today talk about the things that this act did or does. And so I call upon all of our friends across the aisle. Democrats, unite with us to overturn this veto because we live in the most dangerous of times.

Go back in time. I can't think of a time—I don't know if you can—where it has been more dangerous in regards to a resurgent Russia, to China, to Iran, to North Korea, to all of the non-state actors out there that are threatening this Nation and our friends and allies around the world.

This is not the time to play political brinksmanship with our military. This is a time to hold them up, lift them up, and let them do their job and know that their Commander in Chief has their back.

I truly do appreciate, Mrs. HARTZLER, your doing this.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, Mr. NUGENT. I just thought it was so important that you shared, as a parent. I have heard you say this before in committee, that, as a parent, it is vital for you and your wife to know that you are sending the best equipped, best trained force possible over into harm's way so, when you send your sons, you know that they are going to be able to come back safe.

Mr. NUGENT. People forget that there is actually flesh and blood, parents and children, of those young men and women that are serving this country. They forget there are real people in those uniforms. And so that is why this is so important.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Absolutely. And what message is that sending to them right now? Thank you.

Now I would like to turn to Representative DOUG LAMBORN, my friend from Colorado, who has the privilege and does such a great job representing

one of the most military-intense districts in the country. I had the opportunity to visit the Air Force Academy around Memorial Day. I appreciate your leadership on this issue.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) for whatever he would like to share.

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, today's veto from the President breaks dangerous new ground for callous disregard for the needs of our men and women in uniform.

While he worked so hard to make sure that the Iranian military had the funding they needed via his disastrous nuclear deal, today he chose to willfully disregard the needs of our own military to make a political point with his veto.

The Presidency has sunk to a new low today. For the first time in history, an American President has vetoed a defense bill because of issues that the bill itself cannot possibly address.

Most of us here in Congress agree that defending our Nation is the first and most important priority, a sacred constitutional duty we have to protect the American people and to keep us safe in an increasingly dangerous world.

Tragically, President Obama is willing to hold defense hostage to try to get more money for agencies like the IRS and the EPA, all of this while we remain at war with extremist groups like al Qaeda and ISIS that want to attack America, all of this while we still are having troops killed overseas, including some from Colorado.

This is pretty simple, really. This administration wants to cut our military and increase spending almost everywhere else. Our troops have already endured massive cuts similar in size to the Clinton drawdown in the nineties, although this time global threats are rising, not falling.

On top of all this, the President wants to send Guantanamo detainees to U.S. soil, including to my own district in Colorado, and is also issuing his veto for this reason.

Look, terrorists will find a reason to hate us no matter what happens in Guantanamo.

I ask my colleagues: Are we willing to let this happen on our watch?

To my fellow Republicans who are rightly concerned about out-of-control Federal spending and an out-of-control Federal debt, please hear me when I say we are working on real reform and real accountability for the large defense budget.

But please also hear me when I say that defense is simply not the driver of our debt, especially over the long term. Defense spending ensures and protects our way of life.

I strongly urge my colleagues to do the right thing for our military and the right thing for America: override Presi-

dent Obama's reckless and truly dangerous veto.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank the gentleman so much because he raises a very good point as far as spending goes in that this bill, the NDAA, provides the exact amount of funding for our defense that the President requested.

Mr. LAMBORN. Down to the penny.

Mrs. HARTZLER. We worked hard to come up with that, but we made sure that our troops had the funding they need. And, yet, as the Commander in Chief, he requested \$612 billion. We gave him \$612 billion in this bill, and then he vetoes it.

Mr. LAMBORN. It makes no sense. It is dangerous, and he is doing it for political reasons that can't be solved in this bill.

Mrs. HARTZLER. You are exactly right. Thank you for your comments.

Now I have a gentleman from Georgia that I have been privileged to be elected with in 2010 and serve alongside in both Agriculture Committee and Armed Services. I believe he is one of the most hardworking members on Armed Services.

If you are his constituent, I want you to know he is at every hearing. He does his homework. And I appreciate him coming out tonight to share his thoughts on the NDAA.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. I want to thank you, Mrs. HARTZLER, for what you have done here.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for the opportunity to discuss what has happened here today. As we talked earlier today, I honestly thought there was a chance that we wouldn't be here speaking about this. I thought that maybe this one time our Commander in Chief would do what was right.

I hope you will take an opportunity to look at the news. I am looking at it right now.

Obama to hold photo op to veto defense bill. Obama plans to hold a photo op in the Oval Office when he uses his veto pen on the National Defense Authorization Act, according to his public schedule.

Ladies and gentlemen, when I am around the District, I hear a lot of complaints: Why can't Congress just work together? Why can't you get along?

The National Defense Authorization Act came out of the Armed Services Committee 60-2, 60-2. There was one Democrat and one Republican that voted against the bill; 60-2.

It came through the House. A significant majority voted for the National Defense Authorization bill on the floor. It passed out of the Senate with over 70 votes.

When I am talking to Americans, I have used this as an example of how not everything you see in the press is true, that there are issues like national security that the Democrats and the Republicans in Washington, D.C., absolutely take very seriously, and when it

comes to the well-being of our men and women that serve the country and their families and making sure that they have the training and the equipment that they need, that this is an example of how we are able to put partisanship aside and work in the best interest of everybody in the country, most especially those that serve so honorably.

And the President held a photo op to veto the bill.

I want to thank my fellow colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, for their work on this bill. Certainly I supported it. I continue to support it.

I think one of the things that continues to be mentioned and needs to be mentioned over and over and over again is the President got the total of what he asked for with regard to the authorization of the funds for carrying out the fight against ISIL, for the operations of the military.

There were a couple of things in it that he didn't like. One the them was the transfer of terrorists out of Guantanamo Bay.

□ 1800

Now, I would just ask that you think about the fact that, since the first NDAA 50 years ago, it has only been vetoed four times. In each instance, there was an agreement effectively prior to the veto on how to resolve it.

But not this guy, not this guy. He holds a photo op. He holds a photo op so that he can show off while he vetoes the National Defense Authorization Act.

I just hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will join us as we work to override the President's veto in the House. I honestly believe that we will get the votes in the House to do that.

I hope that the Members of the Senate who voted for the National Defense Authorization Act will vote for it again when they have the opportunity to do so after we send the bill over there, after we have overridden the President's veto with this piece of legislation in the House.

Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to apologize. If the President won't do it, I want to do it. What happened today I think will long be looked upon as one of the worst moments of American leadership.

With that, Mrs. HARTZLER, I thank you again for what you have done for the men and women who serve and your service in this House.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank the gentleman.

I think it is so important to remember that national defense is not a partisan issue. It is a constitutional duty. It is a constitutional privilege that we have, as elected officials in this country, to provide for the common defense.

The bill did pass overwhelmingly with bipartisan support in the House, in the committee, and over in the Senate. I am hopeful as well that we will

be able to continue to join together to override this veto.

My friend from Georgia also made the comment and the sad news about the photo op that the President did today as he vetoed this piece of legislation.

I wonder, where is the photo op with the soldiers right now fighting in Afghanistan and some of them, sadly, who have died lately? Where is the recognition for them? Where is the photo op with the sorties that are being flown and our pilots that are going into harm's way to take on ISIS right now? Where is the photo op with all the military families that are sacrificing?

It is truly shameful, I think, that this occurred. I stand alongside with those who are fighting for the people of this country to keep them safe.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON), another friend who is a champion of this, who is a decorated Army commander, proudly serves on the Armed Services Committee and does a wonderful job.

Mr. GIBSON. Thank you. I really want to express my gratitude to the gentlewoman. I thank her for leading tonight, putting this together.

I also want to thank my colleagues that came out tonight to share their views and share their experiences.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very critical topic we are talking about here today. The first function of government is to protect its people.

Mr. Speaker, every single one of our service chiefs are on record, under oath in sworn testimony, saying that, if they do not get the additional resources that are provided in parts of this bill, that they will not be able to execute the national security strategy, that it will break our military.

Mr. Speaker, this is at a time that we have Russian tanks in Syria. We have got a significant challenge from the Islamic State. We have got major issues with Iran. We are dealing with a very aggressive Putin in Eastern Europe. We have got a quixotic leader in North Korea and an ambiguous situation in China.

Now is not the time to be taking a knee on our national security strategy. Now is not the time to be breaking our military.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure it is clear just how partisan the President's actions are. The American people need to know just how partisan this action is.

This process, our national security policy bill, is collaborative.

In our committee, in the House Armed Services Committee, we hold hearings. It is fully collaborative. Both sides—Republicans and Democrats—get to come together, work on the issues, bring forward the questions, collaborate in that whole process of the hearing.

Then we have a markup. We have a markup at the committee level. This markup lasts for, in some cases, over 12 hours. Every single person in that com-

mittee, regardless of party, is able to bring forward their ideas, to speak for their people, to offer their amendments, to have debate, and to have a vote on those amendments.

As the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) mentioned, at the culmination of that process in the House Armed Services Committee, the vote in our committee was 60-2, a strong vote, a bipartisan vote. The representatives of the people of the United States voted to support our servicemen and -women and their families.

The vote that was taken here on the floor of the House was a strong, bipartisan vote. Our colleagues over in the Senate, as was mentioned—the vote on the conference was 70-27. Three individuals who are running for President of the United States who were not present expressed support for it. Seventy-three votes, almost three-quarters of the United States Senate, represented the will of those respective States that they were here to represent. It was a strong, bipartisan vote.

We have a supermajority supporting this bill for our servicemen and -women and their families.

The President of the United States, despite all that, vetoed this bill when it is so clear that every single one of our service chiefs have said that they need these additional resources or we will not be able to execute the national security strategy.

Mr. Speaker, this is also very personal for me. I enlisted at the age of 17 as a private in the Infantry back in 1981. In my early years in the military, I was part of an effort to try to increase the readiness of our Armed Forces, and I saw those efforts working. I saw us continuing to build capability throughout the eighties and standing on the principle of peace through strength.

We won the cold war without a major conflict. We put ourselves in the position, when we had conflict in 1990 in the Persian Gulf war, that we had a military with overmatch so that we were able to prevail in that conflict with as few casualties as was possible.

Mr. Speaker, over time, in the 29 years that I served in the military, the other important facet of peace through strength is it forged trust with those who were willing to come forward and defend this Nation, trust that their leaders here in Washington, D.C.—regardless of party—would always have their back, would ensure the resources necessary so that they could be fully equipped and trained, would be there for them, that their pay and benefits would always be there for them, and that, when they deployed forward, that the programs would be there to support their families.

Mr. Speaker, that trust was really called into question today by our President, who, in a very partisan manner, vetoed an overwhelmingly bipartisan piece of legislation. I can't even begin to tell you how disappointed I am.

Mr. Speaker, we will fight this. We are working now with our colleagues. We feel like we are in a strong position in the Senate to override this. We have more work to do here in the United States House. That work is ongoing. We need to enact this bill.

Let me just end where I began and thank the gentlewoman for her leadership. I thank her for coming forward today to organize this, to really inspire us to come together to express so that the American people can know what happened today and how their representatives, in a bipartisan way, will rise to this challenge and make sure that we get this important national security policy bill into law.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank the gentleman for his service and for sharing how important it is, how vital it is, that we override this veto and do what is right for our troops and for America.

The last speaker is the newly elected gentleman from California who I have really enjoyed getting to know and is a privilege to serve with on the Armed Services Committee.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT).

Mr. KNIGHT. I thank Congresswoman HARTZLER for her leadership in this role. This is of vital importance.

I want to start this discussion with just a little bit of reference. When I got elected 9 months ago, everyone said: You have to go to Congress. You have to get some things done. You have to work across the aisle. You have to build some friendships. You have to do these things.

I think in the one committee that I sit on, Armed Services, we do that. We talk about the military. We talk about what is best for it, what is best for America, what is best for the readiness, and what are the programs and the projects and the arms and the things that we are going to do to make sure that our men and women are the best prepared to go into battle, if called upon.

But today I think we saw a little bit of politics, and maybe we have seen that for the last week or more. But political football shouldn't happen around the military. We should be able to hammer these things out.

As you heard from some of the speakers before, this has been vetoed four times, and every time it has been basically an issue that has then been worked out. We have come back, we have taken care of that issue, and it has gone forward.

So for 53 years, the NDAA has worked like it is supposed to: put the military first, put America first, and move forward through the disagreements.

But as you have heard—and we heard this in the discussion with part of the NDAA—that this was going to be vetoed. The President was forecasting maybe he would veto this.

Well, this wasn't a secret operation we were doing. The NDAA was out in the open. I don't know of a chairman

that is better than the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services at working across the aisle, working with the issues, and trying to get everything done before we get to a problem like this, including working with the White House. That is exactly what happened.

But I would disagree with some of the speakers that came before me when they said that the President came out and he brought his pen and he did a photo op. This was forecasted that it was going to be done today, today.

Is there something that is happening today that is going to take up all the news, that is going to be in all of the papers tomorrow, that is going to be on Twitter? That is right. The Benghazi hearing is happening right now, and it has been happening for hours.

During this veto, the Benghazi hearing was happening. I just went on Twitter. There are 200 times more Twitter feeds on Benghazi than the NDAA veto.

In politics, we would call that cover. We would call that: You know what? I have to do something bad; so, I had better do it when they are not looking at me. That is exactly what happened today.

Let's talk about the NDAA a little bit. Yes, we have had some disagreements, and we have figured them out: 60-2 in the House. How do you get something done when you get such a bipartisan vote? Well, you sit there for 20 hours and you work through a chairman and you get the issues worked out.

\$612 billion was asked for. \$612 billion was given. A 1.3 percent pay raise from the President's budget, a 1.3 percent pay raise to our military, that was done.

In July, we lost four Marines to a tragic incident in Tennessee. When I went home, many people said: What are you going to do about this? Can you change something? Shouldn't they be armed? Shouldn't something happen?

That is in the NDAA. Now we give post commanders the appropriate ability to arm our recruiting and our reserve centers.

But let's go a little further. This allows our friends and enemies to know what is happening in America. Now, today they say: Is something happening in America that is weak? Because for 53 years, it has been the military first, America first. We are going to be strong. And today I have got to believe that our friends and enemies might be scratching their head and saying: What is happening in America?

That is not something we ever want. We want our friends to know that we are going to be shoulder to shoulder with them, and we want our enemies to know that we are as strong as we possibly can be.

I am going to finish thanking the gentlewoman from Missouri. We have a kindredship. In my district, we tested and built every B-2. In her district, she houses the B-2 Spirit that sends them off to do difficult deals, difficult sorties. I am very proud of what the B-2 does, just as I am proud of every man

and woman in the military and every mission that they complete.

□ 1815

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to stand with the military, then let's stand with the military. If we are going to turn our back and say that this is not what we believe, then that is not what I want to be part of. I think we should work as hard as we possibly can to override this veto. That is the mission. That is the vision.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, gentleman. I share that vision and look forward to working alongside you to do the right thing for the American people.

I think you brought up many good points, but certainly the situation now under this Commander in Chief is that we have a situation where our allies don't trust us and our enemies don't fear us. This action today can't help but contribute further to that thinking. We have got to reverse this. America is strong when it is safe, and it is safe because it is strong.

We have heard this evening, Mr. Speaker, from many people who are experts on this issue. Not only do they care about it passionately, but they themselves have put on the uniform and made the sacrifices. They have left families to serve their country, and they know what it is like, what our troops are facing and what potential dangers we can be in by jeopardizing their security by not providing for them and passing a National Defense Authorization Act. We have heard from other colleagues here who are parents and who have children who have answered the call and signed up to serve their country and gone into harm's way, some of them who are there right now.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard how distressing it is for our troops to hear today—no matter where they are, whether they are in Afghanistan, Iraq, whether they are in the Pacific or they are in the jungles of Africa, or whether they are advising as we look and see what is going on with Ukraine and the President, and whether they are monitoring intelligence around the world, cyber threats and cyber attacks—when they turn on their TV tonight, to find out that their Commander in Chief has vetoed the bill that would provide for the resources that they need to carry out their mission, to find out that it is not done because of some specific provisions in the bill, unlike a few times in the past 53 years where we have passed this, but because the President wants to advance a domestic agenda that has nothing to do with providing for our common defense. It is wrong and it is disheartening.

Just a reminder of the things in this bill, the reasons it is so important. It provides: \$612 billion for our national defense, the exact amount of money that the President requested; a pay raise for our hardworking troops; retirement benefits for those that don't

have it now; the authority of commanders, like Representative KNIGHT shared, to be able to make a policy to allow the soldiers on their installation to be able to defend themselves and carry guns so hopefully we won't see the senseless tragedy again; to restrict allowing Guantanamo Bay detainees—terrorists, basically—to be brought here to America and put into our jails in our backyard; and to support our allies, whether it be the Iron Dome for Israel that has been so helpful in saving countless thousands of lives in Israel in the last few years, but also to provide funding for those fighting for freedom in Ukraine, allowing them to protect themselves.

Other speakers talked about space protections, protections against sexual assault in the military, preventing the transfers, supports our allies, some of the things I have said, acquisition reform. We did everything we could in this bill to help make the Pentagon more efficient and more effective to save money, and we will continue to do that.

We also heard about the dangers and how, with the President's veto, it is going to eliminate critical training time, and parents are going to be able to question whether their child is going to be safe when they send them to war.

Mr. Speaker, we can't allow this veto to stand. If the Commander in Chief is going to forsake his most fundamental duties, then the people of the House, the representatives of the people of America, will and are going to do everything possible to override this veto and to make sure that those in harm's way have what they need, that we don't jeopardize our national defense, and that we continue to have our priorities right as a nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to come on the House floor tonight and to share about this very, very important issue and this very historic day, and to also lay the groundwork for November 5, when we will vote for an override of this veto. I ask all my colleagues to support that, and I look forward to a positive vote.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded not to engage in personalities toward the President.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 22, 2015.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 22, 2015 at 3:09 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 799.
With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. KELLY of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for October 20 through 23 on account of family medical issues.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISIONS TO THE AGGREGATES AND ALLOCATIONS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2016 BUDGET RESOLUTION RELATED TO LEGISLATION REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, October 22, 2015.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER, I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record revisions to the budget allocations and aggregates of the Fiscal Year 2016 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget, S. Con. Res. 11. Section 2002(b)(3) of S. Con. Res. 11 permits the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget to make adjustments to the budget resolution levels for a reconciliation measure upon the determination that it complies with its reconciliation instructions. The Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015 complies with the instructions set forth in section 2002 of S. Con. Res. 11 as determined under section 310(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The adjustments are set forth in the attached tables.

This revision represents an adjustment for purposes of budgetary enforcement. These revised allocations and aggregates are to be considered as the aggregates and allocations included in the budget resolution, pursuant to S. Con. Res. 11, as adjusted. Pursuant to section 3403 of such concurrent resolution, this revision to the allocations and aggregates shall apply only while H.R. 3762 is under consideration or upon its enactment.

Sincerely,

TOM PRICE, M.D.,
Chairman,
Committee on the Budget.

TABLE 1.—REVISION TO ON-BUDGET AGGREGATES
(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal Year	
	2016	2016–2025
Current Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,040,743	1
Outlays	3,092,541	1
Revenues	2,675,967	32,233,099
Adjustment for H.R. 3762, Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015:		
Budget Authority	-9,700	1
Outlays	-9,100	1
Revenues	-12,700	-197,900
Revised Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,031,043	1
Outlays	3,083,441	1
Revenues	2,663,267	32,035,199

¹ Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2017–2025 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

TABLE 2.—REVISION TO COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS, AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS
(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

House Committee on Ways and Means	2016		2016–2025 Total	
	Budget Authority	Outlays	Budget Authority	Outlays
Current Allocation	963,250	962,255	13,218,695	13,217,578
Adjustment for H.R. 3762, Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015	-8,700	-8,700	-268,000	-268,000
Revised Allocation:	954,550	953,555	12,950,695	12,949,578

TABLE 3.—REVISION TO COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS, AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS
(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

House Committee on Energy and Commerce	2016		2016–2025 Total	
	Budget Authority	Outlays	Budget Authority	Outlays
Current Allocation	389,635	392,001	4,341,991	4,346,043
Adjustment for H.R. 3762, Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015	-1,000	-300	-15,200	-12,400
Revised Allocation	388,635	391,701	4,326,791	4,333,643

TABLE 4.—REVISION TO COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS, AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS
(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

House Committee on Education & the Workforce	2016		2016–2025 Total	
	Budget Authority	Outlays	Budget Authority	Outlays
Current Allocation	-14,389	-11,569	-208,805	-203,704
Adjustment for H.R. 3762, Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015	0	0	4,300	4,300
Revised Allocation	-14,389	-11,569	-204,505	-199,404

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 322. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 16105 Swingley Ridge Road in Chesterfield, Missouri, as the "Sgt. Zachary M. Fisher Post Office".

H.R. 323. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 55 Grasso Plaza in St. Louis, Missouri, as the "Sgt. Amanda N. Pinson Post Office".

H.R. 324. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11662 Gravois Road in St. Louis, Missouri, as the "Lt. Daniel P. Riordan Post Office".

H.R. 558. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 55 South Pioneer Boulevard in Springboro, Ohio, as the "Richard 'Dick' Chenault Post Office Building".

H.R. 1442. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 90 Cornell Street in Kingston, New York, as the "Staff Sergeant Robert H. Dietz Post Office Building".

H.R. 1884. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 206 West Commercial Street in East Rochester, New York, as the "Officer Daryl R. Pierson Memorial Post Office Building".

H.R. 3059. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4500 SE 28th Street, Del City, Oklahoma, as the James Robert Kalsu Post Office Building.

H.R. 3116. An act to extend by 15 years the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to conduct the quarterly financial report program.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1362. An act to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify waiver authority regarding programs of all inclusive care for the elderly (PACE programs).

S. 2162. An act to establish a 10-year term for the service of the Librarian of Congress.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on October 21, 2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 1735. To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, further reported that on October 22,

2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 3116. To extend by 15 years the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to conduct the quarterly financial report program.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 23, 2015, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3229. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Insular Areas, Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft bill to permit the use of resettlement and relocation funds provided to the people of Bikini to be used within or outside the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3230. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Insular Areas, Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft bill to improve air service capabilities in American Samoa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1090. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide protections for retail customers, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-304, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2583. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for greater transparency and efficiency in the procedures followed by the Federal Communications Commission, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-305). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Education and the Workforce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1090 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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. ROTHFUS (for himself, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3797. A bill to establish the bases by which the Administrator of the Environ-

mental Protection Agency shall issue, implement, and enforce certain emission limitations and allocations for existing electric utility steam generating units that convert coal refuse into energy; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 3798. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to permit private persons to compel the Securities and Exchange Commission to seek legal or equitable remedies in a civil action, instead of an administrative proceeding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. STEWART):

H.R. 3799. A bill to provide that silencers be treated the same as long guns; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VELA, Mr. YOHO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 3800. A bill to amend section 9A of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require that local school wellness policies include a requirement that students receive 50 hours of school nutrition education per school year; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. BASS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LEE, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ):

H.R. 3801. A bill to redesignate the Federal building located at 935 Pennsylvania Avenue Northwest in the District of Columbia as the "Federal Bureau of Investigation Building"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BABIN (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. GOSAR, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. ZINKE, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3802. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for the disposition, within 60 days, of an application to exempt a projectile from classification as armor piercing ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. RIBBLE):

H.R. 3803. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to establish joint resolutions on the budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of

such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRAT:

H.R. 3804. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide that any estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office or the Joint Committee on Taxation shall include costs relating to servicing the public debt, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LONG, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. OLSON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 3805. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide for the inclusion of broadband conduit installation in certain highway construction projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER (for herself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 3806. A bill to establish certain requirements with respect to pollock and golden king crab; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. LEE, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BEYER, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. COSTA, Ms. MOORE, Mr. TAKAI, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 3807. A bill to provide a process for ensuring the United States does not default on its obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 3808. A bill to require the withdrawal and study of the Federal Housing Finance Agency's proposed rule on Federal Home Loan Bank membership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3809. A bill to establish a pilot program in certain agencies for the use of public-private agreements to enhance the efficiency of Federal real property; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 3810. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, and SAFETEA-LU to direct the Secretary of Transportation to give preference to certain surface transportation

projects that achieve cost efficiencies through the use of project development, finance, operations, and delivery methods, such as design-build, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 3811. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the disclosure of the total number of a company's domestic and foreign employees; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 3812. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the identification of corporate tax haven countries and increased penalties for tax evasion practices in haven countries that ship United States jobs overseas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Ms. MOORE (for herself, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Ms. EDWARDS):

H.R. 3813. A bill to establish a grant program to encourage States to adopt certain policies and procedures relating to the transfer and possession of firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 3814. A bill to permit aliens seeking asylum to be eligible for employment in the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself, Mr. MESSER, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. GROTHMAN):

H.J. Res. 70. A joint resolution disapproving a rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. KLINE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. WALZ):

H. Res. 486. A resolution congratulating the Minnesota Lynx women's basketball team on winning the 2015 Women's National Basketball Association Championship; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas (for herself and Mr. NEAL):

H. Res. 487. A resolution recognizing the importance of cancer program accreditation in ensuring comprehensive, high quality, patient-centered cancer care; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. STEFANIK):

H. Res. 488. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Retirement Security Week, including raising public awareness of the various tax-preferred retirement vehicles, increasing personal financial literacy, and engaging the people of the United States on the keys to success in achieving and maintaining retirement security throughout their lifetimes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. ROTHFUS:

H.R. 3797.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, "[t]o regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes . . ."

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 3798.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (The Congress shall have Power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States and within the Indian Tribes") and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (The Congress shall have Power "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof").

Additional authority derives from Article III, Section 1 ("The judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their Offices during good Behaviour, and shall, at stated Times, receive for their Services, a Compensation, which shall not be diminished during their Continuance in Office.) Additional authority also derives from Article III, Section 2, Clause 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 3799.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1—"The Congress shall have the Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3800.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution 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. COHEN:

H.R. 3801.

At 121 Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 8

By Mr. BABIN:

H.R. 3802.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment II:

A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 3803.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BRAT:

H.R. 3804.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has explicit and implicit powers to spend, to raise revenue, and to borrow throughout Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution. Coherent management of fiscal

powers requires a complete assessment of the effects of proposed legislation, so it is both necessary and proper for the estimating agencies to inform Congress of total fiscal impacts.

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 3805.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER:

H.R. 3806.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 3807.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 3808.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the explicit power of Congress to regulate commerce in and among the states, as enumerate in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause, of the United States Constitution.

Additionally, Article 1, Section 7, Clause 2 of the Constitution allows for every bill passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate and signed by the President to be codified into law; and therefore implicitly allows Congress to amend any bill that has been passed by both chambers and signed into law by the President.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3809.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 3810.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 3811.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 3812.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 3813.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8.

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 3814.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section I, Article 8

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

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.J. Res. 70.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

- H.R. 167: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 303: Mr. MICA, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 430: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 592: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 662: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 721: Mr. PITTS and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 766: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 799: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 829: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 842: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 845: Mr. LOUDERMILK.
H.R. 846: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 863: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 865: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 882: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 885: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 921: Mr. DOLD.
H.R. 932: Mr. MURPHY of Florida and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 953: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 985: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 1090: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. PITTINGER, and Mr. DUFFY.
H.R. 1145: Mr. ASHFORD and Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 1192: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 1217: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 1221: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 1233: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri and Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 1247: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 1248: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 1258: Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 1284: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 1288: Mr. PAULSEN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 1309: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 1343: Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. NORCROSS, and Mr. DONOVAN.
H.R. 1439: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. GALLEGRO, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1450: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1475: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 1594: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 1595: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 1604: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 1614: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 1625: Mr. POLIS and Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 1688: Mr. NORCROSS and Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 1728: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 1737: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. HOLDING.
H.R. 1763: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 1901: Mr. RUSSELL.
H.R. 1902: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 1982: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 2003: Mr. BERA.
H.R. 2043: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 2083: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 2114: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 2142: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 2205: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 2254: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2293: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 2342: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 2350: Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 2355: Mrs. TORRES.
H.R. 2450: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2460: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2493: Ms. GABBARD and Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 2495: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 2515: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2520: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 2546: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 2646: Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 2657: Mr. DOLD and Mrs. LOVE.
H.R. 2660: Ms. NORTON and Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 2726: Ms. GRAHAM.
H.R. 2733: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 2737: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 2789: Mr. HOLDING.
H.R. 2826: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 2858: Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 2894: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 2903: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2917: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 2948: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 2972: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2980: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 3016: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 3033: Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 3071: Mr. COHEN, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 3074: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. MICA.
H.R. 3090: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 3091: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 3092: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 3119: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 3137: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 3222: Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 3225: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 3229: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 3268: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 3286: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 3287: Mr. HOLDING.
H.R. 3314: Mr. SALMON and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 3326: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi and Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 3337: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 3338: Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 3339: Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 3384: Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 3390: Mr. ASHFORD.
H.R. 3406: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 3407: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 3445: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3455: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. ADAMS.
H.R. 3466: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 3471: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 3473: Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 3477: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 3488: Mr. RATCLIFFE and Mr. LOUDERMILK.
H.R. 3516: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 3537: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 3547: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 3579: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 3582: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3588: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 3590: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 3629: Mr. COHEN, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3636: Mr. HOLDING.
H.R. 3637: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 3638: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 3643: Mr. VELA.
H.R. 3656: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 3664: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 3690: Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. TAKAL.
H.R. 3696: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BEYER, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. ESTY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. NADLER, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 3700: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 3706: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 3729: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 3741: Mr. PETERS and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 3746: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 3764: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 3779: Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 3785: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SIREN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. VELA, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. FARR, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. BEYER, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CUELLAR, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 3788: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California and Ms. LEE.
H.J. Res. 48: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois and Ms. LEE.
H.J. Res. 51: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi and Mr. LAHOOD.
H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. GUINTA, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. BOUSTANY.
H. Con. Res. 62: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H. Res. 110: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H. Res. 145: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. DEUTCH.
H. Res. 210: Mr. POE of Texas.
H. Res. 276: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H. Res. 293: Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. BASS, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H. Res. 371: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. SARBANES.
H. Res. 394: Mr. HASTINGS.
H. Res. 416: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. NUNES, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H. Res. 423: Mr. HUDSON.
H. Res. 428: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Ms. MENG.
H. Res. 459: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H. Res. 467: Mr. SERRANO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. TSONGAS.
H. Res. 469: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 22, 2015

No. 155

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today's prayer will be offered by the Reverend Kathryn Pocalyko, Pastor of the Lutheran Church of Our Saviour in North Chesterfield, VA.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God most mighty, O God most merciful, O God our strength and our song, You call these leaders to serve the public, promote justice, and establish peace in our land. We lift before You all who govern and serve our Nation through this body, its Senators, its staff, and its pages. Bless Members with collaboration in this Holy experiment. Give to those whom we entrust with authority the spirit of wisdom and understanding. Guide them with the spirit of counsel and insight. Grant them a spirit of knowledge. Grace them with Your presence. For You show us a vision of a tree whose leaves are for the healing of the Nation. May that tree take root here, bearing fruit in the hearts and work of these servants.

We pray this through 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.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The majority leader is recognized.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, President Obama regularly calls on Republicans and Democrats to work together to advance the priorities of our Nation, and we certainly agree.

Our top priority is our national security, and Congress worked together on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis to pass the National Defense Authorization Act. So while Americans were surprised to learn the President announced he would veto that bipartisan bill, they must be shaking their heads in disbelief now that they have learned the President will not only veto the bill, he is going to brag about it—not only going to veto the bill, but he is going to brag about it in a photo op today down at the White House.

Remember what it is the President will veto today. This bipartisan bill will attack bureaucratic waste and authorize pay raises and improved quality-of-life programs for our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines; it will strengthen sexual assault prevention and response; it will help wounded warriors and heroes who struggle with mental health challenges; and it will equip the men and women who serve with what they need to defend this Nation.

This is the worst possible time for an American President to veto a national defense bill and especially to do so for arbitrary partisan reasons. Republicans and Democrats in Congress worked so hard to pass this important legislation, legislation that authorizes the exact amount—the exact amount—the Commander in Chief requested. So now we will have to work together again, this time hopefully to override the President's veto.

The President should be highlighting his signature on this bipartisan legislation that supports the men and women who defend our Nation. Instead, with our servicemembers facing threats and instability in several theaters, he will

be bragging—bragging—about using his veto pen. Our allies are seeking leadership and stability, not indecision. A partisan veto of this bipartisan bill is simply unacceptable.

CYBERSECURITY INFORMATION SHARING BILL

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, Americans know that cyber attacks are attacks on their privacy and their property. No one wants to think about a stranger riffling through their medical records. No one wants to think about a criminal stealing their credit card information. That is why we have this bipartisan cyber security bill before us in the Senate.

This bipartisan legislation will help protect Americans' most private and personal information by sharing information between the private and public sector on cyber threats. Experts say the tools in this bill can help prevent future attacks in both the public and private sectors. It contains important measures to protect civil liberties and individual privacy, and it has been carefully vetted and scrutinized by Senators of both parties. No wonder this bill passed through committee with nearly unanimous bipartisan support, 14 to 1.

The House already voted to protect the privacy of Americans by passing cyber legislation. With a little cooperation, the Senate can as well. That is why I urge all Members to vote today to move forward on this bipartisan bill, which will set up votes on amendments from both parties. With continuing cooperation, we can take an important step toward protecting the privacy of our constituents.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S7427

THE DEBT AND GOVERNMENT
FUNDING

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the day before yesterday I surprised some by saying nice things about Congressman PAUL RYAN, and they said nice things about him. Since then, a handful of people have demanded to know why we would ever say nice things about a man who has attacked Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security, as he has done in recent history. The answer is very simple. Democrats need, our country needs, responsible Republican negotiating partners if Congress is to avoid twin challenges facing us in the coming weeks: avoiding the first-ever default in the full faith and credit of the United States and preventing another government shutdown. We need someone to deal with. We must avoid the self-inflicted wounds that have typified the rule of House Republicans and certainly Senate Republicans.

In spite of our ideological differences, in my view, Congressman RYAN is the only House Republican, whom I am aware of, with real potential to impose a basic modicum of order in the House of Representatives and work with us to avoid default and another government shutdown. He has helped in the past, and I am confident he could in the future if he chooses to.

To my allies, rest assured that I will continue to oppose Congressman RYAN's plans to privatize Medicare and slash Social Security. I have said the Ryan budget would lead to a "Kochtopia," and I believe that to be truer now than ever before.

Congressman RYAN also coauthored the Murray-Ryan budget compromise. That was good work. House Chairman RYAN and Senate Chair MURRAY, Budget chairs, did a very good job. He appears to be supportive of comprehensive immigration reform, and he joined Democrats in saying America's auto industry and financial system should be saved.

Maybe the problems are too deep to resolve any time soon. I hope not. I am concerned that we have already seen Congressman RYAN prove incapable of reining in members of the so-called Freedom Caucus. I hope that is not a sign of things to come, but with the stakes as high as they are, we owe it to the American people to pursue the most responsible path, and that will be it. Now is the time to rebuild a system where "compromise" is no longer considered a dirty word and where Republicans and Democrats work side-by-side to address the challenges our government faces. However, one of the conditions Congressman RYAN has given House Republicans is that he doesn't want to work weekends. Well, if he gets the job, I hope he will not take weekends off until we do something to solve the debt crisis and to fund the government.

BLOCKING NOMINATIONS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Congressional Republicans continue to govern

destructively during this 114th Congress. After nearly a year in control of the Senate, what do Republicans have to show for it? Shutdown threats, lapsed laws, vital programs expired, and an abiding sense of uncertainty. Instead of looking for opportunities to govern constructively, Republicans appear to be bent on mayhem. They are doing everything they can to appeal to their extreme rightwing without regard to the consequences.

It seems that every day that is a bad day for government, we have a large segment of the Republican caucus cheering that it is great. Anything that is bad for government is a good day for us, is what they are saying. Instead of looking for opportunities to govern constructively, they are doing everything they can to not do things constructively. They are doing everything they can to appeal to, I guess, the extreme rightwing, to phrase it, without regard to the consequences, but consequences are very significant.

This afternoon we are finally confirming Ambassadors for several African nations, but to view the confirmation of four individuals a success would be a mistake, when we consider that Senate Republicans are doing everything they can to stop these nominees.

Just 2 weeks ago, the junior Senator from Arkansas announced his intention to hold up our Ambassadors to Sweden, Norway, and the Bahamas. At a time when American leadership is needed abroad, these posts sit empty because the junior Senator from Arkansas is blocking them. Why is Senator COTTON blocking these nominees? He has admitted his hold has nothing to do with the nominees' qualifications—nothing. Indeed, all were reported out of the Foreign Relations Committee with bipartisan support months ago. Instead, the junior Senator from Arkansas is holding these nominees hostage until he gets information from the Department of Homeland Security. That is right. He is holding up State Department nominations to get a response from Homeland Security. Blocking important Ambassadors to get information from a completely different agency makes zero sense. That is akin to having two fighters in a ring and one fighter is going for the referee instead of the other boxer. That is about what we have here. The sad part about this is that the junior Senator from Arkansas is not alone in blocking qualified nominees. The Republican caucus is obviously supporting him. Why?

I have spoken before about the crucial need to confirm Gayle Smith as Ambassador to the U.S. Agency for International Development. She would be a good Administrator. I talked to one of my staff yesterday who has a relative who works for this Agency. It is terrible. There is nobody leading the Agency. It has affected the whole department. That is wrong.

Why is this nomination important? The Agency for International Development, better known as USAID, plays a

central role in our Nation's foreign policy. How? By administering humanitarian and development aid to nations of people in need. A person only needs to watch the nightly news to see that help is needed across the globe—the pictures of the huddled masses of men, women, and children now with the weather turning in Europe. There are millions of people trying to get out of Syria, trying to get out of the Middle East because of what is going on there, with blankets—wet blankets—over their bodies. Little kids are being protected by their mothers, as much as they can be, and by their dads. Victims of civil wars, disease outbreaks, and natural disasters depend on the aid and compassion of the American people. To our credit, we try our best to help as much as possible.

Let's take one example: the Syrian refugee crisis. It is the worst humanitarian crisis since World War II. That says a lot. Millions—not thousands, millions—of Syrians have been displaced because of the country's civil war. Thousands are fleeing to Europe to escape the violence. Because of that civil war, it is estimated that there are 4 million displaced people in Syria alone. Millions have been displaced in Iraq. The whole Middle East is in turmoil. The United States has an obligation to assist—a humanitarian obligation to assist. We are the single largest donor of humanitarian aid for the Syrian crisis. But how can we help if Senate Republicans are hamstringing this Agency? They are doing that.

Gayle Smith, an experienced public servant, has been nominated to lead this Agency. This good woman can't even get a vote in the Senate. Senator CRUZ has been blocking her nomination for months. Why? Is there anything that is wrong about her? Of course not. The word is it is because he doesn't like the Iran nuclear agreement. Remember what the Iran nuclear agreement was? It was an effort by the international community, including Russia and China, to stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. That is what it was all about. I guess Mr. CRUZ, in his attempt to become President—1 of 15 Republicans running for President—thinks this would be a good issue for him, blocking the person this government has chosen to lead this Agency.

Gayle Smith has extensive experience in African affairs. She worked at this Agency during the Clinton administration. She is exactly the type of leader our country needs to confront this crisis in Europe. Even the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the junior Senator from Tennessee, said he was "glad the executive branch has nominated someone who has the kind of experience [Smith] has." Her nomination has won support from prominent Republicans, including Bill Frist who was one of my predecessors as the majority leader in the Senate, and from Richard Lugar, the distinguished Republican, former chair of the Foreign Relations Committee in

the Senate, a man who has expertise in foreign relations. They both see her as the person to do the job. But that does not affect the junior Senator from Texas.

We know how others feel about him. Former President Bush gave his opinion of the junior Senator from Texas 2 days ago. There is widespread support for her nomination—if only the Republican leader would bring it to the floor. Yet Republicans continue to hold Ms. Smith and other important foreign policy nominations as ransom to exact political prices from the White House while our diplomacy suffers.

I am disappointed that the junior Senators from Arkansas and Texas would hold up these proud Americans who only want to serve their country. But I am far more disheartened by the actions of Republicans who should know better. Why do other Republicans support these callous actions? Republicans have blocked nominees to other ambassadorships for years. Now they are even blocking career Foreign Service officers. These are people who simply receive a promotion they have earned and serve our Nation regardless of the President. Foreign Service officers are not Democrats. They are not Republicans. They do our country so much good.

I have had the good fortune to travel the world. When I travel I always meet with the Foreign Service officers, not just the Ambassadors. I get everybody together. I tell them what a wonderful job they do for our country. They go to the most remote outposts in the world, representing the interests of America. They are career people. I also try to visit with the Peace Corps volunteers.

But I am so disappointed—and I have talked to him—in the senior Senator from Iowa for holding up a list of 20 career Foreign Service officers. He has held them up for months until he gets answers from Secretary Hillary Clinton's aide Huma Abedin. What does this have to do with these Foreign Service career officers? Nothing. He sent nine letters to the State Department demanding things regarding this woman and some emails from Hillary Clinton. Haven't we heard enough about emails for Hillary Clinton?

As we talk, she is over there before this great committee of the House that even the majority leader of the House said is nothing more than—I am paraphrasing—a political witch hunt. The Republican Congressman from New York said basically the same thing. A person who works over there in that committee was fired because he thought it was wrong that they were going after Hillary Clinton when the purpose of the whole hearing was supposed to be to find out what happened in Libya.

There has been a concerted effort for more than 2 years to try to embarrass Hillary Clinton. Huge amounts of money have been spent on outside groups, and the House of Representatives, which is supposedly so frugal—

the Republican House of Representatives—doesn't want to spend any money that shouldn't be spent—\$5 million on this worthless committee wasting time.

Listen to these people who are being held up, being denied a well-deserved promotion and rank by the senior Senator from Iowa. This is important. These people serve for decades. They work hard, and they get a promotion once in a while—not with the help of the senior Senator from Iowa. He will hold them up because he wants to try to embarrass Hillary Clinton, who is running for President of the United States. Here is who he is holding up: the Deputy Director for East Africa Operations in Kenya, an education officer in Honduras, a deputy controller in El Salvador, a regional Food for Peace officer in Ethiopia, the Director of the Food for Peace Program in South Sudan, the Democracy and Governance Director in El Salvador. There are others.

What could the senior Senator from Iowa possibly have against the Deputy Director for East Africa Operations in Kenya? Or an education officer in Honduras? Or the regional Food for Peace officer in Ethiopia? They have absolutely nothing to do with Senator GRASSLEY's concerns, and these individuals have no ability to respond to any of his requests. I have spoken with him. I told him I think it is a mistake to target these career people. Career diplomats are some of the finest people who work for our government. They are not partisans. They have committed their lives to public service under Democratic and Republican administrations. The Foreign Relations Committee reported these nominations unanimously. They hail from Texas, Florida, Michigan, Arizona, Virginia, New Mexico, and a few other States. Like other Foreign Service officers across this great world, these fine individuals wake up tomorrow ready to serve on the frontlines of American diplomacy in hotspots throughout the world—places such as Iraq, Afghanistan, and Libya, where we lost four.

Denying them a promotion they have earned will affect their career advancement and retirement, and it has real consequences for the families. This is not anything that is going to hurt President Obama. It affects our country. These are people who have families. They have children. They are being held up, stopped for this little promotion they get once in a while. We shouldn't be singling out these non-partisan officers and putting their careers on hold because the senior Senator from Iowa is not getting the answer to nine of his letters that have nothing to do with these people.

Promotions for military officers and our Foreign Service Officer Corps have traditionally moved through the Senate without political interference. They shouldn't now be subjected to political gamesmanship because people are concerned that Hillary Clinton may

be elected President. Senators GRASSLEY and COTTON have also placed holds on a man named Brian Egan to serve as the State Department's Legal Adviser, a lawyer—a position that has been vacant for 2½ years. The senior Senator from Iowa stated that his hold is not intended to question the credentials of Brian Egan in any way, but is instead related to Clinton aide Huma Abedin. That says it all.

He continues to hound the State Department. He sent nine different letters, including requesting Ms. Abedin's sensitive private employment information. Not only does Senator GRASSLEY want emails and timesheets, but he wants access to any and all information related to her maternity leave. She had a baby. I wonder if he thinks she faked that. This is nothing more than a transparent attempt to drag this good woman through the mud. For what? Let's be clear. This isn't about her. This is about Hillary Clinton's Presidential campaign. Congressional Republicans are desperate to find something—anything—to embarrass this good woman—a woman who served as First Lady of this country, served as a Senator from the State of New York, and served with distinction as our Secretary of State. They will do anything they can to embarrass her.

They are in the process of doing it across the Capitol Complex now. They have told her to be ready: We have 8 hours of questioning. Remember, their questions are dealing with issues that have nothing to do with what happened in Libya.

This is their frantic attempt to damage her politically. I say to my friend from Iowa: Stop this nonsense. Have some dignity. Stop this obstruction for politics' sake. For whatever sake, it is wrong. She is no longer Secretary of State. She hasn't been for a long time. John Kerry is. Secretary Kerry has been there a long time now. Stop trying to undermine the State Department, and instead give it the resources and people it needs to work for the American people.

I suggest to my Republican colleagues, if they seek expedited responses to their inquiries, it would make more sense to confirm the Legal Adviser, who can advise on these issues and respond to their questions—they don't have a lawyer down there—rather than to block these nominations so that he can't assist anyone.

Senate Republicans are holding Ambassadors captive over an issue that has absolutely nothing to do with the State Department. They are holding up career Foreign Service officers. The Senate Republicans are blocking promotions for a group of career people over an issue that has nothing to do with them, that they possibly can't resolve. They can't do anything about it. They are blocking the person who would be running our Agency for International Aid because they don't like the Iran agreement—an issue that the nominee does not handle.

Finally, Senate Republicans are blocking the nomination of the Legal Adviser of the State Department, the person who would be best able to answer their legal questions if he were confirmed. Thanks to the Republicans' failure to govern—now I am not making this up. It has been determined by political scientists in our country that this Congress is the most unproductive Congress in the history of the country. Thanks to the Republicans' failure to govern, we are still far behind recent historic norms in confirming nominees, and innocent public servants are caught in the middle of this do-nothing Congress led by the Republicans. It is not right, and it is not fair. I hope adult voices in the Republican caucus will say enough is enough. Sometimes enough is enough. People have to rise up against these people who are giving Republicans such a name. The brand is not so good. I hope the Presiding Officer understands that. Partisanship should not extend beyond the borders of our Nation. It is time for Republicans to start acting like a governing party and stop playing these games with our national security based on the fact that they don't like the person who is President of the United States and the one who is going to become President of the United States.

Will the Chair announce what our business is today?

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CYBERSECURITY INFORMATION SHARING ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 754, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 754) to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Burr/Feinstein amendment No. 2716, in the nature of a substitute.

Burr (for Cotton) modified amendment No. 2581 (to amendment No. 2716), to exempt from the capability and process within the Department of Homeland Security communication between a private entity and the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the United States Secret Service regarding cybersecurity threats.

Feinstein (for Coons) modified amendment No. 2552 (to amendment No. 2716), to modify section 5 to require DHS to review all cyber threat indicators and countermeasures in order to remove certain personal information.

Burr (for Flake/Franken) amendment No. 2582 (to amendment No. 2716), to terminate the provisions of the Act after six years.

Feinstein (for Franken) further modified amendment No. 2612 (to amendment No. 2716), to improve the definitions of cybersecurity threat and cyber threat indicator.

Burr (for Heller) modified amendment No. 2548 (to amendment No. 2716), to protect information that is reasonably believed to be personal information or information that identifies a specific person.

Feinstein (for Leahy) modified amendment No. 2587 (to amendment No. 2716), to strike the FOIA exemption.

Burr (for Paul) modified amendment No. 2564 (to amendment No. 2716), to prohibit liability immunity to applying to private entities that break user or privacy agreements with customers.

Feinstein (for Mikulski/Cardin) amendment No. 2557 (to amendment No. 2716), to provide amounts necessary for accelerated cybersecurity in response to data breaches.

Feinstein (for Whitehouse/Graham) modified amendment No. 2626 (to amendment No. 2716), to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect Americans from cybercrime.

Feinstein (for Wyden) modified amendment No. 2621 (to amendment No. 2716), to improve the requirements relating to removal of personal information from cyber threat indicators before sharing.

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 Nevada.

AMENDMENT NO. 2548, AS MODIFIED

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, after my years of growing up in Nevada, I appreciate the values that make Nevadans distinct, fiercely independent, and very diverse—in fact, as diverse as the terrain is in Nevada. But what never ceases to amaze me about Nevadans is our passion for protecting America's privacy from the intrusion of the Federal Government. It is a value that is shared across the entire State and one that I have sworn to uphold. But many Americans have lost faith that their government will uphold their civil liberties.

It is Congress's responsibility to ensure that every piece of legislation passed by this body protects the privacy and liberties of all Americans, and I will not accept attempts to diminish these nonnegotiable rights. That is why I am on the floor today to continue protecting Americans' and Nevadans' privacy by pushing for my amendment on the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act.

To begin with, I wish to commend my colleagues, both Chairman BURR and Ranking Member FEINSTEIN, for recognizing the need to address the serious issue of cyber security. As ranking member of the commerce committee's consumer protection subcommittee in the last Congress, I delved into these issues and understand the impact of data breaches and cyber threats. It is an economic concern as well as a national security concern for our country.

I share the desire to find a path forward on information sharing between the Federal Government and the private sector as another tool in the cyber security toolbox, but these efforts cannot come at the expense of personal privacy. The bill, including the substitute amendment that I see today, does not do enough to ensure that per-

sonal, identifiable information is stripped out before being shared, and that is why I have offered this simple fix.

Let's strengthen the standard for stripping out this information. Right now, this legislation says that the Federal Government only has to strip out personal information if they know it is not directly related to cyber threat—that word being “know.” My amendment No. 2548, as modified, will ensure that when personal information is being stripped out, it is because the entity reasonably believes it is not related to cyber threat. That is the change—from knowing to reasonably believing. This distinction creates a wider protection for personal information by ensuring that these entities are making an effort to take out personal information that is not necessary.

Frankly, I am proud of the support I have from Senators LEAHY and WYDEN, both great advocates in the Senate for privacy. However, I am disappointed that my amendment was not included in the substitute amendment that we see today.

The supporters of this bill talk about how this legislation upholds privacy but couldn't accept a reasonable amendment that complements those privacy provisions.

Our friends over in the House of Representatives already agree that the private sector should be held to this standard, which is why they included this language in the cyber security bill they passed. I guess the question is, if this is good enough for the private sector, shouldn't it be good enough for the government sector?

Furthermore, DHS has publicly acknowledged the importance of removing personal, identifiable information because it will allow an information sharing regime to function more efficiently.

What this has come down to is our Nation's commitment to balancing the needs for sharing cyber security information with the needs to protect Americans' personal information. Like many in the tech community have already stated, security should not come at the expense of privacy. In fact, that was said a couple hundred years ago by Benjamin Franklin. Security should not come at the expense of privacy. I believe my amendment No. 2548 to hold the Federal Government accountable strikes that balance, and I hope this simple fix can be incorporated into the legislation.

I encourage my colleagues to support this commonsense effort to strengthen this bill and keep our commitment to upholding the rights of all U.S. citizens.

I appreciate Senators BURR and FEINSTEIN's willingness to work with me on this amendment and look forward to continuing this debate.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Nevada and say to him generally that we tried to put everything in the managers' amendment that we could, and the threshold was that we had to have total agreement. I know my colleague understands that it is difficult, but we have done everything we can to protect the rights of every individual Member to bring an amendment to the floor, to debate the amendment, and to have an up-or-down vote—even for the ones that were not germane. It is unfortunate that one amendment on both sides will be kicked out because they have to happen before the cloture vote, and that was not allowed to take place.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 2193

Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk that is due for its second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2193) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to increase penalties for individuals who illegally reenter the United States after being removed and for other purposes.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, in just shy of 25 minutes, the Senate will have a procedural vote on the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015. The committee worked diligently for most of this year in a bipartisan way to achieve a balance of great policy and reported that bill out on a 14-to-1 vote.

I say to my colleagues: We have reached a very delicate balance. There have been bending and twisting and giving and taking, and we have done it not only within the Senate of the United States and within the committee, we have done it with stakeholders all around the country.

I will remind my colleagues that this bill we are attempting to get through the Senate is a voluntary information sharing bill, and the mere fact that it is voluntary means we have to have in place certain incentives that provide a reason for companies to participate.

I commend Chairman JOHNSON and Ranking Member CARPER. Their committee and staff have worked with us side by side to try to incorporate their thoughts and the thoughts of all the agencies and also worked with stakeholders around the country.

I am pleased to tell my colleagues today that we received this morning a notice from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and it says: "The Chamber urges the United States Senate to pass CISA expeditiously. There is overwhelming support."

When the vice chair and I ventured into this, we also made a commitment

to lock arms because we thought we found the right balance. Although it may be enticing for Members to support amendments that might come up, there is a reason we didn't incorporate them in the managers' amendment. It may have been due to the differences the vice chair and I had or maybe it was because it would have killed the support we had with the stakeholders around the country. We will have one of those amendments today, and it is going to be inviting for people to do it, but let me say to my colleagues, if do you it, information sharing is over with, and the effort is dead. It has been tried for 3 years, yet we continue to see attacks happen, and massive amounts of personal data go out of the system to be used for criminal or espionage reasons.

This is really our last chance. The vice chairman and I have reached what we think is the absolute balance that provides the buy-in of those who will be asked to voluntarily turn over this data and to help minimize the loss of data in our entire economy.

I urge my colleagues to support the cloture motion that will happen at 11 a.m. We will have a short debate, and then we will take up an amendment, and the vice chair and I at that time will ask our colleagues not to support that amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum calls with respect to the cloture motions on amendment No. 2716 and S. 754.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BURR. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators on the Democratic side be permitted to speak for 5 minutes each on our time: FEINSTEIN 5 minutes, WYDEN 5 minutes, and CARPER 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, after many years of effort, the Senate is about to take its first vote to move forward on important cyber security legislation. As I stated in my remarks yesterday, this substitute makes 20 changes to the underlying bill. It includes 14 amendments offered by other Senators to improve privacy protections and ensure better cyber security for emergency services, the health care industry, and the Federal Government. As the chairman just said, we have been listening and we have tried to incorporate a substantial number of amendments in the managers' package.

This is a good bill. It is a first step. It is not going to prevent all cyber attacks or penetrations, but it will allow companies and the government to share information about the cyber threats they see and the defensive measures to implement in order to protect their networks.

Right now—and this is important—the same cyber intrusions are used again and again to penetrate different targets. That shouldn't happen. If someone sees a particular virus or harmful signature, they should be able to tell others so they can protect themselves. That is what this bill does—it clears away the uncertainty and concern that keep companies from sharing this information. It says that two competitors in a market can share information on cyber threats with each other without facing antitrust lawsuits. It says that companies sharing cyber threat information with the government for cyber security purposes have liability protection.

The bill is completely voluntary. I don't know how to say that over and over more times than I have. If you don't want to participate, don't. If a company wants to take the position that it can defend itself and doesn't want to participate in real-time sharing with the Department of Homeland Security, that is its right.

I thank my colleagues who came to the floor in support of this bill and this managers' amendment yesterday: Senators MCCONNELL, REID, GRASSLEY, NELSON, MCCAIN, KING, THUNE, FLAKE, Senator CARPER in particular, Senator BLUNT, and others. They have all described the need for this bill, and I so appreciate their support.

I urge my colleagues to support cloture on this substitute managers' package so that we can start moving on to other amendments that are pending.

I also thank Senator BURR and his staff. Over the past couple of days, they have been going through comments, proposing technical changes, and perfecting changes to the substitute. It is my understanding that Chairman BURR will ask a unanimous consent agreement on that perfecting amendment shortly.

I also thank Senator COLLINS for agreeing to changes in her provision, section 407, to start to address concerns that were raised by its inclusion.

I also want to thank Senators WHITEHOUSE, LEAHY, and WYDEN for reaching an agreement on text that Senator WHITEHOUSE very much wanted to include, and I am pleased we were able to include it in this unanimous consent package.

So I appreciate the support of my colleagues. I urge a strong "yes" vote on the cloture vote to allow us to proceed to this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise to speak against cloture on the substitute. This substitute would not have stopped the Target hack, the Anthem hack, the Home Depot hack, or the OPM hack. When it comes to real privacy protection for millions of Americans with this substitute, there is simply no "there" there.

We see that by looking at page 17 of the substitute. Companies have to remove only personal, unrelated information if they know that it is personal

and unrelated. How would they know under this amendment? Under this amendment, they are required to virtually do no looking. It is the most cursory review. That is why the Nation's leading technology companies have come out overwhelmingly against this legislation. They are not satisfied by this substitute.

The sponsors of the bill have been pretty vociferous about attacking these companies for coming out against the legislation. These companies know a lot about the importance of protecting both cyber security and individual privacy. These tech companies that are being attacked now have to manage that challenge every single day. The challenge gets harder all the time with things such as the EU ruling that I opposed. These companies know that customer confidence is their lifeblood, and the only way to ensure customer confidence is to convince people that if they use their product, their information is going to be protected both from malicious hackers and from unnecessary collection by the government.

The fact is, we have a serious problem with hacking and cyber security threats. The fact is, information sharing can be good, but a cyber security information sharing bill without real and robust privacy protections that this amendment lacks—I would submit millions of Americans are going to look at that, and they are going to say this isn't a cyber security bill, this is yet another surveillance bill.

With this amendment, colleagues, the Senate is again missing another opportunity to do this right and promote both security and liberty. Just because a proposal has the words "cyber security" in its title doesn't make it good. But that is, of course, why the leading technology companies in this country—companies that make a living every single day by being sensitive to cyber threats and privacy—have come out overwhelmingly against this bill.

I know my colleagues have tried to improve this issue, and I appreciate that. But the core privacy protections that America deserves in a bill like this are still lacking, and that is why I oppose cloture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I wish to respond very briefly to what our colleague from Oregon has said.

Senator FEINSTEIN shared with me a copy of the actual text of the managers' amendment. I would maybe make two points. One, if a private company elects to share information—they don't have to, but if they elect to share information, as Senator FEINSTEIN has said, it is their call. But if they do, there is a requirement under the law that they scrub it. The reporting entity which is submitting the indicator—in this case to DHS, the Federal entity—has to scrub it. They have the responsibility, whoever is initiating this, to scrub and remove that personally iden-

tifiable information. If for some reason they don't, the way the legislation comes before us today, in order for a company that chooses to submit threat indicators to the Federal Government, in order to get help on the liability protection they are looking for, they have to submit it through the Department of Homeland Security, through the portal of the Department of Homeland Security, which is literally set up to do privacy scrubs. It is literally set up to do privacy scrubs, and then to share information it wants with other relevant Federal agencies. Very, very infrequently—very infrequently—will there be some reason to—the threat indicators coming through the portal at DHS, maybe less than 1 percent of the time, there might be a need to take a closer look at that information and make sure there is nothing that is personally identifiable or problematic. I think with the compromise that has been worked out, the issue that our colleague has raised has been addressed.

Let me just go back in time. Why is this important? We know the situation is grim. When the Secretary of Defense has his emails hacked by an entity, and we know not who, when we have 22 million personal records and background checks hacked by maybe the Chinese or maybe somebody else, that is not good. When companies such as DuPont in my own State and universities all over the country are having their R&D information—their intellectual seed corn upon which our economy is going to grow—stolen, and presumably stolen for bad reasons, so that they can beat us to the bunch in terms of economic opportunity, that is not good.

What are we going to do about it? It turns out we did quite a bit about it in the last Congress. Two Congresses ago, Senator FEINSTEIN proposed comprehensive cyber security legislation, the whole kit and caboodle. We tried very hard, as she knows, for a year or two to get that enacted. We couldn't get it done. Finally, we gave up at the end of I think the 112th Congress. We gave it up, and we started again in 2013.

Tom Coburn was the ranking member on Homeland Security. I was privileged to be chairman. He and I partnered with people on our committee and, frankly, with a lot of folks outside of the committee, to do three things: To strengthen the capability of the Department of Homeland Security to do its job, a much better job of protecting not just the Federal Government but the country as a whole against cyber attacks. We passed three pieces of legislation. They are helpful; they are not the whole package, but they are three very helpful bills to make DHS a better, more effective partner.

This year, the Intel Committee, under the leadership of Senator BURR and Senator FEINSTEIN, came forward with their proposal. The administration, the President, came forward with an information sharing proposal as well. We took it up in a hearing in the

committee on homeland security, looking at the President's proposal, trying to figure out what we should retain and what we should change to make it better, and we did. We changed it and we made it better. I introduced it as a standalone bill. The Intel Committee reported out their legislation 14 to 1.

We have been working with Senator BURR and Senator FEINSTEIN and their staffs ever since to try to infuse the elements of the President's proposal, modified by us on homeland security, to make a more perfect—not a more perfect union, but a more perfect bill. Is it perfect? No. Is it better? Sure, it is better. I think it is going to enable us to do a much better job protecting that which needs to be protected.

The last thing I will say is this: On this floor I have said more than a few times I love to ask people that have been married a long time, what is the secret to a long marriage? The best answer I have ever received is the two C's—communicate and compromise. I would add a third C, which is also important for a vibrant democracy. The third C is collaborate.

This legislation is a great example of communicating, talking with own another, with stakeholders on Capitol Hill, off Capitol Hill, across the country and around the world, but at the end of the day to figure out how to compromise and to do so by collaborating.

I think we have come up with a very good piece of legislation. At the end of the day, if an entity or business wants to share information—I hope they would, we need them to do that. If they want to share information with the Federal Government, the idea is to get liability protection and share it through the portal of the Department of Homeland Security; that information is scrubbed—cyber security scrubbed, piracy scrubbed. Share with other Federal agencies as appropriate after it has been dutifully scrubbed, and then we are in a better position to defend against those attacks in the future.

I think when people send us to work on big problems—and this is a big problem for our country—they want us to work together. They want us to get stuff done. We have been talking about this for 3 or 4 years, and now we have an opportunity to get something done. Let's pass this and accept this managers' amendment, and then let's take up some other amendments, and pass this bill and send it to the House. When they have done their work, let's go to conference.

Thank you very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise to support the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act, long overdue and vital legislation designed to reduce our Nation's vulnerability to cyber attacks.

I want to commend the ranking member of my committee, Senator

TOM CARPER, and Senator BURR and Senator FEINSTEIN, for their collaborative effort. This is an example of when we actually seek to find the areas of agreement that unify us versus exploit our divisions, then we can actually accomplish some pretty good things. This bill is one of those examples.

The cyber threat we face today is real and it is growing. Sophisticated nation-state adversaries such as China and North Korea are constantly probing American companies' and Federal agencies' computer networks to steal valuable and sensitive data. International criminal organizations are exploiting our networks to commit financial fraud and health fraud. Cyber crime is so pervasive that the former Director of the National Security Agency described it as the "greatest transfer of wealth in human history." Cyber terrorists are trying to attack cyber-connected critical infrastructure, thereby threatening our very way of life.

We have already experienced the impact of this threat. Within the last year and a half alone, more than 20 top American companies and Federal agencies have experienced major breaches. A breach of the Office of Personnel Management allowed a foreign adversary to steal 19.7 million Federal employees' background checks, over 5 million fingerprint files, and 4 million personnel records. A breach at IRS allowed cyber criminals abroad to access over 330,000 taxpayer financial records. A destructive cyber attack from North Korea on Sony Pictures resulted in the destruction of thousands of computers and theft of the company's most valuable intellectual property. Data breaches at both Anthem and JP Morgan resulted in the theft of 80 million health care subscribers' personal data and 83 million banking customers' personal information. Even the White House is not immune from attack. Six months ago, foreign adversaries breached White House networks, compromising the President's nonpublic schedule.

Federal agencies are neglecting to protect Americans' data and Federal law is preventing companies from defending their networks. Congressional oversight, including hearings held by my committee, the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, has shown agencies are not doing enough to protect their sensitive data. Our committee's oversight hearings of the IRS and OPM data breaches revealed that basic cyber security hygiene and best practices would have stopped attackers in their tracks had they been in place at these agencies. The Department of Homeland Security has not yet fully implemented the cyber security programs we need to protect Federal agencies' networks.

Meanwhile, current law hinders private companies from sharing indicators that can be used to detect and stop attacks against their networks. To be ef-

fective, cyber threat indicators must be shared very quickly. The 2015 Verizon data breach investigation report revealed that 75 percent of attacks spread within 24 hours, and 40 percent spread within just 1 hour. Yet our current network of anti-trust and wiretap loss hampers companies from sharing that information quickly, creating a threat of lawsuit and prosecution for sharing that the information companies can use to identify and stop attacks.

There is no easy solution, but there are things Congress can do to improve cyber security that might make cyber attacks more difficult. That is why I am proud to have worked with Senator BURR and Senator FEINSTEIN to create the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act, which takes a significant first step in addressing both of these issues.

First, it enables information sharing to improve cyber security within private companies.

Second, it improves cyber security at Federal agencies.

I especially appreciate the collaboration of Senator CARPER in working with me to help craft title II of the bill—the Federal Cybersecurity Enhancement Act—which was unanimously reported out of our committee. This bill will put Federal agencies on track to implement commonsense cyber security solutions already in use in many companies, thereby improving the security of Americans' data at the Federal agencies.

The Federal Cybersecurity Enhancement Act will achieve four key goals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON. I ask unanimous consent for 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON. First, it will mandate deployment and implementation of a government-wide intrusion detection and prevention system for Federal networks.

Second, it will require OMB to develop an intrusion assessment plan so government agencies can hunt down and eradicate attackers already in their networks.

Third, it requires agencies to implement specific cyber security practices, such as multifactor authentication and encryption of sensitive data, which would have stopped previous attacks.

Fourth, and finally, it will give the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget the authority they need to oversee cyber security across the Federal Government.

In short, the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act, with the inclusion of the Federal Cybersecurity Enhancement Act, will significantly improve our cyber security posture. This bill will not solve all of our cyber security woes, but it is an important step in the right direction, and I am glad to support it.

Thank you, Mr. President, and I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes before we move to the cloture vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I believe I have a couple of minutes left after the chairman speaks that I would like to use.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am happy to extend the debate for a couple of minutes for each side, but I think it does need, in the interest of fairness for the proponents and opponents, to have equal time for the purposes of wrapping up, if my colleagues want to go further.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, let me modify my request. I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, just so the record is clear, I was told I did not utilize my entire 5 minutes, and I want to make a very brief closing statement on my 5 minutes.

Mr. BURR. May I modify my request further? My unanimous consent would grant me 2 additional minutes and would grant the vice chair 2 minutes 45 seconds.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I don't want to prolong this. Reserving the right to object—do I have any additional time? I wasn't sure I had used my full 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has 45 seconds remaining in his time from before.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that each side be given 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCAIN. I am about to object. Let's get going here.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I withdraw my request for my 5 minutes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina for 2 additional minutes for each side?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for allowing me the time.

Very quickly, it was said that this bill will not prevent and would not have prevented the attacks that took place at American companies. It is, in fact, right. The vice chair and I have never portrayed that this was a prevention bill. We said it is not a prevention bill. It is a bill designed to share information to minimize the loss of data.

As it relates to personal data, my colleague from Oregon forgets that the managers' amendment strengthens by making sure on the government side that they only draw in the fields that

the entire government collaborative group agrees need to be used for forensic purposes over and above what Senator CARPER pointed out are the responsibilities of the private sector companies.

It was said that the vice chair and I have been critical of technology companies that oppose this bill. I don't think we have been critical. We have been confused—confused that the companies that hold the most personal data on the American people in the country want to deprive every other business in America from having the ability to share their information when they are hacked. So I am not critical. I am challenged to figure out why they would take that position, but I have come to the conclusion that there are some questions in life that have no answers, and I have now reached one of those.

Given that we are at the end of this debate, let me once again thank Chairman JOHNSON and Ranking Member CARPER for the unbelievable contribution that both of them individually made in their committee, and on behalf of the vice chair and myself, I would urge our colleagues to support cloture and allow this process to move forward so we could conference with the House. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, thank you very much.

I just want to urge people to vote yes on cloture. We have been at this for 6 years. This is the third bill. We have been bipartisan. The bill is considered. This is a complicated and difficult arena. The bill is all voluntary. The moaning and groaning of companies, I say, if you don't want to participate, don't participate, but I can give you hundreds and thousands of companies that are desperate to participate to be able to protect themselves without a lawsuit, and this enables that. It is a first-step bill.

I particularly wish to thank the chair and ranking on the Homeland Security Committee. I very much appreciate this support and know that Senator BURR, I, and others will continue to work as we recognize this most serious threat on our economy and the privacy of individuals. To do nothing now is to admit that we cannot come up with a bill, and, in fact, we can. Please vote yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I hope colleagues will vote no. I have three quick points. No. 1, the chairman of the committee—and we work together often—acknowledged that this substitute would not have prevented these major hacks that we are all so concerned about. No. 2, once again we have heard an attack on the country's major technology companies. All of them, all of them, colleagues, are opposed to this legislation. We are talking about Apple and Dropbox and Twitter. The list goes

on and on. Why? Because these companies have to be concerned about both cyber security and protecting their employees and their customers privacy. Unfortunately, this legislation does very little to protect cyber security, which has now been acknowledged by the lead sponsor of the legislation and has major problems with respect to protecting the liberty of the American people. I urge colleagues to vote no.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, are we out of time on the Democrats' side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty seconds remain.

Mr. CARPER. Colleagues, keep in mind, EINSTEIN 1 and EINSTEIN 2 are already effective to detect but not block these intrusions. EINSTEIN 3, authorized by our legislation, puts a new player on the field—a defensive player—to be able to block these intrusions. This is new and requires these agencies to implement that. For no other reason than that, it is a good reason to support this proposal.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

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 amendment No. 2716 to S. 754, a bill to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Johnny Isakson, Richard Burr, John McCain, Shelley Moore Capito, Orrin G. Hatch, John Thune, Chuck Grassley, Pat Roberts, John Barrasso, Jeff Flake, Lamar Alexander, Bill Cassidy, Deb Fischer, Susan M. Collins, Patrick J. Toomey.

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. 2716, offered by the Senator from North Carolina, Mr. BURR, to S. 754, 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 South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 83, nays 14, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 281 Leg.]

YEAS—83

Alexander	Barrasso	Blumenthal
Ayotte	Bennet	Blunt

Boozman	Gillibrand	Nelson
Boxer	Grassley	Perdue
Burr	Hatch	Peters
Cantwell	Heinrich	Portman
Capito	Heitkamp	Reed
Cardin	Heller	Reid
Carper	Hirono	Risch
Casey	Hoeven	Roberts
Cassidy	Inhofe	Rounds
Coats	Isakson	Sasse
Cochran	Johnson	Schatz
Collins	Kaine	Schumer
Corker	King	Scott
Cornyn	Kirk	Sessions
Cotton	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Crapo	Lankford	Shelby
Cruz	Lee	Stabenow
Daines	Manchin	Sullivan
Donnelly	McCain	Tester
Durbin	McCaskill	Thune
Enzi	McConnell	Tillis
Ernst	Mikulski	Toomey
Feinstein	Moran	Warner
Fischer	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Flake	Murphy	Wicker
Gardner	Murray	

NAYS—14

Baldwin	Leahy	Sanders
Booker	Markey	Udall
Brown	Menendez	Warren
Coons	Merkley	Wyden
Franken	Paul	

NOT VOTING—3

Graham	Rubio	Vitter
--------	-------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). On this vote, the yeas are 83, the nays are 14.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2564, AS MODIFIED

There will now be 10 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 2564, offered by the Senator from North Carolina, Mr. BURR, for Mr. PAUL.

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I wish to say to my colleagues that there is 10 minutes of debate in between these votes, so those Members who have conversations, I wish they would take them off the floor. If they are not going to have conversations, stay and listen to the debate.

Mr. President, from the floor, I have said to my colleagues that the information sharing bill is a very delicately balanced piece of legislation.

What we have attempted to do is to create a voluntary program that companies around this country can choose to participate in or not. Some have already expressed their opposition to it, and I would say that is very easy—pass the bill, and they just won't participate.

There are going to be amendments, though, that change the balance. I don't want to get into the details of every amendment. Let me just say to my colleagues that if we change the balance we have reached not just on both sides of the aisle but with the comfort level of businesses across this country to where they believe they can no longer participate in it, then we won't have a successful information sharing bill.

I think every Member of this body and every American knows that cyber attacks are not going to go away. They are going to continue, they are going

to become more numerous, and we are going to be on the floor debating something that is probably much more specific in the future. I wish we could prevent it, but right now our only tool is legislation that voluntarily asks companies to participate to minimize the loss of data.

I encourage my colleagues, as the vice chair and I have—we are going to oppose all the amendments that come up. We have gone through all the amendments, and those which we could accept and which we felt embraced the balance we had achieved and could still hold together the support across the country—we incorporated those in the managers' amendment, and that managers' amendment will be voted on when we come back on Monday or Tuesday.

With that, I yield the floor to my vice chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to vote no on this amendment, and I would like to explain why. This amendment would create an exemption to the bill's narrowly tailored liability protections for companies that take responsible actions to look for cyber threats and share information about them if a company "breaks a user or privacy agreement with a customer, regardless of how trivial it may be."

The underlying cyber bill has been carefully drafted to ensure that it is totally voluntary and that activities can only be conducted on a customer's behalf with express authorization.

Let me read the language in the bill. The bill reads:

Nothing in this title shall be construed—
(1) to amend, repeal, or supersede any current or future contractual agreement, terms of service agreement, or other contractual relationship between any entities, or between any entity and a Federal entity.

There is tremendous objection to the Paul amendment that is coming in from the chamber of commerce, various companies, and the health industry. They understand what is in our bill. This amendment would actually fatally disturb what is in the bill, which is clear and concise.

I urge a "no" vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, this cyber security bill attempts to enhance security for transactions on the Internet but I think actually weakens privacy in the process. The bill would grant legal immunity to companies that, in sharing information, actually violate your privacy.

Most companies have a privacy agreement. You see it when you get on the Internet. It is supposed to guarantee that your information, individual choices, and consumer choices on the Internet are not revealed to anyone. This bill says that if the company violates it in sharing your information, there will be legal immunity

for that company. I think that weakens privacy. It makes the privacy agreement not really worth the paper it is written on.

I think privacy is of great concern to Americans. The government doesn't have a very good record with privacy. In the news today, a teenager is now reading the email of the CIA Director. It doesn't sound as though the government is very good at protecting privacy. I am not really excited about letting them have more information.

The government revealed 20 million individual records of their employees, private records of their employees. This is the same government that now says: Trust us, and let's give everybody involved immunity so the consumer has no recourse if their privacy is breached. This is the same government that allowed the ObamaCare Web site to be hacked and looked at. This is a government that doesn't have a lot of concern or ability to protect privacy. We are now asked to entrust this government with volumes and volumes of personal information sent across the vastness of the Internet. There is good reason that many of our largest technological companies oppose this legislation.

My amendment will give companies and Internet users clarity on what information is shared with the government, and it will protect the privacy agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I would like to respond to that because we have been told that for the industries that support this bill, this amendment is a bill killer, and the opposition to it has come in far and wide. We have 52 industrial associations in business, finance, banking, petroleum, waterworks, railroads, public power, real estate, and retail—52 associations that are on your desk—supporting it. In particular, the health industry has weighed in against this amendment.

We accomplished the purpose in our bill in a way that is acceptable. Please vote no.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, let us be clear that most of the high-tech companies that have anything to do with the Internet and anything to do with information sharing oppose this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I think everybody would like to vote, but I will say one last thing to my colleagues.

Any company in America—any company in America—that chooses not to participate, doesn't have to. If for some reason they find there is something in this piece of legislation they are uncomfortable with or they are concerned about with regard to the transfer of any personal data, it is very simple: They do not have to participate. But to deny everybody who would like to participate is wrong.

I would encourage my colleagues to defeat the amendment and support moving on.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 2564, as modified.

Mr. PAUL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 65, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 282 Leg.]

YEAS—32

Baldwin	Daines	Merkley
Barrasso	Durbin	Murkowski
Bennet	Enzi	Murray
Booker	Franken	Paul
Boxer	Gillibrand	Sanders
Brown	Heinrich	Schumer
Cantwell	Heller	Sullivan
Cardin	Leahy	Udall
Coons	Lee	Warren
Crapo	Markey	Wyden
Cruz	Menendez	

NAYS—65

Alexander	Grassley	Peters
Ayotte	Hatch	Portman
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Blunt	Hirono	Reid
Boozman	Hoeven	Risch
Burr	Inhofe	Roberts
Capito	Isakson	Rounds
Carper	Johnson	Sasse
Casey	Kaine	Schatz
Cassidy	King	Scott
Coats	Kirk	Sessions
Cochran	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Collins	Lankford	Shelby
Corker	Manchin	Stabenow
Cornyn	McCain	Tester
Cotton	McCaskill	Thune
Donnelly	McConnell	Tillis
Ernst	Mikulski	Toomey
Feinstein	Moran	Warner
Fischer	Murphy	Whitehouse
Flake	Nelson	Wicker
Gardner	Perdue	

NOT VOTING—3

Graham	Rubio	Vitter
--------	-------	--------

The amendment (No. 2564), as modified, was rejected.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for not longer than 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS pertaining to the introduction of S. 2194 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Ms. COLLINS. 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. MERKLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEBT CEILING

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I rise to give voice to concerns about the pending battle over what is referred to as the debt ceiling. We have been told that the ability of the United States to pay its bills on time and its interest on bonds will expire on November 3, which is only about a dozen days from now—less than 2 weeks.

This is of grave concern to Americans. In fact, if it hasn't been a concern to someone, it should be because it touches almost every American household. This is all about the question of whether we are going to pay a bill that is due for previous spending on time or not. This is all about whether we are going to pay the interest that will be due on Treasury bills on time or not.

Great Nations don't pay their bills late. They are expected to be organized and competent and have their act together, but there is also a tremendous incentive to pay on time because when you pay late, the interest rate on your debt goes up because you become less creditworthy. Many folks in this Chamber say we should operate like a family and think about family values when it comes to finance. Here is the connection with how families operate: They know if they don't pay their mortgage or insurance or their Target bill on time, then their cost of credit is going to go up and their credit score will go down.

Sometimes families simply don't have any possible way of paying a bill when it comes up, and they struggle to get the funds together, knowing the more cases that fail, the worse it is for their credit score, which means if they borrow money to buy a car, a house, or for any reason, the interest rate is going to be much higher, and they will have to pay a lot more and will not get anything more than they would have gotten before.

Families understand they have to pay their bills on time. That is fiscal responsibility. But some may have forgotten that this lesson is not just anchored in theory, this is in practice. In 2011, when we dillydallied over paying our bills on time, the United States credit rating was taken down a notch, which meant that we had to pay a higher interest.

How about 2013—just 2 years ago—when we failed to act responsibly and the government shut down and it cost us not only 120,000 jobs, but it also cost us, by our best estimates, about \$70 million more in interest that we wouldn't have otherwise had to pay because interest rates went up. Not paying your bills on time is fiscally irresponsible and, to put it more directly, it is a “Dumb and Dumber” tax on every American family. I am not sure why it is that advocates in the House and Senate are advocating for a “Dumb

and Dumber” tax. The worst tax is when it costs money and you buy nothing, but that is what happens when you don't pay your bills on time.

We know the cost of paying more on Treasury bonds doesn't just affect the U.S. Government. We also know that the Treasury bond rate is used as an index for items, such as home mortgages and car loans. So our families have to pay more because of the irresponsibility of the Republican “Dumb and Dumber” tax on America. It is irresponsible, and it is damaging to our country and to our families.

It is not often that I turn to Ronald Reagan for insight, but in this case he had it absolutely right. Ronald Reagan said that fiscal responsibility is paying your bills on time. There were a number of times when he spoke to Congress and said, don't do a “Dumb and Dumber” tax.

To put it in his own words when he was at a radio address in 1987, he said:

This brinksmanship threatens the holders of government bonds and those who rely on Social Security and veterans' benefits. Interest markets would skyrocket. Instability would occur in financial markets, and the federal deficit would soar.

He continued and said, “The United States has a special responsibility to itself and the world to meet its obligations.”

At another time he wrote a letter to the majority leader of the Senate and said:

The full consequences of a default—or even the serious prospect of default—by the United States are impossible to predict and awesome to contemplate.

He continued:

Denigration of the full faith and credit of the United States would have substantial effects on the domestic financial markets and the value of the dollar in exchange markets. The Nation can ill afford to allow such a result. The risks, the costs, the disruptions, and the incalculable damage lead me to but one conclusion: the Senate must pass this legislation before Congress adjourns.

Let us listen to the voice of reason on fiscal responsibility to pay our debts on time. Let us not adopt the Republican “Dumb and Dumber” tax of failing to pay our bills that extracts huge costs, as President Reagan recognized, both on our Nation and on our families.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

PIONEER SPIRIT OF COLORADO AND 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF FARMERS IMPLEMENT COMPANY

Mr. GARDNER. Madam President, in the 1800s, Colorado found itself at the center of a nation—gold rushes and silver rushes, cattle barons and sheep barons, range wars pitting the rancher against the sod farmer. It is a State that, as it does today, had a little bit of something for everyone—a whole lot of space, breathtaking vistas, and pioneer dreams abound.

The 1860s ushered in the land rush across the country, extending to Colorado a few years later by the 1880s. People from the east looking for that

relief valve of western expansion were drawn to the high plains of Colorado with its fertile valleys, peaks and plateaus, places where the rain followed the plow, and the landmen knew no limit to the sale of aridity.

It was in the 1880s that one Raimond von Harrom Schramm, a wealthy baron, was moving his belongings from east to west when the train he was riding on derailed in a small eastern Colorado town. Detecting Divine providence at work—or most likely scared to get back on the train—he decided to stay put, declaring the site of the derailment was where God intended him to be.

He went on to build the first multi-story brick buildings in that town before the town's fathers decided against naming him the mayor. That the town council would subject such a man of possession to the humility of an election was too much for Baron Schramm, promptly causing him to move his brick buildings to a more aptly named town—you guessed it—Schramm, just down the road. It is 100 years later, and there are no brick buildings in his namesake town, just a nice feedlot bearing the name Schramm.

In the town he left behind, hard-scrabble businesses continued, squeezing just enough moisture out of the ground to provide pastures for the cows. Soon enough fortune and luck built up to break the sod on the eastern plains to begin Colorado's long romance with high-plains farming. It surely wasn't easy. Families crammed into tar paper houses, staking their claim on a patch of ground that knows only shades of brown and green.

It was around 1915 when three men came together to start an implement business—Roy Chilcoat, Jack Tribbett, and another partner—selling farm equipment. Steel-studded wheatland machinery, cream separators, and corn shellers tilled sandhills whose only previous disruptions were antelope, buffalo, and the crossing paths of the plains Indians.

It was no easy feat to be a pioneer in agriculture. There was an old saying at the coffee shop in that small town: How do you make a small fortune in agriculture? You start with a large one. The people there lived in sod houses, getting ice from ponds in the winter to store over the summer—if there was enough moisture for the pond. They endured sandstorms and dust bowls that were described in books and movies for generations to come.

These hardy men and women didn't leave when the hard times continued because they had made this their home. To survive was to succeed and to succeed was something that every American aspired to. Their wealth was measured in friends, family, and in the miles of prairie and the consistency of the windmills turning the lifeblood of the plains, their water. Perhaps nothing else has changed the face of Colorado or Western States more than the

application of water to dry land. They are what make Colorado today—boundless spirits of pioneers driven to succeed.

During the Great Depression, it was devastating for everyone. Neighbors saw neighbors' soil drive unrelentingly across the darkened country sky, carried by the wind borne atop the rain-deprived lands. People like Chilcoat and Tribbet knew they had to survive for themselves, their families, and their small, struggling community. They had to survive so that others in the community could survive too.

So they found ways to do it—diversifying the business; trading wheat for tractors; giving a price for the wheat that was at two or three times the money the wheat was actually worth just to keep families on their farms; storing the wheat, hoping that it would someday be worth more than the loss they had incurred. They gave tractors to poor farmers knowing they couldn't pay for them but knowing that without them, those family farms wouldn't make it; knowing that someday—or holding hope above fear—their neighbor would make good on it and pay what they could.

Businesses in these small towns scraped through the Depression, on to World War II when its sons and daughters left to fight for freedom in lands many had never heard of before, rationing, sacrificing, and dedicating new faces to the workforce, forever changing the landscape of small and big towns alike.

Eventually, businesses like Roy's and Jack's and their partners would pass on to a new generation—Howard Crowley and a new partner—and then again to a new generation still. That business still stands today as Farmers Implement Company. Chilcoat and Tribbet were joined by my great-grandfather, known as Daddy Bill, who would eventually sell their interests to my grandfather, Paul Gardner, and my father, John Gardner.

I spent years working there, trying to learn values, the business, but learning more about relationships—people and a way of life—than selling parts. In fact, based on how many wrong parts I sold, I am pretty sure that was one of the least of things I learned about. But I watched as generations of customers came through the door. I watched my grandfather refuse to sell something they could make money on in the dealership, but he knew the person who wanted it couldn't afford to buy it. Why did he do it? Because he wanted them to survive—a new generation of survivors continuing their fight to make a living on the windswept plains of eastern Colorado.

Tomorrow, Farmers Implement will celebrate its 100th anniversary as a family-owned farm implement business. I am proud of the values that dealership represents and honored to be a part of a great rural family heritage and our little town of Yuma. Congratulations.

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.

HIGHWAY BILL

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, last Friday the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee released the bipartisan 6-year highway bill proposal. If everything goes as expected, the House transportation committee will mark up its legislation this week. From what I understand, House leadership is committed to taking up this crucial legislation in the coming weeks.

As many of you know, passing a long-term transportation bill has been one of my goals as a Member of this body. In fact, since my time in the Nebraska unicameral, I have made transportation infrastructure funding a top priority. Two of my signature accomplishments in the unicameral led to increased investment for Nebraska's infrastructure and helped local communities move forward with starting and completing vital transportation projects.

This August I welcomed our U.S. Transportation Secretary, Anthony Foxx, to Lincoln, NE, where we convened a roundtable at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln's Transportation Research Center. We were joined by local transportation stakeholders representing railroad, highway construction, trucking, passenger automobiles, and the aviation industry. At this important meeting, as well as at my listening sessions this summer throughout the State, the message from Nebraskans was loud and clear: Our businesses, consumers, workers, and families want a long-term highway bill.

Throughout the process of developing this bill, I worked with local stakeholders in Nebraska, including our State department of roads, highway builders and project managers, and transportation and community leaders.

Infrastructure is a wise investment. It keeps our country competitive in today's global marketplace. The safety of our traveling public depends on robust and reliable transportation infrastructure. That is why we passed a bipartisan multiyear highway bill here in the Senate. The DRIVE Act provides States and communities with 6 years of certainty for that highway funding without raising taxes on middle-class families.

As an active member of the Environment and Public Works Committee and the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee, I am proud of the work we have accomplished together. Our bill enhances safety, proposes much needed regulatory reforms, and it

increases investment in our Nation's infrastructure.

The DRIVE Act also includes significant reforms to accelerate highway project construction. The bill does so by advancing key provisions that ensure that local infrastructure projects in Nebraska and all across this country will move forward with a better and a more defined process from the very onset.

The meaningful changes that I championed will provide better coordination between the Federal Highway Administration and States by streamlining environmental permitting and reviews, as well as programmatic agreement templates when initiating new infrastructure projects.

Specifically, the bill will establish new procedures based on a template developed by the Secretary of the Department of Transportation. This will allow our States, in addition to the Federal Government, to determine which State or Federal agencies must be consulted prior to beginning that infrastructure project.

In addition, the bill provides technical assistance to States that want to assume responsibility for the reviews of categorical exclusion projects, which are a category of projects that don't have a significant impact on the environment, triggering a less arduous level of environmental review. Rather than wasting time and taxpayer dollars waiting on the Federal Government to provide an assessment, my provisions would help States provide their own categorical certification regarding the appropriate level of environmental review of certain projects.

Given Nebraska's challenges with starting and completing infrastructure projects, these elements of the DRIVE Act offer a major step forward for transportation projects in my State.

The DRIVE Act also includes major components of a bill that I introduced earlier this year called the TRUCK Safety Reform Act. The legislation offers serious regulatory reforms to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration. Additionally, the bill encourages stronger regulatory analysis, more transparency, and wider public participation in the regulatory process.

The bill also provides regulatory relief to agricultural producers in Nebraska, reforms research at the Department of Transportation to reduce duplication across the modal administrations, and addresses the challenges of the Compliance Safety and Accountability truck scoring program.

I am pleased that the DRIVE Act establishes a new freight program that will prioritize, increase efficiency, and lower the costs for moving freight imports and exports throughout our Nation. The DRIVE Act's freight program will designate a national freight system and provide guaranteed dollars to Nebraska to enhance freight movement throughout our State on our railways and highways. The freight program will also help America's transportation system continue to facilitate expanding

U.S. trade flows. The freight program is crucial to our Nation's economic competitiveness, especially as international trade continues to increase.

The DRIVE Act further incorporates performance-based regulations into our Nation's transportation system. Performance-based measures will offer States more flexibility in meeting the goals of infrastructure-related regulations, something that I have strongly advocated as chairman of the surface transportation subcommittee.

In totality, I believe the Senate produced a thoughtful, comprehensive, and well-drafted highway bill. I greatly appreciate the House moving forward with a long-term highway bill, and I am eager to seek passage of this vital legislation so we can move to a joint conference committee.

I am also pleased to see that the House bill offers several critical provisions, including regulatory reform of the FMCSA and the CSA Program, hair testing for commercial drivers, a freight program, and streamlined permitting to initiate local highway projects at a faster pace. Ultimately, the House's legislative activity this week surrounding the highway bill is a strong step toward achieving a multiyear highway bill—one that will move our economy forward, create jobs, and strengthen safety on our roads, highways, and bridges all across America.

In the coming weeks I look forward to working with Chairman INHOFE, Chairman THUNE, Senator BOXER, and Chairman SHUSTER to produce a reform-oriented compromise that enhances the efficiency, reliability, and safety of our Nation's transportation system.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 224

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, on October 15, 2015, Senators DIANNE FEINSTEIN and PATRICK LEAHY released the following statement marking the 5-year anniversary of the arrest of Liu Xia, the wife of Chinese democracy activist and Nobel Peace Prize laureate Liu Xiaobo:

This week marks the five-year anniversary that Liu Xia was placed under house arrest in China. She has never been charged with a crime and remains confined to her apartment because her husband, respected democracy activist Liu Xiaobo, won the Nobel Peace Prize in 2010.

Over the past five years, Liu Xia's health has sharply deteriorated. She suffers from anxiety, depression, severe back pain and had a heart attack last year. Her repeated requests to leave the country for medical treatment have been denied.

We urgently request the Chinese government allow Liu Xia to seek medical treatment abroad and release Liu Xiaobo, the world's only jailed Nobel Peace Prize laureate. Such action would be a welcome humanitarian gesture.

I could not agree more with the very wise sentiments expressed by Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator LEAHY. That is exactly right. The United States should speak with one voice in support of human rights and against the disgrace that China has jailed this Nobel Peace Prize laureate.

My resolution, following in the tradition of legislation that renamed the street in front of the Soviet Embassy in honor of the heroic Russian dissident and Nobel laureate Andrei Sakharov in 1984, would do the same, it would rename the street in front of the People's Republic of China Embassy to be "Liu Xiaobo Plaza" after the equally heroic Chinese dissident and Nobel laureate who had been brutally imprisoned by the PRC since 2009 for peacefully advocating for basic political freedom.

I would note that the original legislation naming the street in front of the Soviet Embassy in honor of Mr. Sakharov was introduced by my colleague the senior Senator from Iowa who is on the floor with me today to support me in this request.

As I noted when I first asked unanimous consent for this legislation on September 24 on the eve of President Xi's visit to Washington, I, for one, think as Americans we should not be troubled by embarrassing Communist oppressors, and this issue is not abstract to me.

My family, like Dr. Liu, has been imprisoned for repressive regimes. My father as a teenager was imprisoned and tortured in Cuba. He had his nose broken. He had his teeth shattered. He lay in the blood and grime of a prison cell.

In Cuba, my aunt—my Tia Sonia—was a few years later imprisoned and tortured by Castro—my father by Batista, my aunt by Castro—imprisoned and tortured by an oppressive Communist regime.

The United States has a long history of standing with dissidents and speaking out for human rights. When this body acted to rename the street in front of the Soviet Embassy "Sakharov Plaza," that was a powerful statement that helped bring condemnation of the world on the Soviet Union's repressive human rights record. We should show the same bipartisan unanimity with regard to Communist China, standing together with a wrongfully imprisoned Nobel Peace Prize laureate. We should say to the wrongfully imprisoned dissidents across the world: America hears you and we stand with you.

Some years ago I visited with Natan Sharansky in Jerusalem. He described how the prisoners in the Soviet gulag would pass notes from cell to cell: Did you hear what President Reagan said? Evil empire, ash heap of history, tear down this wall.

What this body does makes a difference. What this country does makes a difference, and we should not forget our core values.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 224; I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I wish to make a couple of remarks as to why.

Senator CRUZ, believe it or not, I have actually played a role—particularly in the 1990s—in helping dissidents be released by the Government of China and had some success. We did that by talking to the government.

I think to do this in this way will set back the cause and actually be deleterious to the release of these people, so I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I intend to continue pressing this resolution because I believe we have a moral imperative to speak for freedom. It is one thing to put out press releases, it is another thing to act. I agree with every word in the press release that was issued by Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator LEAHY, and my request is simply to put action to those words.

I tell you, when I visit with Chinese Americans in my State of Texas, I don't want to have to look them in the eyes and tell them I stood with the Chinese Communist Government, the oppressors, instead of standing with Dr. Liu, instead of standing with a Nobel Peace Prize laureate, for fear of embarrassing their oppressors.

There are few things more powerful than embarrassment, than public sunshine. When Ronald Reagan stood before the Brandenburg Gate and said "Tear down this wall," he didn't listen to the voice of timidity say: Now that is going to embarrass the Soviets.

I would note in the White House that the staffers repeatedly crossed out that line of his speech. They said: No, no, no, no, no. That will upset the Soviets. That will set us back diplomatically—the exact same argument, sadly, the senior Senator from California just presented. And each time President Reagan wrote that line back in with his own hand, explaining to those staffers: You don't understand, that is the entire point of giving the speech. That is why I am there because when we speak the truth, the truth has power.

This body—Democratic Senators in this body and Republican Senators in this body—should not be aiding and abetting the oppression of the Chinese Government. We should be standing

and speaking for truth and for freedom, and we should be following the pattern that was successfully demonstrated by Senator GRASSLEY in introducing the resolution naming “Sakharov Plaza” in front of the Soviet Embassy.

With that, I yield to my colleague, the senior Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I appreciate my colleague bringing up the history of Andrei Sakharov Plaza. A lot of people wonder whether this makes much of a difference, what the Senator is attempting to do in the case of the Chinese Embassy. I can tell you it made a big difference. All you have to do is measure the opposition as we were considering the one I introduced several years ago. When the State Department fights hard not to embarrass the Russians, when the city of Washington, DC, fights very hard not to rename a street, then you know you are on the right track, when you have those sorts of people in opposition to you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has an order to proceed to executive session.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Julie Furuta-Toy, of Wyoming, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Equatorial Guinea; Dennis B. Hankins, of Minnesota, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Guinea; Harry K. Thomas, Jr., of New York, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Zimbabwe; and Robert Porter Jackson, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Ghana.

VOTE ON FURUTA-TOY NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Furuta-Toy nomination?

Mr. McCAIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 283 Ex.]

YEAS—93

Alexander	Ernst	Murphy
Ayotte	Feinstein	Murray
Baldwin	Fischer	Nelson
Barrasso	Franken	Paul
Bennet	Gardner	Perdue
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Peters
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Booker	Hatch	Reed
Boozman	Heinrich	Reid
Boxer	Heitkamp	Risch
Brown	Heller	Roberts
Burr	Hirono	Rounds
Cantwell	Hoeven	Sanders
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cardin	Isakson	Schatz
Carper	Johnson	Schumer
Casey	King	Scott
Cassidy	Kirk	Sessions
Coats	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cochran	Lankford	Shelby
Collins	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Lee	Sullivan
Corker	Manchin	Tester
Cornyn	Markey	Tillis
Cotton	McCain	Toomey
Crapo	McCaskill	Udall
Cruz	McConnell	Warner
Daines	Menendez	Warren
Donnelly	Merkley	Whitehouse
Durbin	Mikulski	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	Wyden

NOT VOTING—7

Flake	Moran	Vitter
Graham	Rubio	
Kaine	Thune	

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON HANKINS NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Hankins nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON THOMAS NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Thomas nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON JACKSON NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Jackson nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

CYBERSECURITY INFORMATION SHARING ACT OF 2015—Continued

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, that at 11 a.m. on Tuesday, October 27, the postcloture time be considered expired on amendment No. 2716 and the Senate vote in relation to the following amendments in the order listed: Wyden, No. 2621, as modified; Heller, No. 2548, as modified; Leahy, No. 2587, as modified; Flake, No. 2582; Franken, No. 2612, as further modified; that following the disposition of the Franken amendment, the Senate recess until 2:15 p.m. for the weekly conference meetings; that the time from 2:15 p.m. until 4 p.m. be equally divided in the usual form; and that at 4 p.m. on Tuesday, the Senate vote in relation to the following amendments in the order listed: Coons, No. 2552, as modified; Cotton, No. 2581, as modified; Burr-Feinstein, substitute No. 2716, as amended, if amended; further, that if cloture is invoked on S. 754, all postcloture time be yielded back, the bill be read a third time, and the Senate vote on passage of S. 754, as amended, if amended, without any intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROTECTING OUR INFANTS ACT OF 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 246, S. 799.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 799) to combat the rise of prenatal opioid abuse and neonatal abstinence syndrome.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

S. 799

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Protecting Our Infants Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. ADDRESSING PROBLEMS RELATED TO PRENATAL OPIOID USE.

(a) REVIEW OF PROGRAMS.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this Act as the “Secretary”) shall conduct a review of planning and coordination related to prenatal opioid use, including neonatal abstinence syndrome, within the agencies of the Department of Health and Human Services.

(b) STRATEGY.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall develop a strategy to address gaps in research and gaps, overlap, and duplication among Federal programs, including those identified in findings made by reports of the Government Accountability Office. Such strategy shall address—

(1) gaps in research, including with respect to—

(A) the most appropriate treatment of pregnant women with opioid use disorders;

(B) the most appropriate treatment and management of infants with neonatal abstinence syndrome; and

(C) the long-term effects of prenatal opioid exposure on children;

(2) gaps, overlap, or duplication in—

(A) substance use disorder treatment programs for pregnant and postpartum women; and

(B) treatment program options for newborns with neonatal abstinence syndrome;

(3) gaps, overlap, or duplication in Federal efforts related to education about, and prevention of, neonatal abstinence syndrome; and

(4) coordination of Federal efforts to address neonatal abstinence syndrome.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report concerning the findings of the review conducted under subsection (a) and the strategy developed under subsection (b).

SEC. 3. DEVELOPING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PREVENTING AND TREATING PRENATAL OPIOID USE DISORDERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study and develop recommendations for preventing and treating prenatal opioid use disorders, including the effects of such disorders on infants. In carrying out this subsection the Secretary shall—

(1) take into consideration—

(A) the review and strategy conducted and developed under section 2; and

(B) the lessons learned from previous opioid epidemics; and

(2) solicit input from States, localities, and Federally recognized Indian tribes or tribal organizations (as defined in the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b)), and nongovernmental entities, including organizations representing patients, health care providers, hospitals, other treatment facilities, and other entities, as appropriate.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall make available on the appropriate Internet Website of the Department of Health and Human Services a report on the recommendations under subsection (a). Such report shall address each of the issues described in subsection (c).

(c) CONTENTS.—The recommendations described in subsection (a) and the report under subsection (b) shall include—

(1) a comprehensive assessment of existing research with respect to the prevention, identification, treatment, and long-term outcomes of neonatal abstinence syndrome, including the identification and treatment of pregnant women or women who may become pregnant who use opioids or have opioid use disorders;

(2) an evaluation of—

(A) the causes of, and risk factors for, opioid use disorders among women of reproductive age, including pregnant women;

(B) the barriers to identifying and treating opioid use disorders among women of reproductive age, including pregnant and postpartum women and women with young children;

(C) current practices in the health care system to respond to, and treat, pregnant women with opioid use disorders and infants affected by such disorders;

(D) medically indicated uses of opioids during pregnancy;

(E) access to treatment for opioid use disorders in pregnant and postpartum women; and

(F) access to treatment for infants with neonatal abstinence syndrome; and

(G) differences in prenatal opioid use and use disorders in pregnant women between demographic groups; and

(3) recommendations on—

(A) preventing, identifying, and treating the effects of prenatal opioid use on infants;

(B) treating pregnant women who have opioid use disorders;

(C) preventing opioid use disorders among women of reproductive age, including pregnant women, who may be at risk of developing opioid use disorders; and

(D) reducing disparities in opioid use disorders among pregnant women.

SEC. 4. IMPROVING DATA AND THE PUBLIC HEALTH RESPONSE.

The Secretary may continue activities, as appropriate, related to—

(1) providing technical assistance to support States and Federally recognized Indian Tribes in collecting information on neonatal abstinence syndrome through the utilization of existing surveillance systems and collaborating with States and Federally recognized Indian Tribes to improve the quality, consistency, and collection of such data; and

(2) providing technical assistance to support States in implementing effective public health measures, such as disseminating information to educate the public, health care providers, and other stakeholders on prenatal opioid use and neonatal abstinence syndrome.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; that the committee-reported title amendment be agreed to; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 799), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The Committee-reported title amendment was agreed to, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "To address problems related to prenatal opioid use."

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I was pleased to see the Senate pass by unanimous consent just now the bipartisan Protecting Our Infants Act. As prescription drug abuse and heroin use have increased in Kentucky and other States across the Nation, no demographic, socioeconomic status, age, or gender has been left untouched.

As the father of three daughters, particularly concerning to me is the increase in prenatal opiate abuse, which has resulted in a staggering 300-percent increase in the number of infants born suffering from withdrawal symptoms since 2000.

To address this crisis, I introduced the Protecting Our Infants Act, along with my colleague Senator BOB CASEY. The bill would direct the Health and Human Services Secretary to conduct a departmental review to identify gaps in research and any duplication, overlap, or gaps in prevention and treatment programs related to this issue. It would also direct the Secretary to work with stakeholders on recommendations to address the problem. Furthermore, this measure would encourage the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to work with States in an effort to help improve their public health response to this epidemic.

Also, I want to acknowledge the outstanding work of the Senator from New Hampshire, Ms. KELLY AYOTTE. I know

that one of the things New Hampshire and Kentucky actually, unfortunately, share is that this has reached epidemic proportions. Nobody has been more involved in this issue than the Senator from New Hampshire. She has been on top of it from the very beginning. She shares the concerns of others, obviously, who have States that are suffering from this enormous problem.

I would also like to thank Representatives KATHERINE CLARK and STEVE STIVERS for leading the effort to advance a similar message in the House of Representatives. I look forward to the House taking up this bill and it being sent to the President for his signature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I want to thank our leader and thank Senator CASEY for introducing and pushing to pass this very important legislation. This legislation, the Protecting Our Infants Act, of which I was proud to be an early sponsor, will help address the increasing number of newborns born with opioid dependency. I thank the additional Members, including the chairman of the HELP Committee and Ranking Member MURRAY, for helping get that through this important committee.

New Hampshire is facing a public health epidemic. In fact, the heroin and prescription drug addiction crisis is the single most urgent issue facing my State right now. So many families who have lost children have come to me. The other day, I was buying something, and the woman behind the counter said to me: Keep working on this issue. I asked her why. She said: I lost my granddaughter.

Too many families are experiencing losing their loved ones, their family members who are struggling with addiction. Our first responders are inundated. They are saving lives with life-saving drugs such as Narcan. Public health and safety officials in our State—this is truly something on which we all need to work together to address.

One of the tragic results of this growing opioid abuse epidemic—it has often been overlooked—is the increasing number of infants who are born dependent on opioids and suffering from withdrawal.

Researchers estimate that almost every hour in this country, there is an infant being born who is suffering from withdrawal symptoms or born with dependency symptoms from opioid addiction.

This is an issue which I am so glad is being addressed in this bill, the Protecting Our Infants Act. How we treat our children and our infants is so much a reflection of who we are. That is why I was proud to cosponsor this bipartisan legislation which will call for the development of recommendations to prevent and treat prenatal opioid use, including neonatal abstinence syndrome.

This bill would also ask the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to assist States in data collection and increased surveillance to better monitor the prevalence and causes of neonatal abstinence syndrome so that we can work on more support for prevention, treatment, and recovery to help mothers get support and get into treatment so that we don't have infants who are born with opioid dependence and withdrawal symptoms.

As the leader said, across the Nation the number of infants diagnosed with newborn withdrawal has increased 300 percent since 2000. In my home State of New Hampshire, in May of this year, I visited the Catholic Medical Center in Manchester and heard directly from medical personnel there and first responders who have been treating and responding to cases of newborn withdrawal. Catholic Medical Center officials reported that 7 percent of newborn babies at that hospital were born with neonatal abstinence syndrome. That is a significant increase from last year. According to officials at Catholic Medical Center's Pregnancy Care Center, close to half of the mothers cared for are struggling with addiction.

I thank the leader. I thank Senator CASEY. Today's passage of the Protecting Our Infants Act is one very important step to address the crisis of opioid abuse seen in New Hampshire and across this country. Now that we have passed this in the Senate, I want to thank those Members in the House who have led this effort. I hope the House quickly passes this and sends it to the President of the United States.

I hope the Senate will continue to focus on this public health epidemic because there are many solutions that are bipartisan. One is called the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act. This is a bill I helped introduce with Senator WHITEHOUSE, Senator PORTMAN, and Senator KLOBUCHAR. This is a bill which will deal with prevention so that we can make sure we get that message out to prevent people from overusing and misusing prescription drugs and also turning to heroin. It is so we can have more support for treatment and recovery where there is a big gap in my State and so we can support our first responders and make sure they have access to the lifesaving drug Narcan.

One experience I had recently was I went on a ride-along with our largest police department, and I had previously gone on a ride-along with our largest fire department. Within half an hour of the fire department ride-along, we went to a heroin overdose. I watched the emergency personnel—police, fire, emergency first responders—bring someone back to life using Narcan. When I did the police ride-along, within an hour and a half, we went to two heroin overdoses. Again, first responders saved those two individuals' lives.

I have to tell you, I was a murder prosecutor. I saw a lot of tough things

when I was attorney general. But I couldn't breathe when I was sitting in that room and watching that second individual, a young man, on the ground, the first responders doing everything they could, another dose of Narcan—I thought he was gone. This is what our first responders are dealing with every single day.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Ms. AYOTTE. Yes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I naively thought that my State was uniquely afflicted with this scourge—we had the drug czar come down to Northern Kentucky, which is a part of my State, a suburb of Cincinnati—only to find that it is a problem all over the country. I was curious as to how this rates with the people of New Hampshire as one of the things they are concerned about.

Ms. AYOTTE. Leader, I will tell you, Director Botticelli came to New Hampshire as well, and he testified at a field hearing Senator SHAHEEN and I had in New Hampshire. For the people of New Hampshire right now, this is a crisis. It is a public health epidemic. I did a townhall last night, and the single biggest issue I got asked about was this because I believe this is one of the top issues, if not the top issue on the minds of people in New Hampshire because they see their friends and family being impacted by this. Every socioeconomic group is being impacted by, unfortunately, prescription drugs and then heroin, which is so cheap on our streets right now, also sometimes mixed with a deadly drug called Fentanyl. In fact, we had a 60-percent increase in drug deaths. There were 320 drug deaths last year.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Now we are losing more to drug overdoses and heroin overdoses than we are losing in car accidents. Is that true in New Hampshire as well?

Ms. AYOTTE. It is the exact same thing in New Hampshire. In our State, more people are dying from heroin, Fentanyl, and abuse of prescription drugs than car accidents, which is staggering when you think about it. This is a national epidemic. That is why I appreciate the bill that was passed today. I think there is more that we in this body could do that would benefit the Nation and would benefit our States of Kentucky and New Hampshire to help give tools to the first responders, the public health officials, treatment providers, those supporting recovery and helping prevent this in the first instance. It is something that would obviously help address this crisis but also something that is a public health issue we should all care about.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for her outstanding work on this important issue. I have a feeling we will be grappling with this in all of its various forms for many years to come.

Ms. AYOTTE. I thank the leader for this bill today, which I am glad was passed, and I look forward to working on additional legislation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CYBERSECURITY INFORMATION SHARING ACT OF 2015—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

THE BUDGET AND DEBT CEILING

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to address the budget standoff we are in and the looming debt ceiling issue we are facing. I wish to address this briefly. There will be more to say about this in the near future.

The administration tells us that November 3 is the date after which the extraordinary measures they have been taking run out, and they say that on that date, they will need to start borrowing more money. As we know, we have temporary legislation that funds the government through December 11, I think it is, after which we have not yet resolved how we keep the government operating. I would like to address this a little bit.

First of all, the fundamental problem we have on the debt ceiling increase is we are spending too much money. We are running annual deficits, and we have to borrow money to make up the shortfall. That is what is happening. That is why we reached the debt ceiling, and that is why and the administration wants to borrow more. What is particularly problematic is the President's position that we ought to increase the debt ceiling and allow him to borrow a lot more money without even so much as having a discussion on—much less actually addressing—the gross fiscal mismanagement that is requiring us to borrow all of this money in the first place.

Let's go back to a recent occasion in which we had this debate. In 2011, we reached the debt limit and had a big debate about how we should proceed, and what happened was Congress insisted on—and the President resisted but eventually agreed to—some very modest spending cuts. They established caps, or limits, on discretionary spending, which consist of 37 to 38 percent of all Federal spending that Congress controls through the annual appropriations process.

So some caps were put in place, and the idea was that for every dollar that we raised the debt ceiling, or for every new dollar of debt we would impose on the American people, we would at least cut one dollar of spending over the next 10 years, so that even though we were making a bad situation with our debt load worse by increasing the debt, we would at least be improving the underlying dynamic by diminishing the total spending so that in the future our deficits would be smaller. At least that was the idea.

If you take a look, there was actually a lot of progress in the category of Federal spending—the discretionary spending. We have a graph that shows the increase in Federal spending. This red line shows a huge surge that happened when the President insisted on that

massive stimulus spending bill. That is the big spike. It dropped off a little bit because that single, individual gargantuan bill wasn't replicated the next year. Then, a short time thereafter, we reached this agreement with the President where Congress said: Mr. President, you get the debt ceiling increase, but in return for that, let's reduce our discretionary spending over time, and then we will allow it to grow at the rate of inflation after a certain number of years. That was the nature of the agreement. The idea was to address the underlying problem of overspending that is requiring all of this debt.

As this chart demonstrates, this black line shows where we are today. We have made some progress. There is a gradual, modest decline. This is the big surge that came from that gigantic stimulus bill, but after that, there is a gradual, steady, modest decline, so that in this category of discretionary spending—as I said, almost 40 percent of the Federal budget—we actually limited that. It is the first time, that I am aware of, in years—maybe even decades—when we have had several consecutive years in which the Federal Government has actually spent less each year than the year before in discretionary spending.

By way of full disclosure, I voted against this overall agreement because I knew then, as I know now, that while this makes some progress, it doesn't solve the underlying problem. One could argue that it moves in the right direction, but it does not fix the huge debt problem that we have, and this chart illustrates that.

This chart shows that in recent years we have had a slight decline in the size of our deficits. If we go back further, we would see that the deficits were even higher earlier. We have made some progress. The annual deficit, which is the red line, is corresponding to each year since 2014. We can see that it has come down a little bit. This year the deficit will be \$426 billion. It is still too big of a number, but it is less than it was in recent years.

Here is the problem: There are people around this town who talk as though we have this problem solved. A few years ago, the deficit was \$1 trillion, and today it is \$426 billion; so everything is OK. Take a look at where this line is going. This isn't OK. This isn't 100 years from now. This is 5 years from now. This is 10 years from now. What is happening is our deficits are going to explode.

This isn't just my projection. This is the Congressional Budget Office, the nonpartisan CBO. By the way, their numbers are wildly optimistic. I will give three examples of assumptions they make, and you can judge whether you think these are reasonable assumptions or not.

First of all, as to the whole package of tax extenders, the individual tax cuts that we renew every year, they assume that we stopped renewing them and so there will be this surge of rev-

enue that will come into the Federal Government every year thereafter, and that is all baked into these numbers. They also assume that we are going to stick to the spending caps that I illustrated in the previous chart. In this body we all know that negotiations are underway right now to bust those spending caps, and the President is insisting on it.

In fact, the President has gone so far as to say that he is vetoing the National Defense Authorization Act in part because we haven't yet agreed to bust the caps on nondefense spending. Despite that, these numbers assume that the caps are all complied with. Finally, the Congressional Budget Office makes extremely optimistic assumptions, in my view, about economic growth going forward in the next several years, and that means they are making optimistic assumptions about how much revenue the Federal Government is going to be taking in. Despite that, as we can see, deficits are set to explode, and when deficits explode, the corresponding debt total goes right along with it.

This is our debt. This is the gross Federal debt, and the gross Federal debt is exactly a function of how much we borrow every year. The annual deficit is the shortfall between revenue and spending, and we make up the shortfall by going out and borrowing, and that adds to the borrowing from previous years, and the total is our debt.

If we go back to 1980, it was practically zero. The gross Federal debt was a very modest number. Now it is about \$18 trillion, and it is set to just continue rising. This is totally unsustainable. No country has been able to rack up debt on this scale and have it end well. It doesn't end well.

My point this afternoon is really a simple one. We have a choice before us. We are up against the debt limit, and the President says: Just give me more debt, and I don't even want to have a conversation about the underlying cause or what we might do differently to solve this issue. At the same time, they are saying: By the way, let's increase the rate at which we rack up this debt by busting the spending caps and abandoning the one element of spending discipline that we have been able to achieve in this town in I don't know how many years.

I think most Republicans—and I know this Republican Senator—think it would be a very bad idea to just rack up even more debt and do nothing at all about the underlying cause of it and bust the spending caps without finding some offsetting way to save money in other places.

By the way, when President Obama was Senator Obama, he thought it was a bad idea then too. In 2006, he said:

The fact that we are here today to debate raising America's debt limit is a sign of leadership failure. Increasing America's debt weakens us domestically and internation-

ally. Two years later, then-Senator Obama said in 2008: "Adding \$4 trillion in debt is irresponsible, it's unpatriotic."

Isn't it a little bit ironic that under President Obama we added \$8 trillion in debt and now he wants more? He wants more, and as I said before, his insistence is that we can't even have a discussion about dealing with the underlying problems. It is not clear to me why this President should be one of the only Presidents, if not the only President, who gets a debt ceiling increase without even having a conversation about underlying reforms.

In 1984, Gramm-Rudman-Hollings was a major, important budget deal that was done in the context of a debt ceiling increase.

In 1990, the Budget Enforcement Act imposed some spending discipline in return for a debt ceiling increase.

In 1997, we had the Balanced Budget Act, which actually achieved a balanced budget within a short period of time. That came up in the context of a debt ceiling debate.

In 2011, as I mentioned at the beginning of my comments, we established spending caps because we wanted to do something about the underlying problem at the same time we increased the debt ceiling. Unfortunately, as I said, the administration seems unwilling to even have the discussion.

There are two charges that I hear from this administration which are completely untrue, and I want to dispel this. One is this notion that I hear all the time, that raising the debt limit merely enables us to pay the bills that have already been incurred. They tell us how irresponsible we are for not raising the debt limit. After all, these bills have already been incurred. That is nonsense. It is completely untrue. However many times they repeat it doesn't make it true.

I can prove it very simply. If we started running balanced budgets tomorrow and kept running balanced budgets, we would never need to borrow any more money. It is as simple as that. If we didn't spend any more than we took in, we wouldn't need to borrow more money, and we wouldn't need to increase the debt limit.

The precise reason you need to raise the debt limit is because you need to borrow more money because you intend to spend more than you are taking in. That is what the President is planning. That is what he wants to do. That is what his budget calls for. We haven't committed to any spending going forward. We don't even have an appropriations bill. We don't have an omnibus. We don't have a CR. We haven't done that yet. How can it be that this is paying for bills that have already been incurred? It is not.

The second issue is that if we don't raise the debt ceiling by November 3, it is implied—they don't say it this way—that we will have a devastating and disruptive default in the markets and will not be able to pay our Treasury debts. That is ridiculous. It is never going to happen.

Ninety percent of all the money the government is going to spend comes in the door in the form of taxes. It is the other 10 percent that is the shortfall that we have to go out and borrow. Ninety percent of everything that the government is going to spend comes in the form of taxes. You know how much goes out in debt service? About 7 percent. For every \$1 of government spending about 7 cents is service on our debt at the moment, and 90 cents comes in from taxes. And you are going to default on the debt? You would have to willfully choose to do that, and I don't think even this administration would do that.

I will conclude by saying that I hate the idea of raising the debt ceiling because we already have too much debt, but I understand that it would be very difficult and not realistic to get from where we are to a balanced budget overnight. I get that. So I would be willing to raise the debt ceiling, and I think the obvious thing to do here is to tie it to some structural reforms, even if they are just modest reforms. I know the President is not willing to consider the kind of architectural changes to the entitlement programs that it will take to actually solve the problem, but could we at least make progress on the problem? Could we at least go after the low-hanging fruit?

There are dozens of reforms that would at least modestly improve this fiscal imbalance—the size of these annual deficits. We could have more means testing of Medicare. In other words, very wealthy Americans could contribute more to the cost of their Medicare. We could save tens of billions of dollars a year if we did that.

We could reduce some of the subsidies that go to big corporations, including big agricultural corporations. We spend many tens of billions of dollars a year on corporate welfare. Why don't we wipe that out?

We have green energy research, which is another way of forcing Americans to pay for inefficient production of electricity. We spend \$18 billion over the next several years on that.

Medical malpractice liability reform would save the Federal Government \$50 billion a year. These are not my numbers. This is according to the Congressional Budget Office.

Maybe we could reduce the size of the Federal workforce. Between the Departments of Energy, Agriculture, and Commerce, we have 163,000 employees. How much energy do they produce? How many crops do they grow? How much commerce do they really generate? I think we could probably do with a few less. There are hundreds of billions of dollars that could be saved.

We could slow down the growth of the entitlement programs for future beneficiaries. These would be reasonable things. Many of these suggestions have had some level of support by the President at one time or another. I am not looking for something radical. I am looking to make some progress. But I

think it is completely unreasonable for the President to insist that he simply have the opportunity to saddle us, our kids, and our grandkids with even more debt without even addressing the underlying problem that is causing us to rack up this debt in the first place.

I will have more to say about this next week. I think this will not get resolved between now and then. When it does get resolved, one way or another, I hope we will find offsets to any spending increase that we incur relative to the levels we have agreed upon in the spending caps of the 2011 agreement. If the debt ceiling increase occurs, I hope it will occur in the context of some improvement to the underlying situation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about some disappointing news. For only the third time in 40 years, Social Security beneficiaries will not receive a cost-of-living adjustment, or COLA, this year. This news will impact the nearly 60 million American retirees, dependent survivors, and disabled workers who rely on Social Security to make ends meet.

Social Security is the most effective anti-poverty program in U.S. history. Without Social Security, about 44.1 percent of America's seniors would be living in poverty.

In Hawaii, one in six residents depends on Social Security to help pay their bills and keep a roof over their heads. It is the only source of income for 25 percent of our seniors in Hawaii.

We live in a world where wages just aren't rising fast enough, and real pensions are disappearing. More and more workers are working longer and harder with less to show for it when they retire.

According to a 2014 Federal Reserve study, nearly 1 in 37 respondents reported having no retirement savings or pensions whatsoever, pointing out once again that Social Security benefits are essential to millions of working Americans and retirees.

For many who are already struggling to make ends meet, Social Security is all they can rely on. Absent a COLA, too many beneficiaries will see no increase in their primary source of income, making it harder to afford basic necessities, especially medical care.

One of my constituents from Wahiawa wrote to me recently and said:

I find it incredible that there are people who actually believe that Social Security is too generous. The average Social Security benefit is a whopping \$14,000 a year and we've only seen an average 2 percent COLA over the past five years. I can assure you my health care costs have far exceeded that tiny increase.

Another constituent from Honoka'a was more direct in her concerns. She wrote:

I have worked very hard my entire life and have planned to retire in a few years. My

worry is that I will not have enough money to live. I also may have to continue to work due to this deficit. My question is what are you going to do about it and what is your game plan? Year after year no one has done anything about it and has passed it down to the next person entering the Senate office or Congressional office. It is a problem that must be addressed immediately. Please help me and the rest of my baby boomer generation.

Congress needs to listen to these voices and act to responsibly strengthen and expand Social Security before it becomes yet another fiscal crisis.

That is why I introduced the Protecting and Preserving Social Security Act with Representative DEUTCH of Florida. Our bill does two key things that will help seniors now as well as help to ensure the strength of Social Security for decades to come.

First, our bill would help Social Security recipients by having basic COLAs on a more accurate formula of what seniors actually purchase. This formula is called the Consumer Price Index for the Elderly, or CPI-E. The CPI-E more accurately recognizes the rising costs for seniors and gives them a benefit boost.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, if we were using the CPI-E right now, seniors would be getting a 0.6 percent COLA increase in 2016. That is about \$100 more in benefits for the average person on Social Security next year. And while small, seniors tell me that every bit counts. Changing to the CPI-E will mean increases in Social Security benefits to more accurately reflect the rising costs that our seniors experience.

Second, our bill will pay for this benefit increase by requiring millionaires and billionaires to pay the same rate into the Social Security trust fund that everybody else pays. Few know that this year, once workers earned above \$118,500, they stopped paying the payroll tax to support Social Security. In other words, Social Security contributions are capped for these high-wage earners.

But most workers, as we know, earn far less than \$118,500. So with every paycheck, all year, most workers pay into Social Security. This is not fair. It is not fair that millionaires and billionaires get a Social Security tax loophole.

A corporate CEO could earn \$118,500 in just one pay period and not contribute a single additional cent in payroll taxes for the rest of that year.

Our bill would gradually phase out the cap on payments into the Social Security trust fund over 7 years. That way, whether you earn \$50,000 or \$500 million a year, you keep paying at a fair rate to support Social Security in every paycheck all year long.

The Protecting and Preserving Social Security Act is a fair way to strengthen Social Security for decades to come, and it would give current seniors and beneficiaries a much-needed boost right away.

Social Security is one of the cornerstones of the middle class and the lifeline for millions of seniors. We must do

all we can to protect and improve it for not just the current recipients but for those who will rely upon it in the future.

This bill is supported by groups such as Social Security Works, the Strengthen Social Security Coalition, and the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare.

I urge my colleagues to join me in letting seniors in Hawaii and all across the country know that you are on their side by cosponsoring the Protecting and Preserving Social Security Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

9/11 HEALTH PROGRAM

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, two days ago another victim of the September 11 attacks died in New York. He is the eleventh first responder to die since this year's anniversary of the attacks.

His name was Sergeant Gerard Beyrodt. He served for decades in the New York Police Department. His entire career was devoted to serving his community and keeping the people around him safe, and when we were attacked on September 11, 2011, Sergeant Beyrodt didn't waver. He banded together with thousands of first responders from around the country—from every single State—and he rushed to Ground Zero to help.

These heroic men and women ran into the burning towers to try to save anyone they could. When the Twin Towers collapsed, our first responders worked day and night to clear the pile, breathing in toxic, poisonous fumes the entire time. These men and women were heroes. They refused to abandon their community in a time of terrifying confusion and intense grief.

But now, because of the poisonous fumes they were exposed to at Ground Zero, the burning metal and the toxic smoke, these men and women are sick. Many of them have cancer, and many are dying, and far too many have already died.

More than 14 years later, the terror attacks on September 11, 2001, are still claiming American lives. In the 6 weeks since the most recent anniversary of the attacks, we have lost 11 more responders to diseases that can be traced directly back to the work at Ground Zero.

I wish to take a moment to actually speak their names now: John P. McKee, Reginald Umphery, Kevin Kelly, Thomas Zayas, Paul McCabe, Ed Goller, Joseph Fugel, Ronald Richards, John Cedo, Dennis Needles, and Gerard Beyrodt.

The death toll is not going to stop rising. So what is Congress waiting for?

The bill authorizing funding for the 9/11 health program has already expired. It has expired. But these 9/11-related illnesses never expire. Neither should their health care. More than 33,000 first responders and survivors have an illness or injury caused by the 9/11 attacks or their aftermath. More

than 1,700 have passed away from 9/11-related illnesses. More police officers have died from 9/11-related diseases than those who died on 9/11 itself.

The participants in the 9/11 health program live in every single State. Every Senator in this Chamber has constituents who are sick and are registered in the 9/11 health program.

The first responders we have lost leave behind families, spouses, and children. They leave behind bills, mortgages, car payments, and college tuition payments. These 9/11 illnesses not only rob families of their loved ones but leave them to face expenses without, in many cases, their family's primary bread winner.

If Congress doesn't act now, how many more first responders and their families are going to suffer because we didn't do our job and reauthorize the program?

On the most recent anniversary of the attacks, many of my colleagues here released statements and made posts online to commemorate the anniversary and remember the victims of 9/11. Well, if you are a Senator and that is all you are doing—if all you are doing is just talking about the heroism, the courage, and what happened on 9/11—then we are not actually doing our jobs. If we are Senators and all we are doing is tweeting about 9/11 and the responders, then we are not fully fulfilling our duty as Senators.

There is a bill right here, right now, waiting for a vote. The majority of this Chamber already supports the bill as cosponsors. It is widely bipartisan, and not one person is opposed to it. So what are we waiting for? We must reauthorize and make permanent the World Trade Center Health Program and the Victim Compensation Fund. We must finish our job.

Let's truly never forget. Our 9/11 heroes deserve and desperately need this health care. So let's do our job. Let's vote on this bill. Let's pass it. The clock is ticking.

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. PETERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise to express my support for the Export-Import Bank and to encourage my colleagues in the Senate to take up and pass bipartisan legislation scheduled for consideration in the House next week that would reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank until September 30, 2019.

The Export-Import Bank helps American companies export their goods and services across the globe, helping businesses grow and creating more demand for American manufactured goods and agricultural products. Over its 80-year

history, the Ex-Im Bank has provided loans to help businesses start exporting, open new markets, and access new customers. The Bank provides insurance to help businesses protect their bottom lines if a foreign buyer fails to pay and works with private lenders to fill gaps in financing that helps close deals that simply would never happen without its support. Most importantly, the Ex-Im Bank does all of this at no cost to the taxpayers. In fact, it makes money. Just last year, the Bank generated a \$675 million surplus to help reduce the deficit.

The Ex-Im Bank helps level the playing field for American companies in a tough global market. Last year it supported more than \$27.4 billion in U.S. exports and 164,000 jobs. More than \$10 billion of that total—nearly 40 percent—represented exports by small businesses. The Ex-Im Bank is dedicated to serving small businesses in Michigan and across the country. Ninety percent of its overall transactions directly supported small businesses, including many that served suppliers for large companies.

In 2013, I was proud to attend the opening of Ex-Im Bank's regional export finance center in Detroit with Governor Snyder and my colleague Senator STABENOW and Congressman John Dingell. In Michigan alone, the Bank has supported 229 exporter businesses selling \$11 billion worth of goods to places such as Saudi Arabia, Mexico, and Canada. This support is particularly important for our manufacturing industry, including motor vehicles and parts, machinery and chemicals—all vital sectors to our economy.

Over the summer, I had the opportunity to visit a Michigan business, Mill Steel Company in Grand Rapids, which works with the Ex-Im Bank to export its products. Mill Steel is one of North America's premier flat-rolled steel companies. It is also a family-owned business that wanted to make Michigan products and hire Michigan workers. Mill Steel sells and ships its steel to auto suppliers in Mexico and Canada. The loan guarantees provided by the Ex-Im Bank reduce Mill Steel's risk when exporting to foreign buyers, providing certainty and allowing them to continue hiring new employees and providing good-paying jobs in Michigan.

Unfortunately, over the summer, despite bipartisan support for reauthorizing the Ex-Im Bank, a small, ideologically driven minority in Congress allowed the charter for the Export-Import Bank of the United States to expire, risking billions of dollars in exports, hundreds of thousands of American jobs, and putting our country at an economic disadvantage in a competitive global marketplace while also increasing the Federal deficit. The failure of Congress to act on this commonsense Federal program endangers jobs in Michigan and is simply unacceptable. General Electric has a plant in Michigan that employees 1,400

Michiganians. Over the summer, GE announced that it plans to relocate over 300 jobs from Wisconsin to Canada as a result of the Ex-Im Bank closing its doors. When this happened, my office was flooded with inquiries from a number of constituents concerned about what would happen to their communities and their own job security if a similar decision was made in Michigan. In the months since Ex-Im Bank's authorization has lapsed, GE has signed deals with export credit agencies in competitor foreign nations, creating jobs abroad instead of right here in the United States.

As a Senator from a State with world-class engineering and manufacturing talent, I am frankly appalled by these developments, especially when we have already seen the benefits that the Bank has produced for Michigan's economy and workers in my State as well as across the country.

The work done by the Ex-Im Bank is especially critical to Michigan manufacturers who fight to compete with countries using extreme and unfair measures such as direct subsidies or currency manipulation to boost their own manufacturing sectors. According to Ex-Im Bank's most recent annual report, there are 85 other competing foreign-sponsored export credit agencies helping their own domestic companies better compete on the global stage. Other countries, including China, Japan, South Korea, the United Kingdom, Canada, and Germany, use their own export credit agencies to boost their country's exports.

China, in fact, provided more financing through its export credit agency in the last 2 years—approximately \$670 billion—than our own Ex-Im Bank has offered in its entire 81-year history. These export financings are expected to significantly increase in coming years, which means that American firms and workers could fall further behind if we do not act now.

Without our own Export-Import Bank, American businesses will struggle to compete overseas and our economy will suffer. As global competition intensifies, it simply makes no sense to engage in unilateral disarmament. We must stop the self-inflicted wounds on our economy. We must pledge to our constituents that we will first do no harm, and we must stop letting ideology impair our economic growth.

I am pleased that a bipartisan, bicameral group of Senators and Representatives are saying that enough is enough, and are working to move a reauthorization forward. I am looking forward to working with them to get this done as soon as possible. Too much time has already been wasted, and too many jobs have already been jeopardized. We have to get back to the business of working together to find commonsense solutions to help, not hamper, our economic growth in America. Passing a long-term reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank is a great way to start.

Once the House passes the reauthorization next week, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to schedule a vote as soon as possible. We know we have the votes. The legislation the House will soon consider is identical to an amendment passed by the Senate with a vote of 64 to 29 in July while considering the long-term highway bill. We should do this now because there is not a moment to lose. American jobs hang in the balance.

Thank you, Mr. 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. 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.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HATCH. 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.

DEBT LIMIT DEADLINE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, we are apparently pressing another deadline with regard to the statutory debt limit. I am reminded of the old paradoxical proverb: "The more things change, the more they stay the same."

We have dealt with the debt limit here in Congress on numerous occasions, and while there are significant differences this time around, there are some things that just don't change, particularly when we are dealing with the Obama administration.

One thing that is different is that our national debt is higher than it has ever been before, more than \$18 trillion—an astronomical number, when you think about it. That is \$57,000 of debt for every U.S. citizen—every man, woman, and child from age 1 to 101. Just for the people in my State of Utah, which has a relatively small population, that means \$167 billion of debt.

As a share of our GDP, the debt is higher now than at almost any time with the exception of a brief period surrounding World War II. Yet, even though our debt has gotten further and further out of hand under this President, the administration's approach has not changed. As we all know, Treasury Secretary Lew recently sent a series of letters urging Congress to raise the debt limit. In his latest communication, he projected that on November 3, the Treasury will begin to run dangerously low on cash, creating an unacceptably high risk of having to delay payments.

Of course, we don't have an ability to verify that projection. Treasury has long been uncooperative in Congress's

efforts to get more information as to how they arrive at those specific dates. Don't get me wrong, I take the November 3 date very seriously. I think we all should, but given the lack of hard data shared by the Treasury regarding those projections and the fact that the date has in just the last few weeks moved around a little bit, I do understand why some people appear to believe this latest best guess from the Treasury is fun-
gible.

In addition to providing the November 3 deadline, the latest debt limit letter from Secretary Lew includes what has become a stale set of talking points punctuated by the admonition that "only Congress can extend the nation's borrowing authority." I know no one wants to hear a civics lesson, but given the administration's repeated attempts to assign all responsibility relating to the debt limit to Congress, it means that a short refresher about how a bill becomes law might be helpful.

No one disputes that Congress must act to extend the government's borrowing authority, but the President can also sign or veto any debt limit legislation we pass. The same is true of any legislation authorizing or appropriating spending increases or reductions. Congress writes and passes. The President signs legislation into law, and hopefully he does his best to enforce it. In other words, both Congress and the executive branch share responsibility with regard to the debt limit and our Nation's overall fiscal health. Unfortunately, rather than trying to work with Congress on these issues, the Obama administration has repeatedly chosen to try to deflect responsibility with misleading statements about the various burdens borne by the separate branches of government.

Sadly, the Treasury Secretary's tired arguments with regard to the debt limit are not the only problem. In fact, when you examine this administration's record, you will find that the problems are much worse than most want to admit. I am talking, of course, about the massive accumulation of debt we have seen under this administration, as well as the lack of leadership and willingness to work with Congress to address what we know are the main drivers of our debt.

As the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has repeatedly made clear, the main drivers of our debt are unsustainable promises in the Social Security benefit programs and unsustainable spending on the Federal Government's major health care programs, Medicare, Medicaid, health insurance subsidies under the Affordable Care Act, and others.

True enough, we have seen some deficit reduction in recent years. These days, the President and his allies are always quick to point that out. Of course, we know that these temporary reduced deficits have resulted predominantly from increased tax receipts and only modest spending restraint. Still, even with these reduced deficits, our

debt remains well above the historic average and is expected to grow even more in the near future as, according to CBO, our deficits will start to go back up in the next few years.

Our deficit this next year has been brought down but I would have to say mainly because of the work that we have done in the Congress to restrain the growth, the reconciliation act. Had we not done that, this administration would not have done anything. We would be in worse shape than we are.

Simply put, no one in this administration should be bragging about supposed fiscal responsibility. Under this administration, the outstanding public debt has risen by more than an astounding \$7.5 trillion, a 71-percent increase just since this person has become President. Once again, as a share of the economy, our current debt remains at levels that, with a very narrow and understandable exception, are heretofore unseen in modern U.S. history.

According to CBO, by 2025, Federal debt felt by the public will be roughly twice the average of the past 5 decades. As CBO says, "Such high and rising debt would have serious negative consequences both for the economy and for the Federal budget." Given this risky path of debt accumulation, CBO also warns on increasing risks of a Federal fiscal crisis. Unfortunately, those dire warnings have been ignored by this administration. Instead, the administration seems to believe that a temporary lull in deficits is a good time to accelerate spending, even though spending grew well above growth in the economy last fiscal year, all while they continued to ignore the growing crisis in our entitlement programs.

We still have approximately one-half trillion dollars of debt. They are bragging about that. When he was serving in the Senate and a different party controlled the White House, President Obama famously argued that an increase in the debt limit was a sign of leadership failure. Now his definition of leadership is to assign all responsibility to Congress for the debt limit.

When he was running as then-Presidential candidate Obama, he pledged not to kick the can down the road on reforming entitlements, particularly Social Security. Now, he shirks responsibility and his proposed solution to the most immediate problem with Social Security—the Disability Insurance Trust Fund—is to kick the can much further down the road without any changes or reforms to the program. We are just going to borrow from the already dysfunctional general Social Security fund to pay for Social Security disability insurance. My gosh, when does it stop?

I believe that the debt limit has and can play a role in promoting fiscal discipline. Historically, debates over the debt limit have provided opportunities to reexamine our fiscal outlook and, where necessary, make corrections. Debt limit votes give a voice to Mem-

bers of Congress who do not serve on committees that make the spending and tax decisions.

Unfortunately, as we contemplate another debt limit increase, President Obama does not see the need to even talk to Congress about our fiscal future. In fact, the administration won't even take a clear position on how much of an increase it believes is appropriate or how long it should last.

Common sense would indicate that the President would like Congress to extend the debt limit past next year's election. That would be a debt limit hike of about \$1 trillion, and \$1 trillion would mean more than \$3,000 per person in the United States just to get us through next year. Utah's share of that would be about \$9 billion. Yet while the President undoubtedly wants at least that much of an increase, he refuses to make any such desire known.

Instead, we have gotten vague demands that borrowing authority be extended by certain dates and threats to veto any such extension that comes with even modest spending reforms. Essentially, President Obama's position is it's my way or the highway, but oddly enough, he does not want to explicitly define what his way is, and he repeatedly argues that he plays absolutely no role and bears no responsibility in getting us there. It is absurd, absolutely absurd.

Make no mistake, I don't want to see a default. Default on U.S. Treasury securities and failure to pay Federal obligations, which, by the way, are two separate things, is not a desirable or acceptable outcome. Ultimately, I don't believe Congress should shirk its responsibilities, even if President Obama refuses to acknowledge his.

Let's be clear. Neither the administration's uncompromising stance on fiscal reforms nor its selective use of information about our Nation's debt are productive. The President's refusal to work with Congress on a path forward and to share information about our Nation's finances is irresponsible brinkmanship. I want to talk about that information sharing for a few minutes because it is an important part of this continual impasse between Congress and the administration when it comes to the debt limit.

When we talk about our Nation's debt, there are other policy matters in play besides the periodic actions taken to raise the debt limit. The administration is charged with managing the debt in a responsible and effective manner. Toward that end, it has the obligation to preserve the integrity of Treasury securities markets. Congress has the duty to exercise oversight of these activities. As chairman of the Senate committee with jurisdiction over these issues, I have to say that when it comes to accountability and transparency on these matters, a great deal of improvement is necessary. That is putting it kindly.

For example, each time the debt begins to approach the statutory limit,

the administration makes a lot of noise about how it is difficult to deal with delayed payments on Treasury securities. Please note that I am talking about payments on securities, not general payment obligations of the Federal Government for spending programs, which is all together a separate matter. A number of scenarios could give rise to delayed payments on Treasury securities.

One of those scenarios is a debt limit impasse between Congress and the administration, but there are others, including weather events, cyber or terrorist attacks, or any number of known risks, that responsible debt managers must take into account. We know for a fact that the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve have developed contingency plans for these types of risks.

The existence of such plans has been made public in minutes of the Federal Reserve's Federal Open Market Committee and in minutes of meetings involving Fed and Treasury officials and representatives of large financial firms. However, the administration has flat out—flat out—refused to share those contingency plans with Congress or to even openly acknowledge their existence.

I have been the lead Republican on the Senate Finance Committee since January 2011. I have been asking to see those plans since the summer of 2011. Over more than 4 years and through multiple requests for information, I have been told a number of things, usually stories that end with the claim that, even though plans have been discussed, nothing has ever been formalized.

So there are really only two plausible conclusions to be drawn: Either the administration is being dishonest with Congress and they have contingency plans in place, or the administration is being irresponsible by failing to account for the obvious potential risks. Apparently, they are comfortable with Congress, not to mention the American people, reaching either one of those conclusions if it means they don't have to share more information.

Simply stated, there is no reason for Treasury and the Fed, along with large financial firms participating in the Treasury securities markets, to formulate contingency plans for these markets without reporting them to Congress or sharing them with the Senate Finance Committee—no reason whatsoever. Yet here we are. Sadly, this lack of transparency does not end with obviously needed contingency plans. As I alluded to earlier, Treasury also shares very little information with Congress concerning cash forecasts, particularly as we approach the debt limit. I have asked for detailed, contemporaneous updates of cost forecasts in order to, among other things, properly verify Treasury's debt limit projections. In response, Treasury officials have told me that those projections are "highly market sensitive" and, at times, cannot be shared with Congress. Yet I have

to assume that a number of officials at Treasury and probably the Fed have access to this sensitive data.

I am not aware of any special security clearance assigned to these individuals. It is evidently the position of the administration that there are times where it is neither Congress's nor the American people's business to know how much cash Treasury expects to have in the Federal till. This needs to change. Given my oversight responsibilities as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I am always interested in preserving the integrity and efficiency of markets for Treasury securities.

Unfortunately, under our laws, regulatory and oversight authority with respect to those markets spreads far and wide with responsibilities spanning across the Treasury, the Fed, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Commodities Future Trading Commission, and an alphabet soup of other groups. As we saw with the most recent financial crisis, this type of balkanization of authority inevitably leads to ineffective oversight and regulation.

When problems arise, all the various parties point their fingers at each other. Everyone has authority, yet no one ends up being accountable.

Unfortunately, the so-called Dodd-Frank legislation did not fix any of these problems. In fact, I would argue, all it did was give existing regulators yet more authority and of course added a few more acronyms into the mix.

All of this is relevant to current discussion about the debt limit because it speaks to the overall management of our Nation's debt and the lack of transparency among all these agencies. I can cite numerous examples where a lack of communication and accountability has been problematic. For now, I will briefly mention three such instances.

First, in 2013, Treasury began auctioning something called a "floating rate note," the first new Treasury security since inflation protection securities were introduced more than 15 years ago. This was a significant debt management decision. Yet very little information was shared with the Senate Finance Committee, even though Treasury had many discussions about the new note with representatives from large financial firms.

Second, Treasury recently decided again—after several meetings with large banks—that an average cash balance for the Federal Government of around \$50 billion per day was too low and that going forward the balance would need to be \$150 billion or more. Once again, prior to that decision being finalized, there was no communication from Treasury to the Senate Finance Committee.

Third, on one particular day in October of 2014, there were unusual and difficult-to-explain events in markets for Treasury securities. While all the various regulators and interest groups have issued staff reports and have held meetings and seminars relating to the

apparent volatility demonstrated by these events, I am not aware of any outreach or information sharing with the members or staff of the Senate Finance Committee.

Again, these are just three examples. There are certainly others, and all of them demonstrate that this administration is far too often unwilling to even provide simple updates about its debt management policies—all while insisting that Congress repeatedly raise the debt limit without asking questions or attaching reforms. This also needs to change. If the administration is going to continue to demand that Congress act to increase the debt limit, then it should, at the very least, be more forthcoming about its policies and decisionmaking when it comes to managing our debt.

While I agree we cannot and should not risk defaulting on our debt or obligations, it is essential that Congress receives a complete picture from the administration about its debt management policies. Therefore, I want to make clear to Treasury—and other agencies with responsibilities in this area—that there is an imminent need for improved communication and increased transparency on these matters.

As chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I intend to do all I can to ensure greater accountability. That may include more hearings with officials brought before the committee or legislation to require more information flows between the administration and Congress. Ultimately, what specific actions we take will depend on the administration's ability to cooperate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, as we speak—as I am speaking on the floor of the Senate—in an act of stunning partisan politics, President Obama, the Commander in Chief of the U.S. Armed Forces, has decided he will veto the National Defense Authorization Act. He is choosing to hold our military hostage for a domestic political agenda, and he is doing so at a time when the crises we face around the world have never been greater, when U.S. leadership has never been weaker, and when our men and women in uniform need vital resources to defend and secure the Nation.

As I said, in an act of stunning partisan politics, President Obama, the Commander in Chief, has decided he will veto the national defense authorization bill, and he is right now in the act of doing so—holding our military hostage for his domestic political agenda.

I have been in the Senate and the House for a long time. I have never

seen an act of blatant partisanship with disregard for the men and women who are serving in the military than what the President is doing as we speak. For 53 years, Congress has fulfilled its constitutional duty to provide for the common defense by passing the National Defense Authorization Act. For 53 consecutive years, both bodies have passed, and the President has signed into law, the National Defense Authorization Act. In all my years, I have never witnessed anything so misguided, cynical, and downright dangerous as vetoing the Defense authorization for reasons that have nothing to do with defense—nothing to do with defense.

Presidents throughout history—Republicans and Democrats alike—have recognized the importance of this bill to our national defense. In the more than 50 years since Congress has passed an NDAA, a National Defense Authorization Act, the President of the United States has only vetoed the act four times. In each case, the President objected to an actual provision in the bill, and each time the Congress was able to find a compromise that earned the President's signature.

Let's be clear. The President's veto of this year's bill is not over any of its policies, it is over politics. In the President's case, politics has taken precedence over policies, and when we are talking about the lives of the men and women who are serving this Nation in uniform—disgraceful. For the first time in history, the Commander in Chief will sacrifice national security for his larger domestic political agenda.

This veto will not resolve the spending debate; it will not stop sequestration. That is something that can only be done through the appropriations process, not a defense authorization bill.

Our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines have answered the call to protect our Nation. They want and need support. They don't care what budget category that support comes from. I wish to point out we authorized exactly the amount of money the President requested.

This is a Washington game. All the men and women who are serving in the military care about is that their mission is fully resourced. With this veto, their mission will not be fully resourced. We will put their lives in greater danger because of this political game of the President—holding the military men and women hostage for his agenda to fund the IRS and the EPA.

The legislation the President vetoed today authorizes the overall amount for defense that he requested, every single dollar of it.

By making clear that he will "not fix defense without fixing non-defense

spending," the President of the United States puts defense and the men and women in the military on the same level as the IRS. The President is using our military—using our military—as leverage to fight a battle that the Defense authorization bill cannot accomplish.

At a time of mounting threats around the world, it is disgraceful. It is disgraceful the President would refuse to authorize for our troops the resources they need to prepare for and engage in vital missions around the world and that deliver some of the most significant reforms to the Pentagon in more than 30 years.

By vetoing this legislation, the Defense authorization bill, let's be clear what the President is saying no to. He is saying no to pay increases and more than 30 types of bonuses and special pays for servicemembers, saying no to more portability of military health plans and greater access to urgent care facilities for troops and their families, saying no to enhanced protection against military sexual assault, saying no to significant reforms to a 70-year-old military retirement system that would extend retirement benefits to over 80 percent of servicemembers, saying no to the most sweeping reforms to our defense acquisition system in nearly 30 years, saying no to a ban on torture once and for all, saying no to \$300 million in lethal assistance for the Ukrainians to defend themselves against Russian aggression, and saying no to countless other important provisions that are greatly needed to combat the growing threats we see around the world today.

Perhaps, most importantly, the President of the United States is refusing to sign a bill at a time when—as our top military commanders and national security experts have testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee—the world has not seen greater turmoil since the end of World War II.

So, my friends, here is the context. Thanks to the President's failed policies, the results of leading from behind, the results of a policy of "Don't do stupid stuff," we now see a world in a state of turmoil—the likes of which we have not seen since the end of World War II.

On a bipartisan basis, we passed a defense authorization bill that has monumental consequences to the future security of this Nation, the present security of this Nation, and the welfare and ability of the men and women who are serving this Nation and their ability to defend this Nation, and the President—because he wants an increase in domestic spending, has vetoed it.

Never have I seen such irresponsibility on the part of a Commander in Chief. There have been Presidents I have disagreed with. There have been Presidents I have had spirited debates with—but never ever in history has there been a President of the United States who abrogated his responsibilities, his constitutional responsibilities,

as Commander in Chief. I say shame on him today, and this is a shameful day.

The House will vote to override this veto on November 5. I strongly urge my colleagues to reverse this dangerous action and put the interests of our military and national security ahead of politics. Our men and women serving around the world, many still in harm's way, deserve nothing less.

I spend a lot of time with the men and women who are serving in the military, including members of my own family, and they are not uninformed. They are very intelligent. They watch what we do—we, their elected representatives. Their voters trust us to defend them, care for them, to give them the weapons they need, the benefits they need, and the care they need when the wounded come back. They rely on us. They are going to see, as we watch Vladimir Putin on the march, as we watch the success of ISIS, as we watch Ukraine being dismembered, as we watch China commit more aggression in the South China Sea and fill in islands—and now? Now this Commander in Chief decides that this is a time to veto an authorization bill because he doesn't think there is enough domestic spending. It is a sad day, a very sad day. It is a sad day for America but most of all it is a very sad day for the men and women with whom we entrust our very lives and our security. It is a sad day.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION MEDICAL CARE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, next month our Nation will pause to honor the millions of men and women who have fought for our freedom and worked to advance peace around the world.

Veterans Day is our annual way to say thank you and to honor those who have sacrificed so much on our behalf. While I would like to stand on the floor and say our country is doing everything we can for the people we owe the most to, that we are fulfilling the promise we made to them when we sent them off to fight for us, unfortunately that is not currently the case because our Nation is falling far short of its goal of honoring our veterans when it comes to VA care.

Despite a sweeping bill intended to tackle some of the most pressing problems and give the VA new tools and a change at the top of the VA more than a year ago, I continue to hear from veterans across my home State of Washington about care that is inconsistent, outdated, and often downright dismissive of individual needs. I have heard from a number of veterans in my home State of Washington who are waiting on surgeries, MRIs, oncology appointments, mental health screenings—you name it—and far too

often they say they are told it will be months to see a doctor or a specialist.

I bring their stories today, to this "other Washington," to continue to make clear this kind of outdated, inefficient care is unacceptable.

This is a pivotal time for our VA, and the demands on the system will only go up as wars continue to wind down and the Vietnam-era veterans continue to seek more care for the injuries and illnesses they suffer from. As the daughter of a World War II veteran, I refuse to let standard care be the status quo. I won't accept long wait times, redtape, and understaffed hospitals as a reality for our veterans. I am not going to stop fighting to make sure we have a system that works no matter how long it takes, no matter how many obstacles we face, and no matter who is in charge at the VA.

The law we passed to give veterans more options for care has now had an opportunity to go into effect. We can see what is working, what is not, what we can build on, and what we need to tear apart.

Last year I supported the inclusion of an independent assessment of the VA health system in the Choice Act, and recently that assessment validated what we have been telling the VA for years: There is growing bureaucracy, and there are problems with leadership and staffing, and massive capital costs. While the independent assessment identified some bright spots in the VA system, it also found that care and patient experiences differ widely across the system and that best practices and important policies are not instituted across the country. That means we all have more work to do because we have a responsibility to our veterans.

Here is what we are up against. The VA still has multiple non-VA care programs, none of which talk to each other, none of which are coordinated. They all have different eligibility criteria, different procedures for patients and providers, and different reimbursement rates.

I hear frequently from veterans in my home State of Washington about how difficult the Choice Program has been. From VA staff who don't understand the program, to confusion about eligibility, to getting the runaround from contractors, veterans are sick and tired of having to fight just to get an appointment.

I hear how frustrating some of the bizarre rules and restrictions on Choice are. For example, an authorization for care only lasts 60 days. Well, if you are a woman veteran and you are pregnant, you are going to need more than 60 days of care.

At the VA, we are still hearing that the wait times are far too high. But with long wait times in the private sector and the burdensome process to even get into the Choice Program, veterans are finding they actually would have gotten care sooner if they had stuck with the VA. If the solution to the wait time problem takes longer than going to the VA, it is not working.

It is no wonder that veterans and providers alike turn their backs on the VA. The system is so complicated, it is impossible to get good health care.

It is time for the VA to implement one—one—non-VA care program for the future. As we now approach the end of this trial period for the 2-year Choice Program, the VA has to use this opportunity to finally get it right on non-VA care. It needs to design a new system that truly meets the needs of our veterans.

I believe that system must have five fundamental characteristics:

First of all, it has to be veteran-centered, with clear eligibility rules so veterans know what they can do and what they can expect and where they can go for what care and how that system works. It also means the experience for veterans trying to use the system has to improve. For example, veterans should never be turned away with a dismissive “We are not taking new patients.”

Secondly, it has to be easy for our providers, with simple and consistent procedures for them to deliver care, report back to the VA, and get reimbursed quickly. The contracting system needs to be simple and clear so that private providers can step in where the VA cannot.

Third, a new system must provide high-quality care that includes effective care coordination, and that requires that electronic medical records be returned to the VA. That includes oversight of the quality of care being delivered in the private sector. We have to know our veterans are being appropriately cared for.

Fourth, the new system has to be flexible enough to compensate for local needs, types of care where VA is deficient, or locations where the VA does not have a presence. Whether working with community providers to increase certain specialty appointments or seeing where the VA needs to move resources to hire more VA staff, the system has to maintain flexibility to adjust to new trends and new needs.

Finally, it has to be cost-effective for the VA and not shift the cost of care onto our veterans. Earlier this year, the VA nearly ran out of money, and they threatened to shut down the health care system. Well, we should invest whatever we need to to make sure our veterans are getting care. The new non-VA care system must be more efficient, and the VA needs to be clear with Congress about what it needs. Without a change, I would not be surprised if next year we don't find ourselves in the same position where we have underfunded the VA and need to come in and transfer funding to keep the VA operating. I will work with anyone and stand behind no one when it comes to getting veterans the funding they need.

Perhaps most important, when implementation begins, it simply must be better than what we saw with the Choice Program. VA staff have to be

trained and proficient, and third-party administrators in charge of the networks of private providers have to be efficient and responsive. Veterans deserve a system that works, not one that is torn apart and weakened over time.

So the answer isn't just to dismantle the VA and leave veterans to fend for themselves, as some proposals would do; the solution starts, finally, with a real conversation about what is going on at the VA, what the problems are, and then pursues an “all of the above” approach that finally strengthens the VA system, uses community providers to fill in the gaps where the VA cannot get the job done, and continues to make the best use of other Federal help programs, such as DOD and federally qualified health centers—all in an effort to truly build a veteran-centered VA health care system.

I stand ready to work with anyone to do this, and I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me and not make this a Democratic or Republican issue. Veterans issues have never been partisan, and, in my mind, there is no place for that when we sit at the table to solve a complicated problem. I hope the administration is ready to fundamentally reshape this program. I hope bureaucrats who spend more time defending the broken system are ready to get to work implementing solutions built around the needs of our veterans. And I hope providers—those who work with the VA and DOD and TRICARE, as well as those who currently do not provide care to veterans—play a role to improve veteran care.

The wars may no longer lead the nightly news, but that doesn't mean the cost of these wars is gone too. Our veterans are still there, they still need health care and services, and we will not forget them.

I expect the VA to do better. Our veterans have already sacrificed so much. They should not have to come back and fight the VA to get the care they have earned. Let's act and let's do something that truly honors our Nation's heroes.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Washington for her very thorough and passionate explanation of the problems with the VA. It is time we got it straightened out. We have a new director because there was a problem. We gave them more money because there was a problem. We did the Choice Act because there was a problem. I think the VA is kind of fighting the Choice Act because they want to make sure they keep it within their own clutches. But it is time that we got it straightened out and that we got some action.

All of us are getting calls from veterans we should never get. We could go into a variety of them. But I would like to work with the Senator, and I appreciate the comments she just made. I

thought they were very bipartisan and very much needed.

Mrs. MURRAY. I thank the Senator very much.

GROWTH IN FEDERAL REGULATIONS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, it is often said that there are two constants in life—death and taxes—but I would like to add one more for your consideration: regulations. We often talk about the threat that America's growing debt poses to our economy and to our future, but the growth in Federal regulations also poses a serious threat to our Nation's long-term job creation and economic growth.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, or CBO, the potential growth rate of our economy—or the rate of growth that is possible given the education of our workers, the quality of capital equipment, and the business formation rate—averaged 3.3 percent for the period from 1950 through 2014. However, CBO expects that annual rate to fall 2.1 percent in the period of 2015 through 2025. That is a 36-percent reduction in the potential growth rate of the economy. Why is this so critical? According to the President's own Office of Management and Budget, a 1-percent increase in the economy's growth rate will yield more than \$400 billion in new revenues without raising taxes. Yes, that is according to the President's own Office of Management and Budget. A 1-percent increase in the economy's growth rate—we are talking about the private sector, not the government sector; the private sector is where the revenues come from—would yield more than \$400 billion in revenues without raising taxes.

We are always talking about the need for more revenues, but we are doing the opposite. The administration is doing the opposite of what it takes to get that growth to happen. When the growth rate falls, when we grow more slowly than we could and aren't meeting our full potential, government revenues also fail to keep up with budget projections. If we reduce by 1 percent, we lose another \$400 billion in revenues. So what happens when the government revenue comes up even shorter in the face of growing overspending? That results in more borrowing, and it results in bigger overspending and in expanded debt.

Senators from the Western States know all too well the economic effects of regulations coming out of bureaucracy-bloated agencies such as the Environmental Protection Agency. Today I want to focus not just on the impact of recent regulations on my home State of Wyoming's economy but the drag they are creating on the economy nationwide. And at the same time, they are hiring ad agencies at billions of dollars to improve their image. They can improve their image just by doing their job without putting more burdens on the American people and eliminating jobs.

The State of Wyoming is the largest coal-producing State in the Nation. Coal represents almost 40 percent of our share of electricity generation across the United States. My county provides 40 percent of all of the coal in the United States. It is abundant, it is affordable, and it is stockpilable. It is the only energy that is stockpilable. This is an energy source which has the potential to power our country for hundreds of years, to support jobs for thousands of people, and doesn't put us at the mercy of unstable regimes overseas, but this administration continues to denigrate and regulate coal out of existence.

Since 2012, two EPA rules—the mercury and air toxic standards rule and the ozone rule—are estimated to have cost in the tens of billions of dollars.

Let me talk just about the mercury and air toxic standards. That is supposed to help save, with benefits—without seeing any scientific evidence where these benefits come from—over a period of years, maybe \$500 million. What is the cost? The cost is \$73 billion a year. Why would anyone go for that small of a benefit at that big of a cost?

We are an inventive country. If we put incentives of just a couple billion dollars out there, people will solve the problem and get those benefits permanently for a very small number, not \$43 billion to \$73 billion a year. Those two rules don't include the billions of dollars lost to thousands more rules imposed by the EPA and other agencies every year.

If all those rules weren't onerous enough, in August the EPA doubled down on its war on coal when it released the final rule on the Clean Power Plan. With an estimated price tag of at least \$366 billion, this rule will not only devastate the coal industry by mandating unrealistic carbon reductions, it will also distress American families by causing double-digit electric rate increases in more than 40 States.

The coal industry in Wyoming is feeling the impact. The coal industry and businesses and the people who work there and rely on it are facing higher regulatory costs at the same time as energy producers are seeing a tougher market than they have in years. This is a bad combination for economic growth and job creation. At the end of July, Wyoming had 15 percent fewer energy industry jobs than it did a year earlier, and these are good-paying jobs. That is according to the U.S. Department of Labor and Bureau of Labor Statistics. Most of those lost jobs are in coal, oil, and gas, and the businesses that rely on them. We forget about that ripple effect. Given that close to half of Wyoming's GDP comes from this sector, and that nearly half of our State is federally owned and much is removed from development activity, we have always been concerned about any unnecessary government intrusion in our economic livelihood.

Why do we provide 40 percent of the Nation's coal? It is because it is a

cleaner coal, lower in sulfur and other chemicals, than any other State in the Nation. We ship coal to other coal States so they can mix it with their coal to meet the clean air standards. But that is not good enough.

The economic impact of the EPA and other Federal regulations is not just hurting Wyoming's economy and costing my State jobs. They are a major reason why the economy nationwide is not operating at its full potential for economic growth, and it has been stuck around 2 percent since the beginning of the so-called economic recovery. We are doing it to ourselves. Remember, a 1-percent reduction in the gross national product is \$400 billion less in taxes.

The onslaught of Federal regulations targeted directly at the coal industry are not just concerns; they are real threats to people's economic livelihood—the ability to support their families, the ability to support education in most of these States, and the ability to support entire communities across the country. With our \$18 trillion in debt, we can't afford to accept the notion that we are in what some are calling a new normal of economic anemic growth. We need to help our economy reach its potential, which will help each and every American. This cannot be done if the number and cost of significant Federal regulations continues to rise.

The Obama administration continues to push Federal regulations, such as the waters of the United States rule, which significantly expands Federal authority under the Clean Water Act. That rule has been taken to three courts already, and in each of those cases, it has been ruled illegal.

They are still pursuing other avenues. The recent National Labor Relations Board rulemaking redefined the meaning of an employer.

These regulations, taken by themselves, have the potential to impose billions of dollars in economic costs—on family farms, ranches, and particularly small businesses—which hinder the growth of America's entrepreneurial spirit, not to mention the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. It sounds like a great entity, but in banks alone, they have had to hire twice as many people to do paperwork as they used to have to have, just to keep from getting fined by an agency that has no control. I tried to get an inspector general to be over the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. After we got him, he said: You know, I don't have any authority to look at any of this stuff.

Where are the fines going?

We don't know. We are not allowed to see that.

That is because they get their money from the Federal Reserve before the money from the Federal Reserve comes from the U.S. Government. We shouldn't have anything as out of control as that.

I was meeting with some community bankers. I said: Well, my wife is kind of

interested in expanding our kitchen in Gillette, and I was thinking maybe we ought to get a loan and do that. The house is all paid for. I was wondering how long it would take.

They said: Well, about 78 days, and then you get 1 week. In case you don't like the deal you made, you can rescind it. I remember the last time we needed to do something in the house before it was paid for. I had to get a second mortgage, and I got it in a matter of a couple of days. They could just write the check so I could go ahead and do it. Now it is 78 days plus another week. That is what government regulations are doing. That doesn't speed up the economy. There isn't a contractor that can go to work until they get an assurance of being paid.

Over the next few months and weeks, I am going to share with my colleagues new information from leading economists that shows there is a real relationship between the growth of regulations and our struggling economy. This is a relationship that is clear to the people who experience the difficulties of complying with more and more regulations that make it harder to succeed. I hope that what is clear to business owners, to their employees, and to the communities across the country can be understood here in Washington.

I will share new statistics and data showing the lost income and jobs due to Federal regulations, the effects of regulation on key industries, the breakdown of how specific Federal agencies are impacting our economy, and the regulatory burden the Federal Government has placed on hard-working Americans in economic sectors in every State. It is crucial for lawmakers and hard-working Americans to understand the true cost of the regulations that are being issued by this administration. Shining a light on these regulations and the burden they impose on each and every American is the only way to hold government accountable and to begin the process of reining in out-of-control agencies so we can halt the flood of regulations choking our economy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

MIDDLE EAST REFUGEE CRISIS AND UKRAINE

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago, I left for Greece with a Senate delegation that included DICK DURBIN from Illinois, AMY KLOBUCHAR from Minnesota, and ELIZABETH WARREN from Massachusetts. In my capacity as lead Democrat on the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Europe and Regional Security Cooperation, I was honored to head our delegation. We were there to witness firsthand the plight of refugees arriving by sea on the island of Lesbos. In Greece and later in Germany, we received in-depth

briefings on the refugee crisis and Europe's response to it. In Kiev, we conferred with the Ukrainian Prime Minister and President about their country's struggle to create a stable democracy in the face of ongoing Russian aggression.

Nearly a quarter of a million Syrians have been killed during the current conflict in the Middle East. An estimated 8 million Syrians have been displaced internally. Another 4 million have left the country. They are fleeing hunger, unspeakable violence, and a land that no longer offers any hope for their children. They have endured barrel bombs, chemical attacks, indiscriminate shelling, the barbarity of ISIS, and now a military offensive sponsored by Russia and Iran.

To reach Europe, these refugees have been preyed upon by traffickers and other criminals, some selling refugee children for sex, for slavery, or for organs. The refugees have risked drowning at sea and suffocation in locked vans, and they will soon confront the freezing temperatures and snows of winter.

While we were traveling, we heard accounts from the refugees of paying smugglers thousands of dollars to get on small boats with motors that barely work, boats built for a few but loaded with 40 to 50 refugees. I use the term "boats" loosely. What I am talking about are rubber rafts that were built to hold maybe 10 to 15 people and were loaded with 40 to 50 refugees. The Greek Coast Guard told us that refugees pay exorbitant prices for life preservers that are more like the children's inflatables that you see at swimming pools. When refugees set off from Turkey across the Aegean to Lesbos, they are instructed by the smugglers to puncture their raft with a knife if they encounter the Greek Coast Guard so that the Greeks will be forced to rescue them.

I was profoundly moved by my conversations with refugees from Syria and other conflict zones in the Middle East. It is one thing to hear about millions of Syrian refugees fleeing the war; it is something else entirely to actually meet and talk with individual refugees, including children who have been separated from their parents.

I was struck by the fact that many of these refugees have endured extreme hardship for weeks, if not years. Their future is filled with extreme uncertainty. Yet so many of them were filled with optimism and hope. In Athens, we met a 6-year-old Afghan boy who had made the trip to Greece with his 13-year-old cousin. This boy proudly gave us all sticks of gum. In Germany, we met young men from Syria—a former English teacher, a Ph.D. student, and an engineer. One young man looked ahead to a brighter future and said one day he wanted to be the President of Syria. These refugees were weary and they were anxious, but they were also deeply grateful and hopeful about their future lives in a safe, secure Europe.

Altogether, we met and talked with a couple dozen refugees. They are men, women, and children who are no different from loved ones in our own families and citizens in our own communities. They aspire to the very same things, including a decent life for their children. They told us about the desperation and despair they left behind in Syria, Iraq, and other conflict areas. Multiply these desperate stories by countless thousands of refugees—up to 10,000 entering Europe daily and more than 1 million so far this year. It adds up to a humanitarian crisis of staggering dimensions.

Now, to be sure, Europe is being challenged, but this crisis also challenges the United States and the world. At critical moments in history, the international community has faced similar challenges: Jews seeking refuge from persecution and later genocide in Nazi Germany; famine killing millions in Biafra in the late 1960s; the genocides in Cambodia, Rwanda, Darfur, and Bosnia. Faced with these crises, the world confronted a stark choice: to turn away or to engage.

The United States cannot turn away from the refugee crisis unfolding in the Middle East and Europe. On Lesbos last week, we talked with Greeks who operate small businesses that depend on tourism, which has dried up because of the crisis. They said that the refugees must be their first priority, that Greeks must help people who are in need.

In Athens, we visited a facility for refugee children run by a group called Praxis. Praxis workers told us about Afghan children being sold in Europe as sex slaves for as much as \$10,000. Praxis and scores of similar organizations are doing everything possible, with very limited means, to meet the refugees' desperate needs.

In Germany, we met with officials at the Finance Ministry and the Chancery, as well as people in and out of government who are rising to the challenge of the refugee crisis. Chancellor Angela Merkel has demonstrated extraordinary moral leadership in addressing this crisis. Millions of ordinary German citizens—indeed, people all across Europe—have mobilized to meet the needs of the refugees.

However, it was clear to me and to the other Senators in our delegation that these noble efforts are not enough. The refugee crisis is too big; the scale of human suffering and needs is overwhelming.

President Obama has offered to take in 10,000 refugees over the next year. But Germany is taking in as many as 10,000 refugees in a single day—day after day, week after week, with no end in sight. My State of New Hampshire has been welcoming to refugees fleeing conflict, as have other States. I think people are eager to do more across this country. Turkey needs to secure its borders, and it needs to crack down on smugglers and criminal gangs exploiting and trafficking in refugees. Front-

line countries, including Greece and Italy, need more resources to help process and register refugees. In fact, the same is true of Turkey, Jordan, and Lebanon, which have taken in millions of refugees.

As I said, Germany has earned our admiration for its leadership, offering to take in as many as 1 million refugees this year. But for all its resources, Germany can't do this alone. It is already reaching a point where its communities can't keep up with the influx.

We are confronting the greatest humanitarian crisis of our time. Europe is responding. The European Union will use the coming winter months, when the flow of refugees will slow, to come up with a more effective plan to share the burden and address this challenge. However, European nations, Turkey, Jordan, and other frontline states, such as Lebanon, can't meet this challenge alone. The international community must give more generous support to humanitarian efforts by the World Food Program and others. By all means, the United States, as leader of the Atlantic Alliance, must play a more robust role in addressing the refugee crisis.

I am heartened by the bipartisan bill that is sponsored by Senator GRAHAM of South Carolina and Senator LEAHY of Vermont, which would provide \$1 billion in assistance to meeting the needs of refugees. The Obama administration has proposed taking in 10,000 Syrian refugees over the next year. That is a start. It is not enough given the scale of this crisis. We have the resources to safely vet and process more refugees for asylum in the United States, even as we need to do so more efficiently.

As Senator GRAHAM said recently, "I don't see how you can lead the free world and turn your back on people who are seeking it." To turn away families fleeing violence, says Senator GRAHAM, is to "take the Statue of Liberty and tear it down . . . because we don't mean it anymore."

We also need to deal with the root of the problem, the violence in Syria. We must redouble our diplomatic efforts as well as our campaign against the Islamic State in both Syria and Iraq. Unfortunately, there is a new dimension to the chaos and conflict in Syria. In recent weeks, Russia has sent combat planes, heavy armor, and military personnel to support the regime of Bashar al-Assad. Russia is threatening to send thousands of so-called volunteer troops to Syria to fight on the frontline.

A newly aggressive and reckless Russia is a problem not only in the Middle East but also in Ukraine, where our Senate delegation visited after leaving Greece. The Ukrainians are struggling to fight corruption and build a stable democracy. But those efforts have been severely undermined by Russian subversion and aggression. President Putin was not content to invade and annex Crimea. He has also sponsored the establishment of Russian-controlled provinces in eastern Ukraine.

This conflict in the east of Ukraine is designed by Russia to destabilize democratic Ukraine and to drain its resources.

While in Kiev, our delegation met with senior government officials, including Prime Minister Yatsenyuk and President Petro Poroshenko. We were briefed on Russia's efforts on many fronts to destabilize the country. We were also briefed on Ukraine's efforts to boost its economy and to root out corruption in the country's government and institutions.

The European Union and the United States are standing by Ukraine, and this solidarity is making a difference. It appears to have moderated Russia's ambitions, at least for now. The countries of Western Europe and the United States have demanded that Russia fully implement the Minsk II agreement to contain the conflict, and we heard some encouraging signs. Elections in the breakaway provinces—elections that might have led to succession—have been delayed. Russia is redeploying light armor away from the region. But, of course, this is not adequate.

Sanctions on Russia must remain in place until President Putin and the rebels he backs fulfill all of their obligations under the Minsk II agreement. I left Ukraine with a strong sense that despite living under an ever-present threat from Russia, this is a nation that continues to stand strong and move forward. It was an honor to personally reaffirm to Ukraine's leadership and citizens that the United States is an ally and partner and that we strongly support the government's agenda of reform and modernization.

Our European allies are confronting an array of challenges unprecedented since the end of the Second World War: not only the refugee crisis but also rising threats from Russia, economies that continue to be held back by debt and austerity, and a resurgence of nationalistic and nativist political parties. However, our delegation witnessed firsthand a creative and resourceful Europe that is capable of meeting these challenges. Europe needs and deserves American support and partnership, beginning with a more robust U.S. response to the refugee crisis, which is the greatest humanitarian challenge of our time. I hope we in this Chamber and in Congress will rise in response to that challenge to do our part.

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. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CYBERSECURITY INFORMATION SHARING ACT

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the Intelligence

Committee bill we are currently debating, the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015, or CISA.

This Chamber sees its fair share of disagreements, so it is worth noting when there is something we can all agree on, and I think we can all agree on the need for congressional action on cyber security. We face ever-increasing cyber attacks from sophisticated individuals, organized crime syndicates, and foreign regimes. These attacks pose a real threat to our economy and to our national security. It is clear that we must respond to these new threats because the cost of complacency is too high, but it is critical, in deciding how we protect our information networks, that we also continue to protect the fundamental privacy rights and civil liberties of Americans. In short, there is a pressing need for meaningful, effective cyber security legislation that balances privacy and security. Unfortunately, as it now stands, the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act falls short.

Since this legislation was first introduced, I and a number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have raised serious concerns about the problems the bill presents for Americans' privacy and for the effective operation of our Nation's cyber defense. My colleagues and I are not alone. Serious concerns have been raised by technologists and security experts, civil society organizations from across the political spectrum, and major tech companies, such as Apple, Dropbox, Twitter, Yelp, salesforce.com, and Mozilla. Neither the Business Software Alliance nor the Computer & Communications Industry Association supports CISA as written.

In a letter I received from the Department of Homeland Security this summer, the agency—which has a leading role in cyber security for the Federal Government—expressed concern about specific aspects of CISA. DHS explained that under the bill's approach, "the complexity—for both government and businesses—and inefficiency of any information sharing program will markedly increase." The letter explained that CISA would do away with important privacy protections and could make it harder, not easier, to develop "a single, comprehensive picture of the range of cyber threats faced daily."

Senator BURR and Senator FEINSTEIN, the bill managers, have worked very hard over the last months to improve various aspects of the bill, and their substitute amendment offers a significantly improved version of CISA. I really appreciate their efforts, but it is clear to me and others that the improvements did not go far enough. Major concerns raised in the letter from DHS and voiced by security experts, privacy advocates, and tech companies still have not been resolved. Let me briefly describe three of them.

First, the bill gives companies a free pass to engage in network monitoring

and information sharing activities, as well as the operation of defensive measures, in response to anything they deem a "cyber security threat," no matter how improbable it is that it constitutes a risk of any kind.

The term "cyber security threat" is really the linchpin of this bill. Companies can monitor systems, share cyber threat indicators with one another or with the government, and deploy defensive measures to protect against any cyber security threats. So the definition of "cyber security threat" is pretty important, and the bill defines "cyber security threat" to include any action that "may result in an unauthorized effort to adversely impact" cyber security. Under this definition, companies can take action even if it is unreasonable to think that security might be compromised.

This raises serious concerns about the scope of all of the authorities granted by the bill and the privacy implications of those authorities. Security experts and advocates have warned that in this context, establishing the broadest possible definition of "cyber security threat" actually threatens to undermine security by increasing the amount of unreliable information shared with the government.

I have written an amendment, which is cosponsored by Senators LEAHY, WYDEN, and DURBIN, which would set the bar a bit higher, requiring that a threat be at least "reasonably likely" to result in an effort to adversely impact security. This standard gives companies plenty of flexibility. They don't need to be certain that an incident or event is an attack before they share information, but they should have at least determined that it is a plausible threat.

The definition of a cyber security threat isn't the only problematic provision of the bill. This brings me to the second concern that I would like to highlight. The bill provides a blanket authorization that allows companies to share information "notwithstanding any other provision of law." As DHS explained this past summer, that statutory language "sweeps away important privacy protections." Indeed, it means that CISA would override all existing privacy laws, from the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, ECPA, to HIPAA, a law that protects sensitive health information.

Moreover, this blanket authorization applies to sharing done with any Federal agency. Companies are free to directly share with whomever they may choose, including law enforcement and military intelligence agencies. This means that, unbeknownst to their customers, companies may share information that contains customers' personal information with NSA, FBI, and others. From a security perspective, it also means we are setting up a diffuse system. I want to emphasize this. This is setting up a diffuse system that, as DHS's letter acknowledged, is likely to be complex and inefficient, where it is

actually harder for our cyber security experts to connect the dots and keep us safe.

These are all reasons why privacy experts, independent security experts, and the Department of Homeland Security have all warned that CISA's blanket authorization is a problem.

Earlier this year, the House avoided this problem when they passed the National Cybersecurity Protection Advancement Act by a vote of 355 to 63. That information sharing bill only authorizes sharing with the government through a single civilian hub at the Department of Homeland Security—a move toward efficient streamlining of information that is also good for privacy. But understand that this is the House of Representatives, 355 to 63, saying: Let's make this easier for the government to have all the information in one place.

Finally, CISA fails to adequately assure the removal of irrelevant personal information. This, of course, is a major concern. The bill allows personal information to be shared even when there is a high likelihood that the information is not related to a cyber security threat. Combined with the bill's overly broad definition of "cyber security threat," this basically ensures that private entities will share extraneous information from Americans' personal communications. If companies are going to receive the broad liability protection this bill provides, they should be expected to do better than this.

Senator WYDEN has offered an amendment, which I am proud to be the cosponsor of, which would require companies to be more diligent and to remove "to the extent feasible" any personal information that isn't necessary to identify a cyber security threat. The "extent feasible" is a crucial improvement, but it is hardly novel; in fact, it is basically the same standard that is in place today when information is shared between private companies and the Department of Homeland Security. There is no justification for lowering that standard in CISA, especially because the bill also provides companies with significant liability protection.

Mr. President, the amendments I have talked about today, as well as a number of other pending amendments, would make CISA a better deal, one that is significantly more protective of Americans' privacy and more likely to advance cyber security. I want to encourage my colleagues to support these amendments. Without them, I fear that, however well intentioned, CISA would do a disservice to the American people.

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.

TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I would just note that the Presiding Officer and I are on the same schedule, because I come here a couple of times a week, but you are here more often than not when I am speaking. I am sorry. This is cruel and unusual punishment, I suspect, for you. But I welcome the opportunity. Thank you for showing up. Otherwise, I would not have a chance to share these thoughts today with the folks that are in the Chamber and anybody else who might have tuned in.

Earlier this year, the Senate actually took up legislation that was reported out of the Environment and Public Works Committee, which was a 6-year Transportation authorization bill. A lot of people who don't work here don't realize that for us to spend money—taxpayer money—in most cases we have to authorize a program at certain funding levels. Then we have to come back and do a second step, and that is to actually appropriate the money to spend that has been authorized.

Usually, if we are authorized to spend \$100 in a program, we cannot come in and just appropriate a lot more money than that. We have to do it within the levels set by the authorization bill.

Well, we took up on the floor of the Senate the Environment and Public Works Committee's 6-year Transportation bill, coauthored by Senator INHOFE and Senator BOXER, Republican and Democrat, and reported out of the committee unanimously. Most people think we fight about everything. Well, we don't. Environment and Public Works Committee Senators BOXER and INHOFE have been very good at working together on these authorization bills.

Now, the authorization bill does not contain the funding, but it says: These are our transportation policies, and this is the level that we think is appropriate. But it does not actually fund a dollar to go to those programs.

Well, over in the House of Representatives today, they got in the act. As I understand it, the House transportation committee has reported out—I think on a voice vote—their own 6-year authorization bill. This is good. It has not passed the House yet, but at least it is out of committee, with apparently a fair amount of broad support, which is good.

This is the Senate-passed bill called the DRIVE Act, reported out by the committee a couple of months ago and passed the Senate here more recently. As you know, we have names for our bills, such as the names for cars. But the DRIVE Act, the Senate-passed bill, the Surface Transportation Reauthorization and Reform Act, has a number—3763. It is a 6-year authorization for transportation programs.

Do these bills have any good ideas in them? Well, they really do. As it turns out, there is a fair amount of common ground that these two pieces of legislation share, the Senate-passed bill and the bill out of the House committee.

One of them is that there is a new focus on making freight transportation

more reliable, more affordable, and more efficient. When you look at an outfit called McKinsey & Company, a big international consulting firm, they have an entity, an appendage of McKinsey, that is called the Global Institute. A year or so ago, they opined that a fully funded, robustly funded transportation program in the United States would provide 1.8 million new jobs in this country—1.8 million new jobs in this country—and that it would grow GDP, gross domestic product, by 1.5 percent per year—not just one time, but per year. Those are pretty amazing numbers, actually, for me.

Well, one of the things that actually drives the increase in employment and the growth in GDP is a more efficient freight transportation system and one that actually focuses—as in this legislation—on freight, and not just moving our cars, trucks, and vans but actually figuring out how we move freight from place to place in a more efficient way.

The second area where there seems to be some agreement is that both pieces of legislation prioritize—especially the Senate version—bridge safety and large facilities of national importance. Think big bridges; think big tunnels. We have a bunch of bridges in this country—I forget what the percentage is—that are substandard, not safe—maybe one out of every nine. So take your choice for the bridges you are going over. Think about that. One in nine is deemed to be essentially unsafe.

Both of those bills say: Well, that ought to be a priority and we would like to authorize higher spending for that. These bills focus on clean air funding and toward some of the most dangerous sources of emissions—diesel emissions. A lot of it comes from road-building—road and highway—and bridgebuilding equipment that is diesel powered and puts out harmful emissions.

Actually, our bill in the Senate does some good things to reduce those emissions while we go about building these transportation projects. One of the things that I especially like about our bill is that it says that eventually we ought to have an approach to funding roads, highways, and bridges.

Maybe it should be something that reflects vehicle miles traveled. We don't have that kind of magical system now. In Oregon, they have been trying to do it for 10 years. They call it RUC, a road user charge. They have maybe 5,000 families that are actually using this. But it is a long way from 5,000 families in Oregon to having a national system that we can use to come up with money to pay for roads, highways, bridges, and transit.

But our Senate-passed bill establishes research to develop alternative user fees to replace, maybe eventually, the gas and diesel tax somewhere down the line—not next year, probably not this decade, but somewhere down the line. I think that should be a growing part of the source of revenues to pay for transportation.

The Senate bill even increases—bumps up not hugely but bumps up a little bit—the baseline funding and funding for transportation. I wish it had been more, but at least it is an effort to do that. Our next chart is one of my favorite charts. I have a friend from Montana, a former attorney general, former Governor, former chairman of the Republican National Committee, whose name is Marc Racicot. Folks from his State like to talk about cowboys who really are not cowboys.

They have a saying out there. They say: All hat, no cattle. In this case, we can have all the transportation authorization bills until the cows come home, but unless we actually fund them, they are just words on a piece of paper, and we don't build a road or a highway or a bridge or do anything on the transit side unless we actually fund them. I don't know who this guy is, but I love this poster. All hat, no cattle. That is where we are right now because we don't have agreement on how we are really going to pay for robustly funding transportation projects.

There is an idea out there that goes beyond lousy pay-fors. I think the kind of stuff goes like this: We steal money for 10 years out of TSA, instead of making our skies safer, and we put that money of 10 years of revenues into 3 months of helping to fund transportation projects. That is not too smart, but we do that. Instead of making border crossings in this country safer, where folks are trying to get into our country, we use Customs fees for that purpose. But instead of using it to make our border crossings safer and our ports of entry safer, we put 10 years of Customs fees collected into 3 months or so of transportation projects.

We look at the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, for which we bought the petroleum. We try to buy it low and not use it very much. But we will see what we spent in the last couple of years buying and refilling our Strategic Petroleum Reserve, at \$80, \$90, maybe \$100 a barrel, and now we are selling it at basically half of that price.

You are supposed to buy low and then sell high. That is where you end up making your profits. What we are doing with our Strategic Petroleum Reserve is to buy high, sell low, and use whatever money we realize to help pay for some transportation projects—not a real smart investment strategy.

What Senator DICK DURBIN and I have introduced is something we called the TRAFFIC Relief Act. It is an acronym. Tax Relief and Fix the Trust Fund for Infrastructure Certainty Act of 2015. Here is the real thing we need to know about. It raises \$220 billion over the next 10 years. We raise \$220 billion in the next 10 years to go into the transportation trust fund.

If we just want to go, frankly, not to a level of spending that actually addresses the problem, then, in fact, we have our roads, highways, and bridges get a D-plus. Civil engineers across the country every year evaluate our trans-

portation infrastructure. They give us a D-plus. "D" as in "dog." "D" as in "dangerous." "D" as in "degraded." That is when you spend \$90 billion a year, which is maybe contemplated in the authorization legislation—maybe a little bit more. We don't really make much of a dent in the work that needs to be done.

What we propose in our legislation is \$220 billion, and we would have \$130 billion for new investments in repairs and upgrades. I should be able to do some new projects and make a bigger dent in the ones that need our attention.

Let's see what we have in our next chart. I think there is a fair amount of support for doing that from what I hear. Let's take a look.

We looked at a couple of recent editorials that basically say what day—I think from these newspapers are from coast to coast, from North to South, East to West. Believe it or not, they say we ought to pay for transportation—roads, highways, and bridges. It should be that the user pays to use the roads, highways, and bridges. They ought to pay for them. It is what we have done for years. If we raise the gas and diesel tax from 1993—22 years ago, about 18 years ago for the gas tax, 23 cents for the diesel tax—in today's purchasing power, adjust for inflation. So the gas tax is worth less than a dime, not 18 cents, but less than a dime. The diesel tax is not worth 23 cents, but less than 15 cents—probably closer to 12 cents.

Here is what some of the people say. The New York Times says: "Highways Need a Higher Gas Tax." They are essentially saying restore the purchasing power of the gas and diesel tax. All right? Not add \$1, not add 50 cents or 25 cents, but restore the purchasing power.

USA TODAY says: "Raise the gas tax: Our view." They also add: "Highway funding hijinks: Our view"—which actually coincides with mine.

Let's see if we have any others. The Washington Post says, and this is a very recent one: "Highway Transportation Fund needs a permanent and simple fix." Even more recent, editorial board said: "Congress recklessly refuses to top up the Highway Trust Fund." Then even more recently: "Congress should fix the gas tax."

Again, restore the purchasing power of the gas and diesel tax, not to use it for extraneous stuff, not to use it for foreign aid, not to use it for Afghanistan or other places around the world, not to use it for health care, not to use it for education, but to use it to take these roads, highways, and bridges that are deteriorating and actually put the money, any extra money we generate, into those. Bangor, ME: "The nation's highway fund doesn't have to continue to lose ground."

The Register-Guard—I am trying to remember where that is. I am not sure where the Register-Guard is, but it said "Just raise the gas tax" in an editorial in July.

Again, the Washington Post opined the same message earlier in January of this year. Let's look at that one again. They said: "With oil prices low, now's the perfect time for Congress to raise the gas tax." That is what they said in January of this year.

As it turns out, we did some checking. We found out last week, at 29,000 gas stations across the country, they are selling gas for less than \$2 a gallon. Think about that: 29,000 gas stations across America. The gas station in my neighborhood is at \$2.09, and the Washington Post opined 7 months, 8 months, 9 months ago that "With oil prices low, now's the perfect time for Congress to raise the gas tax." Actually, gas prices are about half a dollar lower now than they were then.

If the Iran agreement is fully implemented, Iran—which now produces about 200,000 barrels of oil a day—a year from now they are going to be producing about 1 million barrels a day. This suggests to me that a world already awash in oil might actually continue to be awash in oil for a while, so with the low oil prices, I think there is reason to believe they are not going to spike back up any time soon.

There are more editorials and headlines. The Miami Herald: "Fix our roads." Akron Beacon Journal, Akron, OH: "Raise the gas tax and make better policy." The JournalStar, which is in Nebraska: "Follow the logic on gas tax."

Those are major newspapers across the country. We have also had some polling done, not by us, but by the American Road & Transportation Builders Association and also by Mineta. Some of us remember Norman Mineta, former mayor of San Jose, the Secretary of Transportation who worked in both the Republican Bush administration and the Clinton administration. In these two recent nationwide surveys, clear majorities have indicated support for increasing fuel taxes as a fair way to invest in transportation projects.

This is from the American Road & Transportation Builders Association:

A Strong Majority Supports Payments to Keep Up With Inflation

By more than a 2:1 margin, voters support increased payments directed to upkeep of the nation's infrastructure, given the need to keep up with inflation. About 68 percent to 70 percent support, strongly support, or somewhat support doing that. We have another recent poll, and these are just representative samples. There are others that are coming out almost weekly now.

The Mineta Transportation Institute Poll—there is one that gives a variety of different options in gas tax, sales tax, and vehicle-miles-traveled fee. The one that actually gets the most support is a 10-cent increase with revenue used just for transportation—not for any other purpose, just for transportation—71 percent. I was surprised it was this high. People want us to fix their roads, highways and bridges. They are tired of paying for repairs to their vehicles.

The next quote is from the Philadelphia Inquirer today. They are talking to people who read their paper. "The next time your axle snaps or a tire rim is bent on a bumpy highway, consider delivering the broken car parts to your congressional representatives"—your representatives in Congress, your House Members, and your Senators.

The average amount of money that we spend on repairs of cars, trucks, and vans every year that is related to bad roads and bad bridges is anywhere from \$350 a year to as much as \$500 per year. That is the range there.

I wish to close with sometimes people say you can't vote—we can't vote here to do this stuff. None of us will ever get reelected.

Well, wait a minute. How about the 12 States where in the last 2 years they actually voted to do this stuff. State highway transportation departments get about half of their money from the Federal Government, and they raise about half of their money locally. Their major sources of revenues locally are taxes and user fees on gas and diesel.

In 12 States in the last 2 years they voted to do this. These are mostly red States because there are more red States, at least with legislatures and Governors, than blue. But 95 percent of the Republican legislatures voted to raise user fees on gas and diesel in their States; 95 percent of them were reelected last fall. They won their primary; they won their general. They were reelected.

Who wasn't elected as much? The people who voted against doing that. So the folks who actually voted to raise the user fees actually were reelected more than the people who voted against it.

On the Democratic side, in the States where they voted to raise the user fees to pay just for transportation—not for anything else—90 percent of the Democrats were reelected. More legislators were reelected than did not get reelected. So just keep that in mind.

I have said enough. The majority leader is waiting, and I thank him for his patience, but here is the long story short: There is a need out there. The American people expect us to do something about it. They want us to work together. We need not just to have a hat. This can't be all hat; there has to be some cattle. Where is the beef? Where is the money to pay for all of this stuff?

I will be back next week to talk about it some more, and I thank the majority leader for his patience.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

BURMA

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, on November 8, just a few weeks away, the people of Burma will hold national elections. This promises to be a momentous event for a country many of us have studied and followed for a very

long time—in my own case for over 20 years. This is going to be a momentous election for at least two reasons.

First, for Burma's citizens—or for many of them, at least—this election represents a chance to finally choose their own leaders, which is, indeed, a rare occurrence in recent Burmese history. That is significant in itself, but there is another reason these elections are so important, because the manner in which they are conducted will serve as a key indicator of the progress of reform in that country.

There are some encouraging signs that the election will be freer and fairer than what we have seen in the past. Unlike recent Burmese elections, for example, international election observers have been permitted into the country. That is an important departure from the past, and it is encouraging. At the same time, there have been troubling signs during the election cycle. Allow me to share a few of them with you now.

First, the Constitution was not amended prior to the election. As many of my colleagues will recall, the Burmese Constitution unreasonably restricts who can be a candidate for President, a hardly subtle attempt to bar the country's most popular opposition figure from even standing for office. That is certainly worrying enough, but the Burmese Constitution goes even further, ensuring an effective military veto over constitutional change—over, for instance, amendments about running for the Presidency by requiring more than three-fourths parliamentary support in a legislature where the Constitution also reserves—listen to this—more than one-fourth of the seats for the military. So in order to change the Constitution, you have to get some military votes and obviously, so far, that hasn't happened.

Allowing appropriate constitutional changes to pass through the Parliament would have represented a tangible demonstration of the Burmese Government's commitment to both political reform and to a freer and fairer election this November. But when the measures were put to a vote on June 25, the government's allies exercised the very undemocratic power the Constitution grants them to stymie the effort.

So what kinds of messages do these actions send us? They bring the Burmese Government's continued commitment to democracy into question. If you were truly committed to democracy, why would you continue a provision like that, which to most of the world is simply quite laughable or outrageous?

They also raise fundamental questions about the balloting this fall, increasing the prospect of an election being perceived as something other than the will of the people, even if its actual conduct proves to be free and fair. It is hard to see how that is in anybody's interest.

The second deeply troubling consideration is the apparent widespread, if

not universal, disenfranchisement of the Rohingya population. For all the ill treatment the Rohingya have had to endure in their history, at least they had once been able to vote and run for office in Burma. They voted and fielded a candidate for office in both the 2010 election and the 1990 election, but, alas, no more.

Reports indicate that otherwise eligible Rohingya, more than half a million of them, have been systematically deprived of the right to vote and the right to stand for election. That poses another serious challenge to next month's elections being seen as free and fair, and there is another serious challenge I would note as well.

Finally, while media activity in Burma is far more open than it was before 2010, there have been troubling signs that indicate a recent and worrying backslide. In fact, just a few days ago, news circulated of individuals being arrested for Facebook postings.

These are very disturbing reports. Campaigns can be conducted only when a free exchange of ideas is permitted. Arresting citizens for free expression runs directly counter to that idea. It is at odds with notions of free speech and democracy, and it seems designed to send chilling signals to the Burmese people.

It is clear that Burma faces substantial challenges. From the undemocratic elements in Burma's Constitution, to the disenfranchisement of the Rohingya, to troubling incidents regarding the curtailment of citizens' basic rights, these challenges are significant. They need to be addressed.

At the same time, we should not allow these things to completely overshadow what Burma has accomplished. It has actually come a long way in recent years. There are many positive things to be built upon as well. In short, there is still hope for Burma's upcoming election.

Thein Sein's government has an opportunity to make these last few weeks of campaigning as free and as fair as possible. The Burmese Government can still hold an election that, despite the troubling things I mentioned, can be embraced by Burmese citizens and the international community alike.

That will mean ensuring these final weeks of campaigning are as free and as fair as possible. That will mean ensuring freedom of expression is protected.

These are the kinds of minimum goals that Burmese officials must strive toward in the final weeks of the campaign season. If the Burmese Government gets this right, if it ensures as free and fair an election as possible, with results accepted by competing parties, the government, and the military, that would go a long way toward reassuring Burma's friends around the globe that it remains committed to political reform and progress in the bilateral relationship. Indeed, both the government and the military have committed to standing by the election results.

Now, let me be clear. While I have always approached this relationship and the role of sanctions realistically, this election is a test the government must pass. Simply holding an election without mass casualties or violence, while vitally important, isn't good enough. Let me say that again. Just holding an election without mass violence is not enough. It has to do a lot more than just have the absence of violence.

As I stated on the Senate floor earlier this year, if we end up with an election not accepted by the Burmese people as reflecting their will, it will make further normalization of relations—at least as it concerns the legislative branch of this government—much more difficult. It would likely hinder further enhancement of U.S.-Burma economic ties and military-to-military relations. It would likely erode confidence in Burma's reform efforts. It would also likely make it more difficult for the executive branch to include Burma in the Generalized System of Preferences Program or to enhance political military relations.

Those of us who follow Burma want this country to succeed. We want to see the government carry out an election that is as free and as fair as possible. We are prepared to continue doing what we can to encourage more positive change in that country, and we will be realistic about what is possible.

As I just mentioned, that is the kind of approach I have always tried to take—a hopeful but still realistic one when it comes to this relationship, not just on the role of sanctions but also on the possible steps toward closer relations and on the individual programs and policies that would aid Burma's development and capabilities.

So we are hoping the Burmese Government gets this right. This is a big opportunity to send a signal to the rest of the world that Burma has indeed truly changed. We are hoping the Burmese people continue moving along the path of greater freedom and greater reform, but whatever the result, Burmese Government officials should be assured that Burma's partners in the United States and in the international community will be watching intently to see what happens in the coming weeks with a realistic assessment in what Burma can achieve.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE LEESBURG "STOLEN GIRLS"

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, it is with a sense of solemnity that I recognize a low moment during the civil rights movement in my home State of Georgia 52 years ago.

During the height of the movement, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was arrested for protesting racial segregation in Albany, GA, on December 16, 1961, and held in the Sumter County jail. The arrest galvanized the community and Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, SNCC, efforts to establish the Sumter County movement. Largely

comprised of preteen and teenage students, the movement repeatedly challenged segregation from 1963 to 1965. On July 15, 1963, a number of school-aged girls were arrested, transported to a jail in Dawson, GA, and held overnight. Early the next morning, they were transported to Leesburg, GA, without parental consent. The girls were held 20 miles from their homes in a Civil War-era stockade following their arrest for protesting, and they were not released until mid-September 1963.

After a SNCC photographer revealed the terrible, unsanitary, and dangerous conditions, the young girls, dubbed the "Stolen Girls," gained national attention. However, the incident has not received the attention it deserves.

The young ladies who were jailed are ready to tell the stories of their untold mistreatment after 52 years. I encourage my fellow Georgians and Americans to learn more about the civil rights movement so that all might find healing.

HEAD START AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the students, parents, staff, and alumni of the Head Start Program and to join them in celebrating Head Start Awareness Month. The dedicated individuals at Head Start have served our Nation's most vulnerable children and families for 50 years.

Since its founding in 1965, this program has provided comprehensive social and emotional development services to children from birth to age 5. Because of Head Start, many young parents have been able to get the support they need during the crucial first years of their child's life.

These services go far beyond what any parenting book could ever achieve. Head Start staff provides real-life guidance for young parents who, for example, may need the name of a local dentist or help finding adequate housing to keep their families healthy and safe.

In Oregon, we have 336 program locations that enrolled more than 13,000 individuals and families last year. You can find a Head Start location anywhere from Clatskanie, OR, all the way to Chiloquin. Earlier this month, Clatsop County celebrated Head Start's anniversary by holding simultaneous block parties at the county's three locations. These Head Start and Early Head Start centers are helping Oregon families who want to see their children reach their full potential.

The Head Start Program fosters literacy and prepares Oregon's children for success in school. Early learning through Head Start can put children on a path toward high school graduation and a better future. In my view, the Head Start Program is a critical investment in the development of our Nation's youngest children.

I speak today to honor those who are working to make a difference for our young people at all the Head Start lo-

cations in Oregon and across the country. I look forward to working with my Senate colleagues to continue to support early childhood education programs like Head Start.

NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS WEEK

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has designated this week as National Forest Products Week to recognize the important contribution of forest products to our economy and environment. This week means a great deal to industries and employees in the State of Idaho and citizens nationally.

In Idaho alone, forestry, logging, wood products, and pulp and paper production support more than 10,600 jobs, contribute over \$430 million to the local economy through wages, and produce a value of shipments of over \$2.6 billion. The industry continues to grow and is taking on new and innovative projects like the development of tall wood buildings. Over the past several years, a number of tall wood projects have been completed around the world, demonstrating successful applications of next generation lumber and mass timber technologies. Today, the concept is gaining traction in the U.S.—with more architects opting for a sustainable solution for attaining safe, cost-effective, and high-performing tall buildings in urban dense settings.

Years of research and real-life experience have proven that wood buildings can withstand the effects of major wind and seismic events. These structures, when properly designed and constructed, protect lives and preserve building function. Wood buildings are durable and can be designed to last a lifetime. For example, a mass timber system was used in the 1974 rebuild of the nine-story Butler Square Building in Minneapolis. Heavy timber post and beam construction provided an adaptable solution and has allowed the building to stand strong since 1900.

As we celebrate forest products this week, let us all thank and congratulate those in the industry for their considerable contributions to economies the world over and their development of cutting-edge technologies that create better, stronger, and greener buildings.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, during National Forest Products Week, I am glad to join my colleagues in highlighting the important role that the forest products industry plays in Oregon and nationwide.

Many rural communities throughout Oregon were founded on the success of the forest products industry. With fresh innovations and a focus on sustainability, the industry continues to bolster these communities year after year. In Oregon, the industry supports more than 37,000 jobs, pumping over \$2 billion in wages directly into local economies. Overall, the industry produces a combined product value of over \$7.8 billion. By encouraging a sustainable forest products industry in Oregon

and across the country, we can help strengthen markets for wood products, both here and abroad, and continue to ensure the success of rural economies.

When harvested in a sustainable manner, wood can reduce carbon emissions, and new state-of-the-art technologies using wood as a building material have made timber more fire resistant and stronger than ever. Wood has the potential to contribute vastly to a low-carbon economy by locking up the carbon that trees draw out of the atmosphere when they grow. Wood products like cross laminated timber also bring down construction costs for multiple story buildings in large cities.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture has already recognized a project in my hometown of Portland that will demonstrate the unique benefits of timber as a building material for a new age. I'm proud that the Agriculture Department gave one of two Tall Wood Building Prize Competition awards to Portland, OR, and I'm looking forward to seeing the 12-story wood building as a new addition to the Portland skyline.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, as we come together to celebrate National Forest Products Week, I want to highlight the impacts and contributions of the forest products industry to my home State of Oregon. In my State, the forest products industry produces over 37,000 jobs; contributes over \$2 billion in wages to local economies; and produces a combined product value of nearly \$8 billion.

Oregon has forest land that covers over 29 million acres. We have 72 sawmills, millwork, and treating facilities, 49 engineered wood and panel products facilities, and 11 other types of wood products facilities, combining to make a total of 132 wood products facilities in the State of Oregon. Forest products produce \$262 million annually in tax payments to support the rural and local economies in the State of Oregon.

Forest products provide a clear value both for our economy and for the environment. Currently, America's forests store 2.5 trillion metric tons of carbon and capture nearly 13 percent of total U.S. CO2 emissions annually. One-half of the dry weight of wood is carbon; and the lumber, wood products, and the wood used in buildings each provide a carbon storage system. With advanced technologies, we are seeing taller and stronger buildings made of wood—buildings that will last for generations and help move us towards a more sustainable future.

In closing, I would like to express my support for the forest products industry and their ongoing efforts to positively contribute to the environment and submit these comments as part of this year's National Forest Product's Week.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, in support of National Forest Products Week, I would like to recognize the nearly 18,000 hard-working men and women employed by the forest products industry in the great State of Maine.

Maine is home to about 40 wood products and paper manufacturing facilities, which contribute over \$900 million to the economy through jobs and wages and over \$4 billion in industry shipments of products, making the forest products industry one of the largest manufacturing sectors in the State.

Our Nation's forests are an essential element of our urban and rural landscape. Covering more than 750 million acres across America, they create opportunities for recreation and habitats for wildlife, and their products play an integral role in our daily lives.

As the only renewable building material, wood requires less energy to transport, construct, and produce in comparison to alternative building materials. By increasing the use of wood products in construction, we have the opportunity to reduce greenhouse emissions and improve the environmental performance of buildings. Design and building professionals are increasingly recognizing wood's environmental attributes and helping to create strong markets for wood products.

The industry continues to grow and is taking on new and innovative projects like the development of tall wood buildings. Over the past several years, a number of tall wood projects have been completed around the world, demonstrating successful applications of next generation lumber and mass timber technologies. Today, the concept is gaining traction in the U.S., with more architects opting for a sustainable solution for attaining safe, cost-effective, high-performing tall buildings.

Even with the advances of digital communications, paper also continues to play a valuable role in our daily lives: from enhancing education through written communications to capturing and preserving life's most memorable moments. In my State, I continually hear from men and women for whom paper is not only a preference, but for some, a necessity. Forty-one percent of Americans over 65 years of age do not use the internet. Eliminating paper as an option for vital government communications—like the IRS tax instruction manual—impedes access to critical information every citizen has a right to receive.

Thank you for the opportunity to recognize the hard-working men and women employed by the forest products industry in Maine. I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating National Forest Products Week and reflect on the positive economic, social, and environmental impacts paper and forest products have on our everyday lives.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the important role of the forest products industry as we celebrate National Forest Products Week.

Montana's forests are a treasured part of our State's heritage which many of us hold so dear—not only are Montana's forests where we hunt, fish, explore, and live, but our forest prod-

ucts industry provides thousands of jobs for Montana families and a boost to our State's economy.

Sadly, many forest products jobs in Montana have been lost this year in large part due to an insufficient supply of logs from Federal lands. I'm fighting for commonsense reforms to restore active management across Montana so we can get more Montanans back to work, improve forest health, increase access to public lands, and provide much-needed sustainable revenues to our forested counties. These reforms must give the Forest Service the tools and resources it needs to increase responsible timber harvests and protect their work from obstructionist tactics that continue to encumber a substantial portion of the timber volume from Montana's national forests. Congress should enact these reforms swiftly.

Further, as we seek to improve the performance of our buildings, we should encourage the use of wood in the construction of Federal and other commercial buildings. Montana is home to approximately 5 engineered and panel products facilities and 12 sawmills, millwork, and treatment facilities that employ several thousand people across the State. These facilities are working to advance innovative new technologies, for example, cross laminated timber. I am proud to have SmartLam, Inc., the very first and only manufacturer of cross laminated timber, CLT, products in the U.S. located in the great State of Montana.

CLT products are creating opportunities in the U.S. to build taller wood buildings. Advancements in new technology utilizing engineered "mass timber" panels are creating new possibilities for wood. This concept is gaining momentum in the U.S. as many successful demonstration projects have been built and proven to be a safe and cost-effective solution in urban dense settings. With more than 17 tall wood buildings of seven stories or more having been built around the world serving as demonstration projects, building officials, designers, contractors, and consumers are increasingly confident in the safety of these buildings.

I want to thank the individuals in the forest products industry for their important contributions to my home State and for their efforts to expand tall wood building projects across the Nation.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in support of the 55th National Forest Products Week and to recognize the more than 26,000 hard-working men and women that work in the forest products sector in Michigan.

Forests in Michigan and nationwide help keep our air and water clean, provide wildlife habitats, and places for recreation. These forests aren't just an environmental treasure; they are an economic powerhouse. Michigan is home to nearly 200 businesses that manufacture everything from office paper to wood pellets for home heating.

Nationwide, our forests provide more than 900,000 jobs, creating almost \$240 billion in economic output every year.

This economic activity leads to new opportunities in rural communities around the country. That's one reason why, as chairwoman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, I worked with a bipartisan group of lawmakers to ensure the 2014 farm bill strengthened forestry programs and helped bolster rural economic development.

Forest product companies are also leaders in the effort to increase recycling. Today, 96 percent of all communities across the country have access to curbside or drop-off paper recycling programs. On top of that, the millions of Americans who recycle at home, work, and school have helped recover more than 60 percent of the paper consumed in the U.S. in each of the last 3 years. Picture this: each day our paper companies around the country recycle enough paper to fill a 15-mile-long boxcar train.

That type of leadership is great news for our planet and has some serious economic savings as well. Already more than 110 mills around the country are making paper using only recovered materials. And efforts are on track to recover more than 70 percent of all paper used by 2020. At the same time, paper can only be recycled a limited number of times, so it's important that steps are taken to ensure sustainable production of paper and forest products from our renewable forest resources.

Forest products can also help us become more energy independent. Manufacturers across the industry now use carbon neutral biomass that comes from forest waste—materials like bark, wood scraps, byproducts, and other unusable products—to help power their plants, reduce emissions, and save energy.

For all these reasons, I am proud to serve as co-chair of the Paper and Packaging Caucus with my colleague from Arkansas, Senator BOOZMAN.

Thank you for the opportunity to recognize the hard-working professionals of the forest products industry in the great State of Michigan. I would urge my colleagues to join me in celebrating National Forest Products Week and applaud the thousands of hard-working Americans who are working hard every day to keep America as the leader in forest products.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I would like to recognize National Forest Products Week and the many women and men in Arkansas who rely on forestry and the forest products industry.

As co-chair of the Paper and Packaging Caucus, I am glad to work with my fellow co-chairs—Senator DEBBIE STABENOW and Representatives REID RIBBLE and GWEN GRAHAM—to highlight the role that this vital industry plays in our country.

About 25,000 Arkansans are directly employed in the forestry and forest

products sector. Arkansas is home to over 100 wood products, paper, and packaging manufacturing facilities that make nearly \$7 billion in products each year. Large and small employers dot the Arkansas landscape. I regularly hear from and meet with Arkansas families who earn a living and make great products at places like Green Bay Packaging, Domtar, Deltic Timber, and Georgia-Pacific. Every year, I meet with family tree farmers and small business operators who rely on our forestry sector to build a successful future. And I track and support efforts to responsibly manage and utilize our renewable Federal forest resources. According to the University of Arkansas, the forest and forest products industry produces \$2.3 billion in wages that are pumped into the Arkansas economy each year. This economic activity creates and supports countless other jobs.

I also serve as the co-chair of the Senate Recycling Caucus. In this dual capacity, I have seen the forest products industry's success in pairing economic growth with respect for the environment. The industry is making great strides in promoting sustainability and energy conservation, especially by using carbon neutral biomass, which meets about two-thirds of the industry's energy needs. Other successes include boosting exports and encouraging recycling. Paper recycling programs now reach 96 percent of the American people, and the industry is on target to recover and recycle about 70 percent of its products in the next few years.

At the same time, the industry is facing challenges—from problems with our transportation policies and infrastructure to a regulatory maze that is too difficult and costly to navigate. Here in Congress, we need to solve these challenges together, through common sense, cooperation, negotiation, an open process, and a clear-eyed analysis of the facts.

We also need to support the industry as it transitions. While more information is available digitally, paper and packaging products are still indispensable to our modern economy. For example, many Americans, particularly those in rural settings or with limited resources or computer skills, have difficulty accessing information digitally. That's why in general, and particularly at government agencies, the format of information should be a consumer choice.

In conclusion, paper, packaging, and other wood products are at the heart of modern life and a modern economy. I am glad to join my colleagues in celebrating National Forest Products Week. These recyclable and renewable resources make our lives better, and forestry is truly an Arkansas success story—and an American success story. Thank you.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I would like to join Senator CRAPO and my colleagues in recognizing National Forest Products Week and in recog-

nizing the men and women of the forest products industry for their contributions to our Nation and, in particular, my home State of Washington.

The forest products industry employs nearly 30,000 people in Washington, contributing \$1.9 billion dollars in jobs and wages. Employees work both in wood products facilities and in paper manufacturing; and these facilities, and the jobs and wages they create, have been a dynamic part of our economy.

I would like to commend the industry for its recent technological advances and for continually looking toward the future. Forest products have contributed greatly to improvements in energy efficiency in buildings and their overall environmental performance. I am particularly excited about new "mass timber" technologies, such as cross laminated timber, CLT, that are now opening an entirely new suite of opportunities. New technologies create new markets for wood and healthy working forests.

Throughout our State, there is great interest in CLT. We are already seeing this new product bringing innovation to the design and construction of buildings. Tall wood buildings are now being built around the world. The U.S. market is ripe for applying this new technology to new construction. I appreciate the support that the administration is providing for builders that want to use CLT. I expect to see an increase in the use of CLT and an increase in the number of facilities that create it.

Our forests and forest products play an important role in sequestering and storing carbon. The use of wood in buildings provides a great opportunity to make our buildings more environmentally and energy efficient. This is a great example of the use of forest products creating a healthier economy and environment.

Even though I have talked so much about CLT, I would like to commend the men and women who comprise this industry for their many contributions in Washington and around the U.S.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I appreciate this opportunity to recognize the men and women of the forest products industry as we celebrate National Forest Products Week. These folks represent a critical part of my State's outdoor heritage and economy.

The forestry and forest products industries support nearly 5,000 jobs in Montana and generate approximately \$22 million in State and local taxes. Today, Montana is home to 20 facilities that rely on forest products, from sawmills to engineered wood and panel production sites. In a time of increased global competition, when the U.S. Forest Service has to spend over half its budget on wildfire costs instead of managing our forests, the men and women who work in this industry deserve our support. These are the folks who cut trees, transport them from the forest to mills, process lumber, and make a wide variety of products that

we use every day. I remain committed to pursuing sound forestry and trade policies that will ensure this important industry can compete fairly, contribute to sustainable forest management, and continue to provide good jobs in Montana.

The forest products industry is also looking forward to find new ways to put our wood fiber to good use and create additional value for local economies in Montana. In Whitefish, SmartLam, Inc. is the first manufacturer of cross laminated timber, CLT, products in the Nation. This Montana company is on the cutting edge of engineered-wood technology for building construction materials. SmartLam is producing more than a million board feet of CLT products a month and hopes to open a new facility due to increasing demand. These products can aid in the construction of taller, more fire-safe wood buildings and help reduce the carbon footprint of the construction process. Innovative wood construction systems are flexible and can be easily combined with other building materials, offering alternatives for construction in urban areas while supporting sustainable development in rural communities.

In addition to providing good jobs, the forest products industry plays a key role in the sustainable management of the more than 25 million acres of forests in Montana. Most of the forested lands in Montana are managed by the U.S. Forest Service. We have seen industry come together with a wide array of stakeholders in Montana to develop collaborative recommendations for projects aimed at supporting local economies, improving forest health, reducing wildfire risks, and restoring watersheds. On private lands, industry has partnered with conservation organizations to keep forested lands forested as development pressures have grown.

In addition to National Forest Products Week, this week also marks the fifth annual Montana Forest Products Week. There is no better time to say thanks to the folks who work in Montana's forest products industry.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am pleased to speak today about the many contributions of the forest products industry, as we recognize their important work during National Forest Products Week.

Wood products play a significant role in our economy. The U.S. wood products industry employs more than 548,000 people in manufacturing and forestry, and U.S. private forest owners support 2.4 million jobs and \$87 billion in payroll. In Maine, there are a number of wood products manufacturing facilities, including sawmills, millwork, and treatment plants, engineered wood and panel product facilities, and paper mills.

The environmental benefits associated with wood products—from renewability to responsible forest practices to a light carbon footprint—are helping

to strengthen markets for wood products, in turn stabilizing the wood industry's ability to create jobs and support local economies. Moreover, sustainable forest management practices in the United States maintain important forest values such as biodiversity and wildlife habitat. Strong markets for wood products provide a financial incentive for landowners to invest in their forests and keep them healthy for future generations.

Design and building professionals are increasingly recognizing wood's environmental attributes and helping to create strong markets for wood products. Over the past several years, a number of tall wood projects have been completed around the world, demonstrating successful applications of next generation technologies. Today, the concept is gaining traction in the United States where more architects are opting for a sustainable solution for attaining safe, cost-effective, high-performing tall buildings, particularly in urban dense settings. As the only renewable building material, wood requires less energy to transport, construct, and produce than other building materials.

In closing, I encourage my colleagues to support policies that maintain and grow strong markets for wood products. As we celebrate National Forest Products Week, I thank the employers and employees of the forest products industry for their contributions to Maine and the Nation.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in support of National Forest Products Week, I would like to recognize the more than 25,000 hard-working men and women employed by the forest products industry in the great State of South Carolina. With an annual payroll of almost \$1.7 billion and an estimated value of products manufactured in the State exceeding \$9 billion, the forest products industry is among the largest manufacturing sectors in my State and the largest valued agricultural crop.

This is the 55th consecutive year that we are recognizing the forest products industry for its contributions to our economy and to sustainable manufacturing. The world has changed a lot since the first National Forest Products Week in 1960 and so has the industry.

Over the last few years, with new advancements in lumber and mass timber technologies, the U.S. has begun innovative projects to build tall wood buildings. Over 17 tall wood buildings with over seven stories or more have been built around the world, which served as demonstration projects. Due to the success of these tall wood buildings, contractors and consumers are more confident than ever in the safety and high performance of these buildings. Additionally, with the right safety measures, tall wood buildings can be designed to meet and exceed fire safety requirements.

Wood buildings are durable and can be designed to last a lifetime. Years of

real-life experiences and research have shown that wood buildings can also withstand effects of major wind and seismic events. When designed and constructed properly, these structures are high performing and provide the necessary strength and ductility to preserve building function and provide life safety protection.

Similarly, paper and packaging products have grown with the demands of a 21st century global economy. Made from a recyclable and renewable resource, paper and paper-based packaging transport food, medicine, and manufactured goods faster, further, safer, and more environmentally friendly than ever before.

I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating National Forest Products Week and reflect on the sustainable uses of America's forests and the important contributions they make to our economy and our national life.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I wish to honor National Forest Products Week. I would simply like to express my support for newly available and continuously evolving opportunities to build with wood.

In the State of Idaho, the forest products industry makes significant contributions to our local, State, and national economies. In Idaho alone, we have 19 sawmills, millwork, and treating facilities and 4 facilities making engineered wood and panel products. These products are increasingly used in buildings all around the globe.

As we all know, U.S. and global populations are rapidly growing. Over the past several years, a number of tall wood projects have been completed around the world, demonstrating successful applications of next generation lumber and mass timber technologies.

Today, the concept is gaining traction in the United States. More architects are opting for a sustainable solution to attain safe, cost-effective, high-performing tall buildings in urban dense settings—many of these projects already do or will use engineered wood products.

With more than 17 tall wood buildings of seven stories or more having been built around the world serving as demonstration projects, building officials, designers, contractors, and consumers are more confident than ever in the safety of these buildings.

Thank you for this opportunity to recognize the many forest products facilities and employers in my home State that are helping make these tall wood building projects become a reality.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO OTTO MERIDA

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today, I wish to congratulate Otto Merida on his retirement after nearly 40 years of service to the Las Vegas Latin Chamber of Commerce. It gives me great

pleasure to recognize his years of hard work and dedication to Las Vegas' Hispanic business community. I am proud to call Otto a friend.

Otto was born in Havana, Cuba, and came to the United States in the early 1960s through a historic U.S. mission in Cuba known as Operation Peter Pan. He attended high school in Wilmington, DE, and received an associate degree from North Florida Junior College and a bachelor's degree in political science from the University of Florida. After graduating, he worked with Volunteers In Service to America, VISTA, in Massachusetts as a community organizer and social worker. He then left VISTA and worked for the Fitchburg Chamber of Commerce.

He later came to Las Vegas in 1974 and began working for Nevada's Department of Education and the Comprehensive Employment and Training Program. As someone who has traveled to Cuba and spent time with the people, I recognize the importance of normalizing some relations with this country. This is why I support lifting travel restrictions to and from Cuba. I am proud to see Otto represent his country in such a positive manner within our Nevada community. Beginning in 1976, Otto helped organize Las Vegas' Latin Chamber of Commerce, LCC, and in 1978 became the executive director. In 2005, he was named president and chief executive officer of the LCC and the LCC Community Foundation. This successful body now has over 13,000 members and is the premier Latin chamber serving the great State of Nevada. I am grateful that our State has had someone like Otto leading this incredible organization for so many years. He is one of a kind and will be missed.

Without a doubt, Otto's work has had a great impact on Las Vegas' Hispanic businesses both large and small. Through his unwavering commitment, the Hispanic business community continues to grow and prosper. Otto has not only worked to build Las Vegas' Hispanic businesses in times of economic stability, but also helped to keep hard-working southern Nevada businessowners on their feet in times of great downturn. Along with his work to support local businesses, he has also focused on philanthropic work, helping foster young Hispanic leaders through the Latino Youth Leadership Conference since 1993. In addition, he has contributed greatly in helping to grow scholarship funds to go towards higher education for Las Vegas' Hispanic youth. This community is fortunate that Otto has served as an ally and leader for decades. To say he has had a positive impact on Las Vegas' Hispanic business community would be an understatement. The strong foundation he has built will be felt for years to come.

I ask my colleagues and all Nevadans to join me in thanking Otto for his dedication to both Las Vegas' Hispanic business community and the LCC and

in congratulating him on his retirement. He exemplifies the highest standards of leadership and service and should be proud of his long and meaningful career. I wish him well in all of his future endeavors.●

TRIBUTE TO WALTER GALVIN

● Ms. McCASKILL. Mr. President, today I would like to recognize and thank Walter Galvin for his years of service with Emerson, a great employer for 125 years in the State of Missouri. Walt joined Emerson in 1973 and has had an enormous impact on the company and the St. Louis community.

Walt's service with Emerson began as the controller at the Ridge Tool subsidiary. In 1993, he was named chief financial officer of Emerson and served in this role for 17 years. During his time as CFO, he served as a management member of Emerson's Board of Directors and as vice chairman. Walt retired from Emerson in February of 2013, but worked for Emerson for another 2 years to lend his expertise and knowledge to the next generation of company leaders.

Walt's experience working at Emerson provided him with the insight necessary to influence positive change in U.S. lawmaking. In 2004, he was directly involved in the passage of the American Jobs Creation Act, which included many provisions intended to incentivize and expand domestic manufacturing. He appeared as a witness many times before committees in the House and Senate, shedding light on the struggle American companies face in such a competitive international environment and lending his expertise to discussions of our Tax Code and comprehensive tax reform.

He served as a member of the Board Of Directors of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and as vice chairman and later, chairman of the Chamber's tax committee in Washington, DC. He also served on the board of the National Association of Manufacturers, NAM, and, for a time, as the chairman of NAM's tax committee. Other companies such as Ameren Corporation, F.M. Global Insurance, and Aegion Corporation also count Walt as a director.

In addition to his service to Emerson and broader policy discussions, Walt was active in charitable endeavors in the St. Louis community. He served on the board of Interco Charitable Foundation, the United Way of Greater St. Louis, and is the past president of the Saint Louis Zoo Association and Cardinal Glennon Children's Hospital.

St. Louis and the entire State of Missouri are very lucky to have such a dedicated community leader making a difference on a local, State, and national level. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in recognizing Walter Galvin's impact on American businesses and leaders nationwide.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:04 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3116) to extend by 15 years the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to conduct the quarterly financial report program.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 10:46 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 3116. An act to extend by 15 years the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to conduct the quarterly financial report program.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

At 10:54 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 1362. An act to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify waiver authority regarding programs of all-inclusive care for the elderly (PACE programs).

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 692. An act to ensure the payment of interest and principal of the debt of the United States.

At 1:42 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 10. An act to reauthorize the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act, and for other purposes.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 2193. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to increase penalties for individuals who illegally reenter the United States after being removed and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 2200. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to strengthen equal pay requirements.

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-3238. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pesticides; Agricultural Worker Protection Standard Revisions" ((RIN2070-AJ22) (FRL No. 9931-81)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 9, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3239. A communication from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Administration's 2015 compensation program adjustments; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3240. A communication from the Acting Director of the Legislative Affairs Division, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "NRCS Procedures for Granting Equitable Relief" (RIN0578-AA57) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 15, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3241. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Olives Grown in California; Increased Assessment Rate" (Docket No. AMS-FV-14-0105) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3242. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Clarification of United States Antitrust Laws, Immunity, and Liability Under Marketing Order Programs" (Docket No. AMS-FV-14-0072) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3243. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Cotton and Tobacco Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Cotton Research and Promotion Program: Procedures for Conduct of Sign-up Period" (Docket No. AMS-CN-12-0059) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3244. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2015-0001)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3245. A communication from the Assistant Director for Legislative Affairs, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendments Relating to Small Creditors and Rural or Underserved Areas Under the Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z)" (RIN3170-AA43) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3246. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the export to the People's Republic of China of items not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry;

to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3247. A communication from the Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Kentucky Regulatory Program" ((SATS No. KY-253-FOR) (Docket No. OSM-2009-0014)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 14, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3248. A communication from the Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Ohio Regulatory Program" ((SATS No. OH-254-FOR) (Docket No. OSM-2012-0012)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 14, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3249. 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-154-FOR) (Docket No. OSM-2010-0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 14, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3250. A communication from the Division of Legislative Affairs and Correspondence, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the final map and corridor boundary description for the Crooked Wild and Scenic River, Segment B, in Oregon; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3251. A communication from the Deputy Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 2012 Annual Report for the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3252. 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 Implementation Plans; Arizona, Phoenix-Mesa; 2008 Ozone Standard Requirements" (FRL No. 9935-56-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 9, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3253. 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; Delaware; Low Emission Vehicle Program" (FRL No. 9935-58-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 9, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3254. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Minnesota; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2008 Ozone, 2010 NO₂, 2010 SO₂, and 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS" (FRL No. 9935-17-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 9, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3255. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch,

Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for *Diplacus vandenbergensis* (Vandenberg Monkeyflower)" (RIN1018-AZ33) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 14, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3256. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; 4(d) Rule for the Georgetown Salamander" (RIN1018-BA32) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 14, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3257. A communication from the Acting Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for *Trichomanes punctatum* ssp. *floridanum* (Florida Bristle Fern)" (RIN1018-AY97) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 14, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3258. A communication from the Acting Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Dakota Skipper and Poweshiek Skipperling" (RIN1018-AZ58) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 14, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3259. A communication from the Acting Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Status for 16 Species and Threatened Status for 7 Species in Micronesia" (RIN1018-BA13) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 14, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3260. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2015-2016 Refuge-Specific Hunting and Sport Fishing Regulations" (RIN1018-BA57) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 14, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3261. A communication from the Chief of the Foreign Species Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Listing the Honduran Emerald Hummingbird (*Amazilia luciae*)" (RIN1018-AY64) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 14, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3262. A communication from the Wildlife Biologist, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Migratory Bird Hunting; Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations on Certain Federal Indian Reservations and Ceded Lands for the

2015-16 Early Season" (RIN1018-BA67) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 14, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3263. A communication from the Wildlife Biologist, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Migratory Bird Hunting; Early Seasons and Bag and Possession Limits for Certain Migratory Game Birds in the Contiguous United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands" (RIN1018-BA67) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 14, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3264. A communication from the Wildlife Biologist, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Migratory Bird Hunting; Final Frameworks for Early-Season Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations" (RIN1018-BA67) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 14, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3265. A communication from the Wildlife Biologist, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Migratory Bird Hunting; Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations on Certain Federal Indian Reservations and Ceded Lands for the 2015-16 Late Season" (RIN1018-BA67) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 14, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3266. A communication from the Wildlife Biologist, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Migratory Bird Hunting; Late Seasons and Bag Possession Limits for Certain Migratory Game Birds" (RIN1018-BA67) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 14, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3267. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Visas: Documentation of Nonimmigrants under the Immigration and Nationality Act, as Amended" (RIN1400-AD17) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 14, 2015; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3268. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (P.L. 107-243) and the Authorization for the Use of Force Against Iraq Resolution of 1991 (P.L. 102-1) for the June 15, 2015-August 14, 2015 reporting period; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3269. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-069); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3270. A communication from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's FAIR Act 2012 and 2013 Commercial Activities Inventories, the FAIR Act 2012 and 2013 Inherently Government Inventories, and the 2012 and 2013 FAIR Act Executive Summary; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3271. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Default Investment Fund" (5 CFR Part 1600; 5 CFR Part 1601; 5 CFR Part 1651) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3272. A communication from the Deputy Chief of the Cybersecurity and Communications Reliability Division, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Ensuring Continuity of 911 Communications" (FCC 15-98) (PS Docket No. 14-174) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3273. A communication from the General Counsel, National Science Foundation, transmitting draft legislation entitled "Antarctic Nongovernmental Activity Preparedness Act of 2015"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3274. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.1216 of the Commission's Rules Related to Broadcast Licensee-Conducted Contests" (FCC 15-118) (MB Docket No. 14-226) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 1, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-78. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania urging the United States Congress to take all necessary action to prohibit any force structure changes, to prohibit any transfer of AH-64 Apache helicopters from the National Guard, and maintain the Army National Guard at 350,200 soldiers until the National Commission on the Future of the Army has reported its findings to Congress in February 2016; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 149

Whereas, The United States Army plans to transfer all National Guard AH-64 Apache helicopters to active duty as part of the United States Army's Restructuring Initiative; and

Whereas, The United States Army has marked Pennsylvania's 55th Armored Brigade Combat Team (ABCT) for inactivation; and

Whereas, The 55th ABCT is headquartered in Scranton, extends over the eastern portion of Pennsylvania and approximately 3,500 Pennsylvanians serve with the 55th ABCT; and

Whereas, Congress established the National Commission on the Future of the Army, which is tasked with completing an independent study on the proper size, force mixture and force generation requirements for the army, and this commission is required to report its findings during February 2016; and

Whereas, This comprehensive assessment will provide Congressional members the opportunity to review and legislate in response to the commission's recommendations; and

Whereas, There are 24 AH-64 Apache helicopters authorized for the Pennsylvania

Army National Guard (PAARNG) with a significant portion of the allotment stationed at the John Murtha Johnstown-Cambria County Airport; and

Whereas, Transferring the Apache helicopters would result in the loss of 350 part-time personnel from the 1-104th Attack Battalion and the stationing of PAARNG is an important economic driver in the Johnstown area with an estimated impact of nearly \$45 million; and

Whereas, The economic necessity and the maintenance of critical national defense units in the Johnstown area, including the 1-104th Attack Battalion PAARNG and its complement of Apache helicopters, dictates that the United States Army reverse its decision to redeploy the helicopters; and

Whereas, Units from the 55th ABCT have deployed multiple times since 9/11, including deployments to Kosovo, Kuwait, Egypt, Iraq and Afghanistan and units from the brigade have earned multiple Navy Unit Commendations and Meritorious Unit Commendations; and

Whereas, The army's current force proposals reduce the total Army National Guard end strength from 350,200 to 342,000 during fiscal year 2016, and further, from 342,000 to 335,000 during fiscal year 2017; and

Whereas, Since 2000, the army has cut the Army National Guard by 14 Brigade Combat Teams and increased the active army by 12 Brigade Combat Teams, which have resulted in a shift from the majority of force structure residing with the Army National Guard to the majority of the force structure contained within the active army; and

Whereas, The geographical location of Pennsylvania in relation to the entire northeast corridor places the Pennsylvania National Guard in a strategically accessible position that can effectively respond at the Federal and State level when needed for domestic emergencies or armed conflicts; and

Whereas, The National Guard represents the best economic value for the United States validated by the Department of Defense stating in 2013 that a drilling guardsman is about 15% the cost of an active component soldier; and

Whereas, When Title 10 mobilized duty, a national guard soldier only cost 80 to 95% as much as an active component soldier: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (the House of Representatives concurring), That the General Assembly urge the United States Army to reverse its decision to deactivate the 55th Armored Brigade Combat Team and to reverse its decision to transfer any National Guard AH-64 Apache helicopters to active duty; and be it further

Resolved, That the General Assembly urge Congress to take all necessary action to prohibit any force structure changes, to prohibit any transfer of AH-64 Apache helicopters from the National Guard, and maintain the Army National Guard at 350,200 soldiers until the National Commission on the Future of the Army has reported its findings to Congress in February 2016; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense and to each member of Congress from Pennsylvania.

POM-79. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania urging the President of the United States and the United States Congress to consider imposing tariffs on imported anthracite coal in order to preserve American jobs; to the Committee on Finance.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 54

Whereas, The anthracite coal industry accounts for more than 1,000 Pennsylvania jobs; and

Whereas, The anthracite coal industry contributes \$200 million to the Pennsylvania economy; and

Whereas, Pennsylvania anthracite coal production accounts for 2 million tons annually; and

Whereas, Pennsylvania coal fueled a large part of the Industrial Revolution and the industrial efforts which helped to win two world wars; and

Whereas, Government-sponsored anthracite coal production in China, Russia and Ukraine provides unfair competition with domestically mined anthracite coal by providing government subsidies which reduce their prices far below market rates: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania urge the President and the Congress of the United States to consider imposing tariffs on imported anthracite coal in order to preserve American jobs; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States and to the presiding officers of each house of Congress and to each member of Congress from Pennsylvania.

POM-80. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Delaware memorializing a commitment to the strong and deepening relationship between Taiwan and Delaware, to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 17

Whereas, Taiwan and the United States are long-standing friends with a shared historical relationship and dearly cherished values of freedom, democracy, and human rights; and

Whereas, 2015 marks the 15th anniversary of the sister-state relationship between Delaware and Taiwan; and

Whereas, for the past 14 years, the sister-state relationship with Taiwan has been strengthened through the efforts of the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) resulting in better mutual understanding; and

Whereas, Taiwan is the United States' tenth largest trading partner, with the two-way trade volume between the United States and Taiwan reaching \$67 billion in 2014, and the United States is Taiwan's second largest trading partner; and

Whereas, Taiwan signed an agreement with Delaware to recognize driver's licenses issued by each side on June 11, 2014, reflecting the friendship, trust, and cooperation between two sides, and benefitting the people of Taiwan and Delaware in terms of travel and business; and

Whereas, Trade and Investment Framework Agreements (TIFA) are an important channel for dialogue on trade and investment issues between the United States and Taiwan, it not only helps to forge a closer relationship but also boosts Taiwan's chances to participate the Trans-Pacific Partnership: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 148th General Assembly of the State of Delaware, That we hereby reaffirm our commitment to the strong and deepening relationship between Taiwan and Delaware; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, and the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

POM-81. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California memorializing the United States Congress to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965

forthwith, with adequate funding to reflect the growing populations of Americans who benefit from the act's programs and services; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 8

Whereas, 2015 marks the 50th anniversary of the enactment of the Older Americans Act of 1965; and

Whereas, During the past 50 years, the implementation of the Older Americans Act of 1965 has contributed to the economic well-being of millions of older Americans, and has improved the quality of life for those individuals; and

Whereas, One of the key elements contributing to the successful implementation of the Older Americans Act of 1965 has been the establishment of an aging network composed of local area agencies on aging, providers of congregate and home-delivered nutrition, and many other community service providers; and

Whereas, The federal Administration on Aging in the United States Department of Health and Human Services was created by the Older Americans Act of 1965, and has been empowered to act as an effective advocate for the concerns and needs of older individuals; and

Whereas, The Older Americans Act of 1965 serves as a model for the development of community-based services, including services that provide alternatives to the institutionalization of older individuals; and

Whereas, Some of the programs authorized under the Older Americans Act of 1965 were created to address the specific concerns of those older Americans with the greatest social and economic needs, especially minority older Americans; and

Whereas, Many services under the Older Americans Act of 1965, including long-term care ombudsman and legal services providers, have acted as powerful advocates for older individuals; and

Whereas, The Older Americans Act of 1965 has brought together thousands of dedicated professionals and volunteers and has provided inspiration to those individuals; and

Whereas, Services authorized under the Older Americans Act of 1965 have provided important part-time community service employment opportunities for low-income older individuals; and

Whereas, Many older individuals, and those who serve them, have benefited greatly from the research, training, and education that programs established under the Older Americans Act of 1965 have provided; and

Whereas, Some of the programs under the Older Americans Act of 1965 were designed to address the special needs of older Native Americans; and

Whereas, In recognition of the changing needs of a rapidly aging society, the Older Americans Act of 1965 has been periodically amended; and

Whereas, The Older Americans Act of 1965 served as the foundation for an effective human services policy for millions of Americans as the United States entered the 21st century: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature recognizes the 50th anniversary of the enactment of the Older Americans Act of 1965, and the successful implementation of that act; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature applauds the many and varied contributions at all levels of the aging network fostered by the Older Americans Act of 1965; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature affirms support for the Older Americans Act of 1965, and

the primary goals of that act of providing services to maintain the dignity of older Californians, and promoting the independence of those individuals; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature memorializes the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965 forthwith, with adequate funding to reflect the growing populations of Americans who benefit from the act's programs and services; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, to the Majority Leader of the United States Senate, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of California in the Congress of the United States.

POM-82. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois affirming support for the Older Americans Act of 1965; and urging the United States Congress to reauthorize the act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 561

Whereas, 2015 marks the 50th anniversary of the enactment of the Older Americans Act of 1965; during the past 50 years, the implementation of the Older Americans Act of 1965 has contributed to the economic well-being of millions of older Americans and has improved the quality of life for those individuals; and

Whereas, One of the key elements contributing to the successful implementation of the Older Americans Act of 1965 has been the establishment of an aging network composed of local area agencies on aging, providers of congregate and home-delivered nutrition, and many other community service providers; and

Whereas, The United States Department of Health and Human Services' Administration on Aging was created by the Older Americans Act of 1965; the agency has been empowered to act as an effective advocate for the concerns and needs of older individuals; and

Whereas, The Older Americans Act of 1965 serves as a model for the development of community-based services, including services that provide alternatives to the institutionalization of older individuals; and

Whereas, Some of the programs authorized under the Older Americans Act of 1965 were created to address the specific concerns of those older Americans with the greatest social and economic needs, especially minority older Americans; and

Whereas, Many services under the Older Americans Act of 1965, including long-term care ombudsman and legal services providers, have acted as powerful advocates for older individuals; and

Whereas, Services authorized under the Older Americans Act of 1965 have also provided important part-time community service employment opportunities for low-income older individuals; and

Whereas, Many older individuals, and those who serve them, have benefited greatly from the research, training, and education that programs established under the Older Americans Act of 1965 have provided; and

Whereas, During Fiscal Year 2015, Illinois Area Agencies on Aging will serve an estimated 515,700 persons 60 and over, accounting for 22% of the 2.3 million seniors in Illinois; the agencies will also develop and coordinate comprehensive systems of home and community-based services to enable older adults with chronic illnesses and disabilities to live in the least restrictive setting and avoid unnecessary hospital readmissions and placements in long term care facilities; and

Whereas, Thirteen Area Agencies on Aging in Illinois collaborate with 179 provider agencies to provide a myriad of home and community-based services for older adults and their caregivers, including information and assistance for older adults to help them make informed decisions about programs, benefits, and services and live independently for as long as possible, transportation programs, in-home services, home-delivered meals, congregate meals, Multi-Purpose Senior Centers, recreation programs, legal assistance, health promotion and disease prevention, and evidence-based health promotion programs; and

Whereas, In recognition of the changing needs of a rapidly aging society, the Older Americans Act of 1965 has been periodically amended and reauthorized; and

Whereas, The Older Americans Act of 1965 served as the foundation for an effective human services policy for millions of Americans as the United States entered the 21st century; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Ninety-Ninth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we affirm our support for the Older Americans Act of 1965 and the primary goals of the Act of providing services to maintain the dignity of older Illinoisans and promoting the independence of those individuals; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge Congress to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965 without delay and with adequate funding to reflect the growing populations of Americans who benefit from the Act's programs and services; and be it further

Resolved, That suitable copies of this resolution be delivered to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Majority Leader of the United States Senate, and the members of the Illinois congressional delegation.

POM-83. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California relative to the Armenian Genocide of 1915-1923, and calling upon the President of the United States and the United States Congress to formally and consistently reaffirm the historical truth that the atrocities committed against the Armenian people constituted genocide; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 2

Whereas, Armenians have resided in Asia Minor and the Caucasus for approximately four millennia, and have a long and rich history in the region, including the establishment of many kingdoms, and despite Armenians' historic presence, stewardship, and autonomy in the region, Turkish rulers of the Ottoman Empire and the Republic of Turkey subjected Armenians to severe and unjust persecution and brutality, including wholesale massacres beginning in the 1890s; and

Whereas, The Armenian nation was subjected to a systematic and premeditated genocide officially beginning on April 24, 1915, at the hands of the Young Turk Government of the Ottoman Empire from 1915-1919 and continued at the hands of the Kemalist Movement of Turkey from 1920-1923 whereby over 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children were slaughtered or marched to their deaths in an effort to annihilate the Armenian nation in the first genocide of modern times, while thousands of surviving Armenian women and children were forcibly converted and Islamized, and hundreds of thousands more were subjected to ethnic cleansing during the period of the modern Republic of Turkey from 1924-1937; and

Whereas, During the genocides of the Christians living in the Ottoman Empire and

surrounding regions, which occurred during the first one-half of the 20th century, 1.5 million men, women, and children of Armenian descent, and hundreds of thousands of Assyrians, Greeks, and other Christians, lost their lives at the hands of the Ottoman Turkish Empire and the Republic of Turkey, constituting one of the most atrocious violations of human rights in the history of the world; and

Whereas, These crimes against humanity also had the consequence of permanently removing all traces of the Armenians and other targeted people from their historic homelands of more than four millennia, and enriching the perpetrators with the lands and other property of the victims of these crimes, including the usurpation of several thousand churches; and

Whereas, In response to the genocide and at the behest of President Woodrow Wilson and the United States State Department, the Near East Relief organization was founded, and became the first congressionally sanctioned American philanthropic effort created exclusively to provide humanitarian assistance and rescue to the Armenian nation and other Christian minorities from annihilation, who went on to survive and thrive outside of their ancestral homeland all over the world and specifically in this state; and

Whereas, Near East Relief succeeded, with the active participation of the citizens from this state, in delivering \$117 million in assistance, and saving more than one million refugees, including 132,000 orphans, between 1915 and 1930, by delivering food, clothing, and materials for shelter, setting up refugee camps, clinics, hospitals, and orphanages; and

Whereas, The Armenian nation survived the genocide despite the attempt by the Ottoman Empire to exterminate it; and

Whereas, Adolf Hitler, in persuading his army commanders that the merciless persecution and killing of Jews, Poles, and other people would bring no retribution, declared, "Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians?"; and

Whereas, On November 4, 1918, immediately after the collapse of the Young Turk regime and before the founding of the Republic of Turkey by Mustafa Kemal Ataturk in 1923, the Ottoman Parliament considered a motion on the crimes committed by the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP): "A population of one million people guilty of nothing except belonging to the Armenian nation were massacred and exterminated, including even women and children." The Minister of Interior at the time, Fethi Bey, responded by telling the Parliament: "It is the intention of the government to cure every single injustice done up until now, as far as the means allow, to make possible the return to their homes of those sent into exile, and to compensate for their material loss as far as possible"; and

Whereas, Mustafa Kemal Ataturk made a historic admission in an interview published in the Los Angeles Examiner on August 1, 1926: "These leftovers from the former Young Turk Party, who should have been made accountable for the lives of millions of our Christian subjects who were ruthlessly driven, en masse, from their homes and massacred"; and

Whereas, The Parliamentary Investigative Committee proceeded to collect relevant documents describing the actions of those responsible for the Armenian mass killings and turned them over to the Turkish Military Tribunal. CUP's leading figures were found guilty of massacring Armenians and hanged or given lengthy prison sentences. The Turkish Military Tribunal requested that Germany extradite to Turkey the masterminds of the massacres who had fled the country.

After German refusal, they were tried in absentia and sentenced to death; and

Whereas, Unlike other people and governments that have admitted and denounced the abuses and crimes of predecessor regimes, and despite the Turkish government's earlier admissions and the overwhelming proof of genocidal intent, the Republic of Turkey inexplicably and adamantly has denied the occurrence of the crimes against humanity committed by the Ottoman and Young Turk rulers for many years, and continues to do so a full century since the first crimes constituting genocide occurred; and

Whereas, Those denials compound the grief of the few remaining survivors of the atrocities, desecrate the memory of the victims, cause continuing pain to the descendants of the victims, and deprive the surviving Armenian nation, both on individual and collective levels, of their ancestral land, property, culture, heritage, financial assets, and population growth; and

Whereas, The Republic of Turkey has escalated its international campaign of Armenian Genocide denial, maintained its blockade of Armenia, and increased its pressure on the small but growing movement in Turkey acknowledging the Armenian Genocide and seeking justice for this systematic campaign of destruction of millions of Armenians, Greeks, Assyrians, and other Christians upon their biblical-era homelands; and

Whereas, Those citizens of Turkey, both Armenian and non-Armenian, who continue to speak the truth about the Armenian Genocide, such as human rights activist and journalist Hrant Dink, continue to be silenced by violent means; and

Whereas, There is continued concern about the welfare of Christians in the Republic of Turkey, their right to worship and practice freely, and the legal status and condition of thousands of ancient Armenian churches, monasteries, cemeteries, and other historical and cultural structures, sites, and antiquities in the Republic of Turkey; and

Whereas, The United States is on record as having officially recognized the Armenian Genocide in the United States government's May 28, 1951, written statement to the International Court of Justice regarding the Reservations to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, through President Ronald Reagan's April 22, 1981, Proclamation No. 4838, and by congressional legislation including House Joint Resolution 148 adopted on April 9, 1975, and House Joint Resolution 247 adopted on September 12, 1984; and

Whereas, Even prior to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, the United States has a record of having sought to justly and constructively address the consequences of the Ottoman Empire's intentional destruction of the Armenian people, including through United States Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 adopted on February 9, 1916, United States Senate Resolution 359 adopted on May 11, 1920, and President Woodrow Wilson's November 22, 1920, decision entitled, "The Frontier between Armenia and Turkey," which was issued as a binding arbitral award, yet has not been enforced to this date despite its legally binding status; and

Whereas, President Barack Obama entered office "calling for Turkey's acknowledgment of the Armenian Genocide" and on April 24, 2013, and similarly on April 24, 2014, he further stated, "A full, frank, and just acknowledgment of the facts is in all of our interests. Peoples and nations grow stronger, and build a more just and tolerant future, by acknowledging and reckoning with painful elements of the past"; and

Whereas, California is home to the largest Armenian-American population in the

United States, and Armenians living in California have enriched our state through their leadership and contribution in business, agriculture, academia, government, and the arts, many of whom have family members who experienced firsthand the horror and evil of the Armenian Genocide and its ongoing denial; and

Whereas, Every person should be made aware and educated about the Armenian Genocide and other crimes against humanity, and this state has been at the forefront of encouraging and promoting a curriculum relating to human rights and genocide in order to empower future generations to prevent the recurrence of genocide; and

Whereas, April 24, 1915, is globally observed and recognized as the commencement of the Armenian Genocide and April 24, 2015, will mark the centennial anniversary since the commencement of the Armenian Genocide; and

Whereas, Armenians in this state and throughout the world, have not been provided with justice for the crimes perpetrated against the Armenian nation despite the fact that a century has passed since the crimes were first committed; and

Whereas, The Armenian people, in this state and elsewhere, remain resolved and their spirit continues to thrive a century after their near annihilation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature hereby designates the year of 2015 as "State of California Year of Commemoration of the Centennial Anniversary of the Armenian Genocide of 1915-1923" and in doing so, intends, through the enactment of legislation, that the Armenian Genocide is properly commemorated and taught to its citizens and visitors through statewide educational and cultural events; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature hereby designates April 24, 2015, as "State of California Day of Commemoration of the Centennial Anniversary of the Armenian Genocide of 1915-1923"; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature commends its conscientious educators who teach about human rights and genocide, and intends for them, through the enactment of legislation, to continue to enhance their efforts to educate students at all levels about the experience of the Armenians and other crimes against humanity; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature hereby commends the extraordinary service which was delivered by Near East Relief to the survivors of the Armenian Genocide and the Assyrian Genocide, including thousands of direct beneficiaries of American philanthropy who are the parents, grandparents, and great-grandparents of many Californian Armenians and Assyrians, and pledges its intent, through the enactment of legislation, to working with community groups, non-profit organizations, citizens, state personnel, and the community at large to host statewide educational and cultural events; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature deplores the persistent, ongoing efforts by any person, in this country or abroad, to deny the historical fact of the Armenian Genocide; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature respectfully calls upon the President of the United States and the United States Congress to formally and consistently reaffirm the historical truth that the atrocities committed against the Armenian people constituted genocide; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature calls on the President of the United States to work toward equitable, constructive, stable, and durable Armenian-Turkish relations; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Majority Leader of the Senate, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Governor of California, to every member of the California State Legislature, and to the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

POM-84. A resolution adopted by the City Council of New Orleans, Louisiana, recognizing August 6, 2015, as the 50th anniversary of the signing of the Voting Rights Act of 1965; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-85. A resolution adopted by the Michigan Senate encouraging the United States Forest Service to issue the owners of privately-held hunting camps on leased acres within the Ottawa National Forest special use authorization under the Recreation Residence Program; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 79

Whereas, Starting in the late 1950s, Michigan residents were offered an opportunity to lease privately-owned land from the Upper Peninsula Power Company (UPPCO) to build recreational hunting camps. In 1991, the UPPCO announced intentions to sell the land currently under lease to an intermediary who would simultaneously sell the land to the United States Forest Service (USFS). Existing leaseholders were offered an option to sign a 25-year, nonrenewable lease on the land that was to be sold or to immediately vacate the property. The leases were signed in March of 1992, and the United States Forest Service (USFS) took control of the land in June 1992. The land currently under private lease accounts for less than 1,100 acres in the Ottawa National Forest; and

Whereas, Hundreds of people have experienced the wonders of Michigan's great outdoors at these hunting camps. The Ottawa National Forest is almost one million acres of rolling hills, lakes, rivers, waterfalls, and abundant wildlife. Those who lease land in the forest have built outdoor recreational traditions with their families. The hunting camps allow them to experience the seclusion and isolated environment of the Ottawa National Forest while engaging in varied recreational activities, including hunting, fishing, canoeing, and snowshoeing; and

Whereas, The USFS has informed leaseholders that leases will not be renewed at the end of 2016 because it is national policy not to lease national forest land to individuals. The holders of the active leases will have 90 days after the leases expire to remove the hunting cabins and return the land to its natural state; and

Whereas, The expiration of the leases will hurt local economies in Ontonagon and Gogebic Counties. It will result in over \$35,000 in lost lease fee revenue to the townships and almost \$10,000 in tax revenue to the counties. Even a greater loss will be realized by local businesses, including gas stations, grocery stores, hardware stores, and restaurants that benefit from the patronage of the camp families; and

Whereas, The expiration of the leases will eliminate refuge for people from the occasionally harsh and unexpected shifts in weather conditions. The Ottawa National Forest covers a large area in the western Upper Peninsula. Camp owners often leave their cabins or outbuildings unlocked to the relief of individuals stranded in the woods who have sought shelter. A Boy Scout troop once sheltered at the Twin Pines camp after being caught in a storm, and a group of snowmobilers is known to regularly rest at one of the camps; and

Whereas, The USFS Recreation Residence Program provides private citizens an opportunity to own single-family cabins in designated areas of national forests. Currently, 15,570 recreation residences occupy national forest system lands throughout the country; and

Whereas, Although the National Forest Service placed a moratorium on the establishment of new tracts under the Recreation Residence program in 1968, the authority to issue special use authorization under the Recreation Residence program remains in federal regulations (36 CFR Part 251). Therefore, lifting that moratorium for the limited purpose of establishing a Recreation Residence tract in the Ottawa National Forest and issuing special use authorization permits is possible and would allow the many families currently leasing in the Ottawa National Forest an opportunity that is provided to thousands of people elsewhere in the country; and

Whereas, Converting to the Recreation Residence Program would maintain a tax base for local governments, provide continuing support for the local economy, and ensure that hunting and recreational traditions held so dear by Michigan residents continue to be experienced in the Ottawa National Forest; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That we encourage the United States Forest Service to issue the owners of privately-held camps on leased acres within the Ottawa National Forest special use authorization under the Recreation Residence Program; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Chief of the United States Forest Service and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-86. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to regulate airline baggage fees and processes for consumers as it relates to transportation of passenger luggage and passenger delays resulting from lost, damaged, or delayed luggage; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 207

Whereas, deregulation of the airline industry in the United States began more than three decades ago in 1978; and

Whereas, a consequence of deregulation was the elimination of federal control over many airline business practices, including pricing and domestic route selection; and

Whereas, though deregulation limits federal control of airline business practices generally, the federal government continues to legislate and enforce certain consumer protections for airline passengers; and

Whereas, the United States Congress largely determines the degree to which certain rights of airline passengers are codified in law or developed through regulatory rule-making; and

Whereas, since deregulation, the primary means of competition amongst airlines has progressively centered on price, not service; and

Whereas, certain concerns for passengers of airlines include increasing baggage fees and passenger delays resulting from lost, damaged, or delayed passenger luggage; and

Whereas, the airline industry began to charge passengers a checked baggage fee per bag to curtail rising jet fuel costs and to supplement marginal revenue during times of economic decline; and

Whereas, as a result of increasing airline baggage fees charged by airlines for checked luggage, passengers are encouraged to increase the contents of carry-on luggage to avoid the extra cost of baggage fees; and

Whereas, increased carry-on luggage of boarding airline passengers may be correlated to the claims of lost, damaged, or delayed passenger luggage, because passengers are oftentimes asked to check carry-on luggage at the boarding gate, which may require passengers to wait for such luggage after deboarding an aircraft, or luggage and contents may become damaged during the process of fitting carry-on luggage onto boarded aircrafts; and

Whereas, although checked luggage may be lost, damaged, or delayed for a variety of reasons, baggage handling systems, airline negligence, and the act of luggage offloading to accommodate extra fuel have also been discussed as reasons for lost, damaged, or delayed passenger luggage; and

Whereas, the aforementioned concerns of airline passengers are issues of consumer protection for which the United States Congress has the constitutional power to address and determine fair and reasonable solutions through codified law or regulatory rulemaking: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to regulate airline baggage fees and processes for consumers as it relates to transportation of passenger luggage and passenger delays resulting from lost, damaged, or delayed luggage; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-87. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress and the Louisiana Congressional Delegation to take such actions as are necessary to rectify the revenue sharing inequities between coastal and interior energy producing states; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 167

Whereas, since 1920, interior states have been allowed to keep fifty percent of the oil, gas, and coal production revenues generated in their states from mineral production on federal lands within their borders, including royalties, severance taxes, and bonuses; and

Whereas, coastal states with onshore and offshore oil and gas production face inequities under the federal energy policies because those coastal states have not been party to this same level of revenue sharing partnership with the federal government; and

Whereas, coastal energy producing states have a limited partnership with the federal government that provides for them to retain very little revenue generated from their offshore energy production, energy that is produced for use throughout the nation; and

Whereas, in 2006 congress passed the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act (GOMESA) that will fully go into effect in 2017; an act that calls for a sharing of thirty-seven and five tenths percent of coastal production revenues with four gulf states with a cap of \$500 million per year; and

Whereas, the Fixing America's Inequities with Revenues (FAIR) Act would have addressed the inequity suffered by coastal oil and gas producing states by accelerating the implementation of GOMESA as well as by gradually lifting all revenue sharing caps but the legislation died with the close of the previous congress; and

Whereas, with the state and its offshore waters taken alone, Louisiana is the ninth largest producer of oil in the United States

in 2014 while including offshore oil from federal waters, it was the second largest oil producer in the country; and when taken alone Louisiana was the fourth largest producer of gas in the United States in 2013 while including the Gulf of Mexico waters, it was the second largest producer in the United States; and

Whereas, with nineteen operating refineries in the state, Louisiana was second only to Texas as of January 2014 in both total and operating refinery capacity, accounting for nearly one-fifth of the nation's total refining capacity; and

Whereas, Louisiana's contributions to the United States Strategic Petroleum Reserve with two facilities located in the state consisting of twenty-nine caverns capable of holding nearly three hundred million barrels of crude oil; and

Whereas, with three onshore liquified natural gas facilities, more than any other state in the country, and the Louisiana Offshore Oil Port, the nation's only deepwater oil port, Louisiana plays an essential role in the movement of natural gas from the United States Gulf Coast region to markets throughout the country; and

Whereas, it is apparent that Louisiana plays an essential role in supplying the nation with energy and it is vital to the security of our nation's energy supply, roles that should be recognized and compensated at an appropriate revenue sharing level; and

Whereas, the majority of the oil and gas production from the Gulf of Mexico enters the United States through coastal Louisiana with all of the infrastructure necessary to receive and transport such production, infrastructure that has for many decades damaged the coastal areas of Louisiana, an impact that should be compensated through appropriate revenue sharing with the federal government; and

Whereas, because Louisiana is losing more coastal wetlands than any other state in the country, in 2006 the people of Louisiana overwhelmingly approved a constitutional amendment dedicating revenues received from Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas activity to the Coastal Protection and Restoration Fund for the purposes of coastal protection, including conservation, coastal restoration, hurricane protection, and infrastructure directly impacted by coastal wetland losses; and

Whereas, the state of Louisiana has developed a science-based "Comprehensive Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast" which identifies and prioritizes the most efficient and effective projects in order to meet the state's critical coastal protection and restoration needs; and

Whereas, the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority is making great progress implementing the projects in the "Comprehensive Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast" with all available funding, projects that are essential to the protection of the infrastructure that is critical to the energy needs of the United States; and

Whereas, in order to properly compensate the coastal states for the infrastructure demands that result from production of energy and fuels that heat and cool the nation's homes, offices, and businesses and fuel the nation's transportation needs, revenue sharing for coastal states needs to be at the same rate as interior states that produce oil, gas, and coal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to treat mineral and gas production in the Gulf Coastal states in a manner that is at least equal to onshore oil, gas, and coal production in interior states for revenue purposes; and to rectify the revenue sharing in-

equities between coastal and interior energy producing states in order to address the nationally significant crisis of wetland loss in the state of Louisiana; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-88. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Missouri calling on the President of the United States to support the increased importation of oil from Canadian oil sands and to approve the newly routed TransCanada Keystone XL pipeline to reduce our oil dependency on unstable governments, and to support and facilitate permitting for oil production off the northern coast of Alaska to decrease our dependence on foreign oil and spur investment in the American economy; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 15

Whereas, high oil prices are having a major detrimental impact on families, farms, and businesses in Missouri and are likely to undercut the prospects for an economic recovery; and

Whereas, the United States currently imports almost half of its oil and petroleum products, making it dependent on foreign sources and subject to interruptions and price fluctuations stemming from geopolitical forces; and

Whereas, such instability has damaging consequences both for our economy and our national security; and

Whereas, the United States Geological Survey estimates a resource of up to 27 billion barrels of oil in the Chukchi and Beaufort seas of Alaska, providing a vast domestic oil reserve, but opposition and regulatory hurdles are keeping energy producers from accessing these resources; and

Whereas, the TransCanada Keystone XL pipeline project seeks to link expanded oil production from the Canadian oil sands to refineries in the United States and to facilitate the flow of oil from the Dakotas to the Gulf Coast, thereby decreasing our dependence on oil from outside of North America; and

Whereas, Canada is a close friend and ally, with whom we share links of infrastructure and energy networks and other ties, so that dollars spent on Canadian oil will likely contribute to the success of the American economy; and

Whereas, the TransCanada pipeline project is projected to create construction and manufacturing jobs in the United States, adding billions of dollars to the United States economy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the House of Representatives of the Ninety-eighth General Assembly, First Regular Session, the Senate concurring therein, hereby call upon President Barack Obama and administration officials to:

(1) Support the increased importation of oil from Canadian oil sands and to approve the newly routed TransCanada Keystone XL pipeline to reduce our oil dependency on unstable governments, strengthen ties with an important ally, and create jobs for American workers;

(2) Support and facilitate permitting for oil production off the northern coast of Alaska to decrease our dependence on foreign oil and spur investment in the American economy; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Missouri House of Representatives be instructed to prepare properly inscribed copies of this resolution for President Barack Obama, Vice

President Joe Biden, Secretary of State John Kerry, United States House of Representatives Speaker John Boehner, and each member of the Missouri Congressional delegation.

POM-89. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to reestablish a right-of-way through the Lake Ophelia National Wildlife Refuge in order to provide access to property owned by the Avoyelles Parish School Board; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 228

Whereas, Lake Ophelia National Wildlife Refuge, located in Avoyelles Parish and named for its most prominent water body, the 350-acre Lake Ophelia that was at one time a channel of the nearby Red River, was established in 1988 to protect the Mississippi and Red River floodplain ecosystem; and

Whereas, due to its location in east-central Louisiana, this area is prime waterfowl hunting territory influenced by both the Mississippi and Central Flyways which are the highways in the sky for bringing millions of duck and geese each spring and fall to the area; and

Whereas, another species found in the Avoyelles Parish area is the Louisiana black bear which was listed as threatened within its historic range of southern Mississippi, Louisiana, and east Texas under the Endangered Species Act on January 7, 1992, due to extensive habitat loss and modification, as well as human-related mortality; and

Whereas, Louisiana currently supports three core bear populations; the Tensas River Basin population in the north, the upper Atchafalaya River Basin population in central Louisiana, and the coastal population in the southern Atchafalaya River Basin; and

Whereas, the Black bear management efforts in Louisiana by both the state and the federal agencies have had a great deal of success with a likely result that the central Louisiana and northern Louisiana populations expanding towards each other through the area set aside for the Lake Ophelia National Wildlife Refuge; and

Whereas, because of the likelihood that the two populations will merge in the area, the Department of the Interior has designated a certain parcel of land in the Lake Ophelia National Wildlife Refuge as a Black bear habitat which in turn has prevented ingress and egress to a six hundred forty acre tract owned by the Avoyelles Parish School Board; and

Whereas, through the years, this sixteenth-section land owned by the Avoyelles Parish School Board has been available for public hunting, camping, and other recreational activities, activities from which there has been great economic benefit to Avoyelles Parish; and

Whereas, without these outdoor activities, businesses in Avoyelles Parish that rely on recreational activities in the area including hunting, fishing, and camping for their income have been and will continue to be negatively impacted by the loss of access to the acreage owned by the Avoyelles Parish School Board; and

Whereas, simply having the Department of the Interior allow a limited right-of-way access to the school board owned land will solve the problem: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to reestablish a right-of-way through the Lake Ophelia National Wildlife Refuge in order to provide access to property owned by the Avoyelles Parish School Board; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-90. A resolution adopted by the Michigan Senate urging the United States Congress to restore Great Lakes Restoration Initiative funding to 300 million dollars for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 42

Whereas, the Great Lakes are a critical resource for our nation, supporting the economy and a way of life in Michigan and the other seven states with the Great Lakes region. The Great Lakes hold 20 percent of the world's surface freshwater and 95 percent of the United States' surface freshwater. This globally significant freshwater resource provides drinking water for more than 30 million people and is an economic driver that supports jobs, commerce, agriculture, transportation, and tourism throughout the region; and

Whereas, The Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI) provides essential funding to restore and protect the Great Lakes. This funding has support long overdue efforts to clean up toxic pollution, reduce runoff from cities and farms, combat invasive species like the Asian carp, and restore fish and wildlife habitat. Since 2010, the federal government has invested nearly \$2 billion in more than 2,000 projects through the GLRI. Over its first five years, the GLRI has provided more than \$280 million for 580 projects in Michigan alone; and

Whereas, GLRI projects are making a significant difference. They have restored more than 115,000 acres of fish and wildlife habitat; opened up fish access to more than 3,400 miles of rivers; helped implement conservation programs on more than 1 million areas of farmland; and accelerated the cleanup of toxic hotspots. In Michigan, GLRI funding has been instrumental in removing contaminated sediments from Muskegon Lake, the River Raisin, and the St. Mary's River, restoring habitat along the St. Clair River, Cass River, Boardman River, and the Keweenaw Peninsula; and developing improved methods for sea lamprey control; and

Whereas, While this is a significant investment, there is still more work to be done with numerous ready-to-go projects that need funding. Toxic algal blooms, beach closings, fish consumption advisories, and the presence of contaminated sediments continue to limit the recreational and commercial use of the Great Lakes. The 2014 shutdown of the city of Toledo's drinking water system due to a toxic algal bloom, forcing more than a half million people to find another source of drinking water, is just one example of how much still needs to be done; and

Whereas, Proposed cuts to GLRI funding would jeopardize the momentum from a decade of unprecedented regional and bipartisan cooperation. The FY 2016 executive budget recommends a \$50 million cut in federal funding to \$250 million. This cut would be a shortsighted, cost-saving measure with long-term implications. Restoration efforts will only become more expensive and more difficult if they are not addressed in the coming years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That we urge the Congress of the United States to restore Great Lakes Restoration Initiative funding to \$300 million for fiscal year 2016; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United

States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-91. A resolution adopted by the Michigan Senate opposing the United States Environmental Protection Agency's efforts to study or commission a study that could lead to regulations on grills and barbecues; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 56

Whereas, Barbecues are an American tradition enjoyed by families from all walks of life across the country. Whether tailgating for a football game, hosting a backyard get-together, or just grilling a summer meal, barbecues are a quintessentially American experience and an opportunity to eat and socialize with family and friends; and

Whereas, Cooking outdoors on a grill during the summer saves electricity. Using a grill prevents the release of heat into the kitchen and other living spaces. While cooking indoors heats up a kitchen, forcing cooling systems, such as the refrigerator and air conditioner, to work harder and use more energy; and

Whereas, The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), our nation's environmental regulatory agency, has funded a University of California-Riverside student project to develop preventative technology to reduce emissions from residential barbecues. By funding this project, the EPA is apparently intent on finding a solution to a problem that does not exist and demonstrating an unnecessary interest and concern over the impact of backyard barbecues on public health; and

Whereas, Based on the EPA's past practices, today's study, no matter how small, is a concern to Michiganders and Americans, as it is inevitably the first step towards tomorrow's regulation of this American pastime. To fulfill its mission to protect human health and the environment, the EPA's primary tool has been, and continues to be, regulatory mandates that I time and again ignore the financial, economic, and social burdens to the state and the country. The regulation of barbecues would be the latest, egregious example of overreach by the EPA; and

Whereas, Funding such a study is a poor use of taxpayer dollars. In the face of record national debts, annual budget deficits, and other profound problems the country is facing, surely the federal government can better use our resources than on a study of grills and backyard barbecues: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That we oppose the United States Environmental Protection Agency's efforts to study or commission a study that, if consistent with the agency's past practices, many fear will serve as the first step towards the regulation of grills and barbecues: and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-92. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts promoting a multilateral approach to the potential crisis in the Dominican Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTIONS

Whereas, Massachusetts, the first cradle of liberty, has a long history of diverse activism and advocacy regarding the issue of equality and civil rights; and

Whereas, The connection between Massachusetts and Haiti dates back to the civil

war during which time U.S. Senator Charles Sumner, who served Massachusetts from 1852 to 1874, fought for the passage of federal legislation in 1862 which enabled the United States of America to recognize Haiti as a sovereign nation; and

Whereas, In 1871, in recognition of his diplomatic work on this issue, president of Haiti Nissage Salet presented Senator Sumner with a gold medal on behalf of the Haitian people, which currently resides in the Massachusetts state house in Boston; and

Whereas, Despite their shared history and geographical proximity, Haiti and the Dominican Republic have often faced challenging diplomatic relations; and

Whereas, In September 2013, the constitutional court of the Dominican Republic issued a ruling that would denaturalize people born in the Dominican Republic after 1929 whose parents were noncitizens, the majority of whom are Dominicans of Haitian descent; and

Whereas, The constitutional court's ruling effectively stripped these persons of their identity and affiliation with the Dominican Republic, rendering them stateless and subjecting them to the risk of deportation from the country of their birth; and

Whereas, In May 2014, the Dominican Republic passed special law 169-14, which required persons affected by the 2013 constitutional court's decision to be re-recognized as citizens or apply to gain state recognition based on their birth status and year; and

Whereas, The deadlines set forth in the 2014 naturalization law allowed for only a fraction of this population to be re-recognized thereby rendering tens of thousands of Dominicans of Haitian descent vulnerable to deportation, discrimination and loss of livelihood; and

Whereas, Later that same year, in response to a ruling by the inter-American court of human rights deeming the 2013 and 2014 actions of the Dominican Republic to be in violation of the American convention to which the Dominican Republic is party, the Dominican Republic's constitutional court declared the country would no longer recognize the authority of the inter-American court; and

Whereas, Both the rulings of the constitutional court and special law 169-14 have further separated Dominicans of Haitian descent from the larger Dominican community; and

Whereas, The majority of Dominicans of Haitian descent, threatened by deportation, have no family or support networks in Haiti nor are they fluent in French or Haitian creole; and

Whereas, Article 15 of the universal declaration of human rights, of which the Dominican Republic and the United States of America are signatories, states that, "no one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality"; and

Whereas, Recognizing the impact that this crisis will have on all nations in the western hemisphere, the Caribbean community and Common Market Secretariat (Caricom) has called for a moratorium on this law; and

Whereas, At the urging of other concerned nations, the organization of American states sent a special mission to the Dominican Republic and Haiti in order to investigate the situation between the two countries to prepare a report for the secretary general of the organization of American states; and

Whereas, A broad coalition of humanitarian, academic, legal, political and civil rights groups from across Massachusetts, including but not limited to: the Irish International Immigrant Center, Haitian Americans United, Inc., Urban League of Eastern Massachusetts, Catholic Charities' Haitian Multi-service Center of Boston, as well as

the Institute for Justice and Democracy in Haiti call for immediate action by the Dominican government to reverse the effects of the constitutional court rulings and special law 169-14: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts general court requests the U.S. State department and the U.S. Secretary of State to pursue a multilateral approach to promptly address the potential crisis in the Dominican Republic that could render tens of thousands of dominicans of haitian descent stateless; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the clerk of the Senate to the President of the United States of America, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, Secretary of State John Kerry and United States Ambassador to the Dominican Republic James Brewster.

POM-93. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts supporting the friendship between Massachusetts and Taiwan in the international community; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTIONS

Whereas, The United States and Taiwan share an important relationship supported by common values of freedom, democracy, rule of law and a free market economy; and

Whereas, President Ma Ying-Jeou has worked to uphold democratic principles in Taiwan, ensure the prosperity of Taiwan's more than 23 million people, promote Taiwan's international standing and to strengthen relations between the United States and Taiwan; and

Whereas, The Commonwealth has enjoyed a close friendship with Taiwan, marked by strong bilateral trade, educational and cultural exchange, scientific and technological development and tourism; and

Whereas, New England exported more than \$1 billion in goods to Taiwan of which the Commonwealth exported \$825 million in commodities, mostly in machinery, computer and electronic products and chemicals; and

Whereas, the United States has maintained and developed its robust commercial ties with Taiwan and Taiwan is the tenth largest trading partner of the United States while the United States is Taiwan's largest foreign investor, Taiwan has worked to enter a bilateral investment agreement to further enhance its trade and investment relations with the United States; and

Whereas, Taiwan has been a member of the United States visa waiver program since November 1, 2012, reflecting the cooperation between the United States and Taiwan and making travel for business and tourism more convenient; and

Whereas, Taiwan has made significant contributions toward peace in the region through discussions regarding the use of resources in the surrounding seas and has worked diligently to propose East and South China Sea Peace Initiatives; and

Whereas, Taiwan is a key transport hub in the Asia-Pacific region and has jurisdiction over the 176,000 square nautical miles of the Taipei flight information region and has attended the International Civil Aviation Organization, ICAO, assembly as a special guest since 2013; and

Whereas, Taiwan is committed to ICAO standards and seeks to expand its meaningful participation in the ICAO, including attending technical and regional meetings and related activities; and

Whereas, Taiwan strives to be included in the work of the United Nations framework convention on climate change and has expressed a keen interest in the global effort to address climate change: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts General Court hereby reaffirms the friendship between the Commonwealth and Taiwan; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the clerk of the Senate to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and the members thereof from the Commonwealth, to the Honorable Charles D. Baker, Governor of the Commonwealth, to the Honorable Ma Ying-Jeou, President of Taiwan and Scott Lai, Director-General of the Taipei Economic and Cultural Office in the City of Boston.

POM-94. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to work to adopt policies that will help with the stability and the viability of the domestic shrimp industry, including support for the Imported Seafood Safety Standards Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 225

Whereas, consumption of seafood is one of the fastest growing areas of our nation's food supply with shrimp being one of the most consumed seafood products in the United States; and

Whereas, over three-fourths of the seafood consumed in the United States is imported from other countries around the world with shrimp as the leading fresh or frozen product imported into the United States accounting for about twenty-eight percent of all seafood imports by weight; and

Whereas, most of the shrimp consumed in the United States is grown in man-made ponds along the coasts of Thailand, Vietnam, Ecuador, and other tropical countries rather than being harvested from the waters of the Gulf of Mexico; and

Whereas, the countries that produce most of the shrimp consumed worldwide support their shrimp hatcheries with large state subsidies to keep the price of their shrimp lower than the prices that our domestic Gulf of Mexico shrimpers need to charge in order to just break even; and

Whereas, the Tariff Act of 1930, a law originally introduced to protect farmers from imports, allows United States industries to "petition the government for relief from imports that benefit from subsidies provided through foreign government programs"; and

Whereas, the United States Department of Commerce launched an investigation in 2013 to determine whether there was sufficient evidence to support the claim that the seven largest shrimp-producing countries were subsidizing their shrimp industries, an investigation that will run concurrently with the International Trade Commission's (ITC) examination of whether the subsidies are causing significant injury to United States producers with both investigations needing to call for countervailing duties before any penalties could be applied; and

Whereas, in September 2013, the ITC voted to throw out the shrimp countervailing duty case based on the fact that injury to the domestic industry was not proven, thus removing the possibility of a countervailing duty and terminating the shrimp subsidy investigation against Ecuador, China, India, Malaysia, and Vietnam; and

Whereas, the ITC's decision has had a devastating impact on the domestic shrimp industry, including the shrimpers trawling the Gulf of Mexico and landing their shrimp at Louisiana docks; and

Whereas, without relief from the unfair foreign competition undercutting the domestic shrimp prices, the prices that shrimpers

are getting at the dock have dropped over fifty percent from last year making it almost impossible for shrimpers to earn enough money to provide for their families; and

Whereas, the Imported Seafood Safety Standards Act introduced in the United States Senate by Louisiana Senator David Vitter is being supported by the American Shrimp Processors Association and it specifically targets foreign food imported into the United States with hopes of tightening testing standards, increasing inspection standards on foreign imported seafood, requiring placement of United States safety standards for foreign exporters, and increasing severe penalties for exporters who fail food safety inspections, ultimately benefiting the American shrimp industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to work to adopt policies that will help with the stability and the viability of the domestic shrimp industry including support for the Imported Seafood Safety Standards Act; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-95. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan urging the United States Congress to enact legislation that requires uniform and science-based food labeling nationwide; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 59

Whereas, In the absence of a federal genetically modified organism (GMO) labeling standard, some states and localities have developed a patchwork of labeling proposals that can be confusing and misleading to consumers. Multiple local regulations increase agriculture and food production costs, requiring food companies operating in Michigan to create separate supply chains to be developed for each state; and

Whereas, GMOs are found in 70 to 80 percent of the foods we eat and play a vital role in maintaining Michigan's agriculture, food processing, and other industries. In 2014, 100 percent of all sugar beets, 93 percent of all corn, and 91 percent of all soybeans grown in Michigan were genetically modified; and

Whereas, A maze of regulations would cripple interstate commerce throughout the food supply and distribution chain and ultimately increase grocery prices for consumers by hundreds of dollars each year. A Cornell University study found that a patchwork of state labeling laws would increase food costs for a family by an average of \$500 per year; and

Whereas, On July 23, 2015, the U.S. House of Representatives passed bipartisan legislation—the Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act (H.R. 1599)—to avoid this patchwork of regulations and the costly challenges it creates; and

Whereas, Senate passage of the Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act will allow consumers to have access to accurate and consistent information on products that contain GMOs by ensuring that labeling is national, uniform, and science-based. The bill also establishes a United States Department of Agriculture (USDA)-administered certification and labeling program, modeled after the USDA National Organic Program for non-GMO, organic foods: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That we urge the United States Congress to enact legislation

that requires uniform and science-based food labeling nationwide; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States House, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-96. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California commemorating the 43rd anniversary of Title IX, and commending the national movement toward increased equality and fair treatment of all students; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 23

Whereas, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 is a federal law that specifically states that no person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance; and

Whereas, All public and private elementary schools and secondary schools, school districts, colleges, and universities receiving any federal funding must comply with Title IX; and

Whereas, Title IX requires equal access in recruitment, admissions, counseling, financial assistance, discipline, employment, and athletics; protection from sex-based harassment; and equitable treatment of pregnant and parenting students; and

Whereas, Prior to the enactment of Title IX, many women and girls faced discrimination and limited opportunities in athletics, academics, and extracurricular activities; and

Whereas, Discrimination on the basis of sex can include sexual harassment or sexual violence, including rape, sexual assault, sexual battery, and sexual coercion; and

Whereas, Title IX has been used as a basis in a number of complaints alleging sexual violence on college campuses, as sexual violence interferes with a student's right to receive education free from discrimination; and

Whereas, Of the 109 colleges and universities under investigation by the United States Department of Education for their handling of sexual violence cases, 11 are located in California; and

Whereas, Title IX, which governs educational equity generally, is widely known for ensuring equal access to women and girl athletes; and

Whereas, The members of the United States Women's National Soccer Team, which is ranked #2 in the world and continues to make our nation proud, all played collegiate level soccer; and

Whereas, Title IX regulations require that pregnant and parenting students have equal access to schools and activities, and that all separate programs for pregnant or parenting students be completely voluntary; and

Whereas, Title IX has been the basis for California laws that protect graduate students from discrimination on the basis of pregnancy in research projects in California universities, laws requiring affirmative consent, and current legislation requiring lactation accommodations in California schools; and

Whereas, The educational equity guaranteed in Title IX does not solely apply to women. It protects everyone from sex-based discrimination, regardless of real or perceived sex, gender identity, or gender expression; and

Whereas, Although Title IX has increased opportunities for girls and women in academics, sports, and other educational activi-

ties, it has not yet achieved the goal of full equality: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature urges Californians to continue to work together to achieve the goals set by Title IX of increased opportunities for girls and women in academics, sports, and other educational activities; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of California, on June 23, 2015, commemorates the 43rd anniversary of Title IX, and commends the national movement toward increased equality and fair treatment of all students; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

POM-97. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California urging the President of the United States and the United States Congress to craft a balanced and workable approach to reduce incentives for and minimize unnecessary patent litigation while ensuring that legitimate patent enforcement rights are protected and maintained; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 9

Whereas, The principle of intellectual property is enshrined in the United States Constitution, specifically under clause 8 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, which empowers Congress to "promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries"; and

Whereas, A robust patent system is critical to promote economic growth and innovation and ensure just compensation for the labor and proliferation of beneficial ideas and innovations; and

Whereas, California accounts for 25 percent of the nation's patents; and

Whereas, The state recognizes and respects the importance of patent protections and patent enforcement rights to driving continued research, investment, technological innovation, and job creation across multiple sectors of our economy; and

Whereas, Small businesses depend on patents to secure investments, and firms with fewer than 25 employees hold nearly one-quarter of United States-held patents in innovative emerging technologies; and

Whereas, Enforcement of legitimate patent rights is essential to promoting an innovation environment that fuels economic growth; and

Whereas, There is increasing concern about litigation by predatory Patent Assertion Entities (PAEs), which are built on a rent-seeking business model that exploits the patent legal system for financial gain without producing or manufacturing anything of value for society; and

Whereas, Many PAEs attain ambiguous patents with the sole intent of filing patent infringement lawsuits. PAEs assert these patents against businesses of all sizes and in all industries, often years after the product has become standard and widely used; and

Whereas, PAEs rarely earn successful judgments in court, underscoring the questionable merits of these particular patent cases. However, given the high cost and risks associated with patent litigation, most defendants choose to settle in order to avoid further financial loss. Indeed, many PAEs will offer royalty settlements below market value in order to encourage settlement and avoid trial; and

Whereas, Predatory PAEs have a detrimental impact on the economy and innovation. PAE activities cost businesses \$29 billion directly, mostly borne by small- and medium-sized businesses; and

Whereas, The growth of patent litigation is directly tied to aggressive PAEs in recent years. In 2010, PAEs were responsible for 29 percent of patent litigation, and by 2012 PAEs represented 62 percent of all patent suits; and

Whereas, The California economy is especially vulnerable to lawsuits directed at information technology patents; and

Whereas, Federal legislation is necessary to prevent and deter abusive patent litigation; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature urges the President and the Congress of the United States to craft a balanced and workable approach to reduce incentives for and minimize unnecessary patent litigation while ensuring that legitimate patent enforcement rights are protected and maintained; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, the Majority Leader and Minority Leader of the Senate, and each member of the California delegation to the United States Congress.

POM-98. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California urging the United States Congress to further amend the GI Bill of Rights to make benefits available to veterans for use as startup capital in the establishment of first businesses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION No. 7

Whereas, Men and women of the State of California volunteer to serve in the Armed Forces of the United States in greater numbers than those from any other state; and

Whereas, California is currently home to more than 1,800,000 veterans of our Armed Forces; and

Whereas, California veterans have been grateful recipients of the financial support of their fellow Americans through the Veterans Administration and the GI Bill; and

Whereas, The Congress of the United States passed, and President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed, the GI Bill of Rights in 1944 to support our veterans of World War II in their transition back to civilian life; and

Whereas, The Congress of the United States in 2008 added significant new benefits for those who enlisted to serve the nation in the wake of the attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001; and

Whereas, Up to 10 percent of veterans choose to start, run, and own their own businesses; and

Whereas, Over 30 percent of veterans of Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom, and other fronts on the war against terrorism are receiving disability ratings from the federal Veterans Administration; and

Whereas, More than five million Americans, including over one-half million Californians, served in those conflicts; and

Whereas, The State of California is the recognized national leader in the establishment and success of veteran business owner procurement support programs, and

Whereas, Veteran businesses make a significant contribution to the state's economy and serve as a source of employment for fellow veterans; and

Whereas, Finding enough capital to successfully launch a new business or buy an existing business is the largest challenge that

new business owners face: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature requests that the Congress of the United States of America further amend the GI Bill of Rights to make benefits available, with all appropriate safeguards, to all veterans for use as startup capital in the establishment of first businesses; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Majority Leader of the Senate, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 1868. A bill to extend by 15 years the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to conduct the quarterly financial report program (Rept. No. 114-157).

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 Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 2194. A bill to promote the use of clean cookstoves and fuels to save lives, improve livelihoods, empower women, and protect the environment by creating a thriving global market for clean and efficient household cooking solutions; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 2195. A bill to prohibit the indefinite detention of persons by the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 2196. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the non-application of Medicare competitive acquisition rates to complex rehabilitative wheelchairs and accessories; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 2197. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the risk adjustment under the Medicare Advantage program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 2198. A bill to establish a grant program to encourage States to adopt certain policies and procedures relating to the transfer and possession of firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 2199. A bill to require agencies to conform to concurrent resolutions when promulgating rules; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. FISCHER:

S. 2200. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to strengthen equal pay requirements; read the first time.

By Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 2201. A bill to promote international trade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 2202. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain farming business machinery and equipment as 5-year property for purposes of depreciation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 2203. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make residents of Puerto Rico eligible for the earned income tax credit and to provide equitable treatment for residents of Puerto Rico with respect to the refundable portion of the child tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 2204. A bill to respect the Constitutional entitlement to liberty by recognizing the right of an individual to have personal control over the medical assistance and treatment necessary to alleviate intolerable physical suffering; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 2205. A bill to establish a grant program to assist tribal governments in establishing tribal healing to wellness courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CASEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. Res. 292. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the availability of high-quality childcare for working parents should be increased; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. AYOTTE, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. Res. 293. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Domestic Violence Awareness Month, commending domestic violence victim advocates, domestic violence victim service providers, crisis hotline staff, and first responders serving victims of domestic violence for their compassionate support of victims of domestic violence, and expressing the sense of the Senate that Congress should continue to support efforts to end domestic violence and hold perpetrators of domestic violence accountable; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mr. PETERS):

S. Res. 294. A resolution designating October 26, 2015, as Day of the Deployed; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. COONS, Mr. GARDNER, Mr.

MARKEY, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RISCH, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. Res. 295. A resolution designating the week of November 2 through November 6, 2015 as "National Veterans Small Business Week"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 441

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 441, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the Food and Drug Administration's jurisdiction over certain tobacco products, and to protect jobs and small businesses involved in the sale, manufacturing and distribution of traditional and premium cigars.

S. 553

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 553, a bill to marshal resources to undertake a concerted, transformative effort that seeks to bring an end to modern slavery, and for other purposes.

S. 564

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 564, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to include licensed hearing aid specialists as eligible for appointment in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 579

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) were added as cosponsors of S. 579, a bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to strengthen the independence of the Inspectors General, and for other purposes.

S. 746

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 746, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Accelerate the End of Breast Cancer.

S. 804

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 804, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to specify coverage of continuous glucose monitoring devices, and for other purposes.

S. 864

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 864, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish direct care registered nurse-to-patient staffing ratio requirements in hospitals, and for other purposes.

S. 946

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr.

CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 946, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the transportation of horses in interstate transportation in a motor vehicle containing 2 or more levels stacked on top of one another.

S. 1122

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1122, a bill to provide that chapter 1 of title 9 of the United States Code, relating to the enforcement of arbitration agreements, shall not apply to enrollment agreements made between students and certain institutions of higher education, and to prohibit limitations on the ability of students to pursue claims against certain institutions of higher education.

S. 1195

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1195, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to update reporting requirements for institutions of higher education and provide for more accurate and complete data on student retention, graduation, and earnings outcomes at all levels of post-secondary enrollment.

S. 1539

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1539, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to establish a permanent, nationwide summer electronic benefits transfer for children program.

S. 1562

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1562, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 1565

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1565, a bill to allow the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to provide greater protection to servicemembers.

S. 1617

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1617, a bill to prevent Hizballah and associated entities from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 1757

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1757, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to promote health care technology innovation and access to medical devices and services for which patients choose to self-pay under

the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 1775

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1775, a bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to accept additional documentation when considering the application for veterans status of an individual who performed service as a coastwise merchant seaman during World War II, and for other purposes.

S. 1961

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1961, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to make improvements to the treatment of the United States territories under the Medicare and Medicaid programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2015

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2015, a bill to clarify the treatment of two or more employers as joint employers under the National Labor Relations Act.

S. 2066

At the request of Mr. SASSE, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2066, a bill 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.

S. 2067

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of S. 2067, a bill to establish EUREKA Prize Competitions to accelerate discovery and development of disease-modifying, preventive, or curative treatments for Alzheimer's disease and related dementia, to encourage efforts to enhance detection and diagnosis of such diseases, or to enhance the quality and efficiency of care of individuals with such diseases.

S. 2075

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2075, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high cost employer-sponsored health coverage and to express the sense of the Senate that the resulting revenue loss should be offset.

S. 2103

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2103, a bill to modify a provision relating to adjustments of certain State apportionments for Federal highway programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2119

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan

(Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2119, a bill to provide for greater congressional oversight of Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

S. 2123

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2123, a bill to reform sentencing laws and correctional institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 2127

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2127, a bill to provide appropriate protections to probationary Federal employees, to provide the Special Counsel with adequate access to information, to provide greater awareness of Federal whistleblower protections, and for other purposes.

S. 2152

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) were added as cosponsors of S. 2152, a bill to establish a comprehensive United States Government policy to encourage the efforts of countries in sub-Saharan Africa to develop an appropriate mix of power solutions, including renewable energy, for more broadly distributed electricity access in order to support poverty reduction, promote development outcomes, and drive economic growth, and for other purposes.

S. 2193

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2193, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to increase penalties for individuals who illegally reenter the United States after being removed and for other purposes.

S. RES. 275

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 275, a resolution calling on Congress, schools, and State and local educational agencies to recognize the significant educational implications of dyslexia that must be addressed and designating October 2015 as "National Dyslexia Awareness Month".

S. RES. 283

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 283, a resolution designating October 2015 as "Filipino American History Month".

S. RES. 287

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, his name and the names of the Senator

from Nevada (Mr. REID), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator

from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 287, a resolution condemning the senseless murder and wounding of 18 individuals (sons, daughters, fathers, mothers, uncles, aunts, cousins, students, and teachers) in Roseburg, Oregon, on October 1, 2015.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 2194. A bill to promote the use of clean cookstoves and fuels to save lives, improve livelihoods, empower women, and protect the environment by creating a thriving global market for clean and efficient household cooking solutions; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Clean Cookstoves and Fuels Support Act. This bill addresses a serious global public health and environmental issue. I am very pleased to be joined in this effort by my friend and colleague Senator DURBIN.

Nearly half of the world's people cook over open fires or inefficient, polluting, and unsafe cookstoves using agricultural waste, coal, dung, wood or other solid fuels. Smoke from these traditional cookstoves and open fires is associated with chronic and acute diseases that affect women and children disproportionately. The black carbon from these traditional cookstoves is also a significant driver of air pollution and climate change.

Alarmingly, the World Health Organization found that in 2012 this type of air pollution claimed 4.3 million lives. Millions more are sickened from the toxic fumes, and thousands suffer

burns annually from open fires or unsafe cookstoves. The Global Burden of Disease Study of 2010 doubled the mortality estimates for exposure to smoke from cookstoves, referred to as “household air pollution,” from 2 million to 4 million deaths annually. That is more than the deaths from malaria, tuberculosis, and HIV/AIDS combined. This same study ranks household air pollution as the fourth worst overall health risk factor in the world and is the second worst health risk factor in the world for women and girls.

Traditional cookstoves also create serious environmental problems. Recent studies show that the emissions of black carbon or common soot from these cookstoves significantly contribute to regional air pollution and climate change. In fact, black carbon emissions from residential cookstoves in developing countries are responsible for as much as 25 percent of black carbon emissions. Moreover, each family can require up to two tons of cooking fuel, and where the demand for fuel outstrips the natural regrowth of resources, local environmental degradation and loss of biodiversity can result.

The collection of this fuel is also a burden that is shouldered disproportionately by women and children. In some areas, women and girls risk rape and other violence during the up to 20 hours per week they spend away from their families gathering fuel. This often means these women and girls have far less time to pursue an education, to generate income or to participate in other community activities, and this marginalizes their role in society. A new report by McKinsey Global Institute estimates that the world economy could increase by between \$12 trillion and \$28 trillion over 10 years if the participation of women was to equal that of men.

Replacing these cookstoves with modern alternatives would help reverse these alarming health, environmental, and economic trends, and it would be relatively inexpensive. In fact, there are stoves that are coming on the market that cost as little as \$20 that are 50 percent more efficient than the traditional cooking methods. It could also be done quickly. It is what scientists call the low-hanging fruit of environmental and health fixes.

In 2010, the Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves was formed to help support the adoption of clean cookstoves in 100 million households in the developing world by the year 2020. Recognizing the serious health and environmental issues posed by traditional cookstoves, the Alliance aims to save lives, improve livelihoods, empower women, and combat pollution by creating a thriving global market for clean and efficient household cooking stoves. Alliance partners are working together to help overcome the market barriers that currently impede the production, development, and distribution of clean cookstoves in developing countries.

During the first 5 years of the Alliance, the U.S. Government played a

key role in supporting this important endeavor, including through financial assistance that surpassed the original funding commitments. Led by the Department of State, 11 Federal agencies have invested more than \$114 million in clean cookstoves and fuel initiatives to date. For the next 5 years of the Alliance, our government has announced anticipated commitments of another \$175 million.

To date, our government has focused its efforts on applied research and development, diplomatic engagement to encourage a market for clean cookstoves and to improve access to them, international development projects to support clean cookstove businesses engaging women entrepreneurs, and supporting the adoption of clean and efficient cooking solutions by providing some financial assistance.

The legislation Senator DURBIN and I are introducing today strengthens these important commitments by requiring the Secretary of State—in consultation with the relevant Federal agencies and in coordination with international NGOs and private and other government entities—to advance the goals and work of the Alliance. In addition, the bill would formally authorize the funding commitments already made by our government for the next 5 years, through the year 2020, to ensure that these important pledges toward preventing unnecessary illness and reducing pollution around the globe are met.

By supporting the work of the Alliance and the commitment of the U.S. Government to replace traditional cookstoves with modern versions that emit far less soot, this bill aims to benefit directly some of the world’s poorest people and to reduce the harmful pollution that affects all of us. It offers a way for us to address the second largest contributor to climate change in a way that is inexpensive, not burdensome to the people of our country, and that will benefit poor people living in developing nations.

There is lots of disagreement on many proposals that have been advanced to address climate change, but this is one that should unite all of us. It will help to improve the health of women and children, in particular, who bear the burden of working over these dirty cookstoves in developing countries, and it will reduce carbon soot in our atmosphere—the second biggest contributor to greenhouse gas emissions. It will do so without requiring those of us in our country to change our ways.

I urge my colleagues to join Senator DURBIN and me in supporting the Clean Cookstoves and Fuels Support Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 292—EX-PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE AVAILABILITY OF HIGH-QUALITY CHILDCARE FOR WORKING PARENTS SHOULD BE INCREASED

Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CASEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 292

Whereas working parents depend on high-quality childcare so they can work and support their families;

Whereas over 60 percent of children under 5, and ½ of grade school-aged children, are in a regular childcare arrangement;

Whereas United States businesses lose \$3,000,000,000 annually due to employee absenteeism resulting from child care challenges, which weakens the stable and reliable childcare system that is essential for the economy;

Whereas childcare is difficult to find for millions of families, particularly the nearly 9,000,000 parents who work non-standard hours, because only 8 percent of childcare centers provide evening or weekend care;

Whereas most middle-class families struggle to afford high-quality childcare;

Whereas the median annual aggregate cost of full-time care for an infant and a 4-year-old in a childcare center is nearly \$16,000;

Whereas the average annual cost of center-based childcare for an infant is over ½ of the income of a family of 3 living at the poverty level in 21 States;

Whereas high-quality childcare and early education, especially for disadvantaged children, helps children thrive in school and beyond by—

- (1) decreasing special education placement and reducing grade retention;
- (2) decreasing child abuse and neglect and juvenile arrests;
- (3) increasing high school graduation and college attendance; and
- (4) increasing employment;

Whereas the eligibility requirements to receive assistance under the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858 et seq.) (referred to in this preamble as the “CCDBG”), the primary source of Federal funding support for childcare, exclude most United States children from Federal childcare assistance;

Whereas the CCDBG serves only a fraction of families eligible for Federal support, with only 17 percent of eligible children receiving Federal childcare assistance, the lowest percentage since 1997;

Whereas these issues affect all families, but disproportionately affect women because—

- (1) over 95 percent of the formal childcare workforce is comprised of women; and
- (2) women do most of the unpaid childcare work in families;

Whereas increased pay for workers in the childcare industry improves the quality of childcare for young children;

Whereas to recruit and retain a qualified childcare workforce for young children, childcare staff for young children should be paid as much as K-12 staff with equivalent education and experience;

Whereas a full-time living wage of at least \$15 per hour is needed for childcare workers to meet the essential needs of their families, but the average childcare center worker earns \$10.60 per hour and has experienced no increase in real earnings since 1997;

Whereas high-quality childcare that works for everyone is essential for a strong economy and future;

Whereas each working family needs, in order to support its well-being—

- (1) universal preschool;
- (2) child nutrition programs that promote health and wellness;
- (3) a fair work schedule;
- (4) a living wage;
- (5) paid family and medical leave;
- (6) paid sick days; and
- (7) credit in the Social Security system for time spent caregiving; and

Whereas when families are guaranteed high-quality, flexible, available, and affordable childcare—

- (1) business productivity improves;
 - (2) parents have a greater likelihood of finding and keeping employment; and
 - (3) children do better in school and in life:
- Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate supports efforts—

- (1) to provide childcare assistance to each working family that needs childcare assistance, including—
 - (A) middle-class families that struggle to afford the costs of high-quality childcare; and
 - (B) underpaid families that are often left behind;
- (2) to make childcare affordable—
 - (A) such that no working family must pay more than 10 percent of its income for childcare; and
 - (B) by providing additional help to families most in need;
- (3) to ensure that childcare is available so that parents in the 24-hour economy can access high-quality care—
 - (A) when and where the parents need it (during weekends, nights, and as their job schedules change); and
 - (B) with options across school, center, and home settings;
- (4) to guarantee that each family eligible for childcare receives childcare by creating a system that expands with need;
- (5) to improve the quality of childcare by—
 - (A) guaranteeing childcare workers a living wage and wage parity with K-12 staff with equivalent education and experience;
 - (B) improving training opportunities; and
 - (C) giving workers a voice on the job to advocate for higher workplace standards and standards of care for the children the workers serve; and
- (6) to provide sufficient Federal, State, and local investment to ensure resources for high-quality jobs and affordable childcare.

SENATE RESOLUTION 293—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH, COMMENDING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM ADVOCATES, DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM SERVICE PROVIDERS, CRISIS HOTLINE STAFF, AND FIRST RESPONDERS SERVING VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE FOR THEIR COMPASSIONATE SUPPORT OF VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, AND EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT CONGRESS SHOULD CONTINUE TO SUPPORT EFFORTS TO END DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND HOLD PERPETRATORS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ACCOUNTABLE

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. AYOTTE, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 293

Whereas domestic violence victim advocates, domestic violence service providers, domestic violence first responders, and other individuals in the United States observe the month of October, 2015, as “National Domestic Violence Awareness Month” in order to increase awareness in the United States about the issue of domestic violence;

Whereas it is estimated that each year up to 9,000,000 individuals in the United States are victims of intimate partner violence, including—

- (1) physical violence;
- (2) rape; or
- (3) stalking;

Whereas more than 1 in 5 women in the United States and more than 1 in 7 men in the United States have experienced severe physical violence by an intimate partner;

Whereas domestic violence affects women, men, and children of every age and background, but women—

- (1) experience more domestic violence than men; and
- (2) are significantly more likely than men to be injured during an assault by an intimate partner;

Whereas women aged 18 to 34 typically experience the highest rates of intimate partner violence, according to the Bureau of Justice Statistics;

Whereas most female victims of intimate partner violence have been victimized by the same offender previously;

Whereas domestic violence is cited as a significant factor in homelessness among families;

Whereas research shows that households in which children are abused or neglected are likely to have a higher rate of intimate partner violence;

Whereas millions of children are exposed to domestic violence each year;

Whereas victims of domestic violence experience immediate and long-term negative outcomes, including detrimental effects on mental and physical health;

Whereas crisis hotlines serving domestic violence operate 24 hours per day, 365 days per year, and offer important—

- (1) crisis intervention;
- (2) support;
- (3) information; and
- (4) referrals for victims;

Whereas staff and volunteers of domestic violence shelters and programs in the United States, in cooperation with 56 State and territorial coalitions against domestic violence, serve—

(1) thousands of adults and children each day; and

(2) at least 1,000,000 adults and children each year;

Whereas law enforcement officers in the United States put their lives at risk each day by responding to incidents of domestic violence, which can be among the most volatile and deadly disturbance calls;

Whereas Congress first demonstrated a significant commitment to supporting victims of domestic violence through the landmark enactment of the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act (42 U.S.C. 10401 et seq.);

Whereas Congress has remained committed to protecting survivors of all forms of domestic violence and sexual abuse by making Federal funding available to support the activities that are authorized under—

- (1) the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act (42 U.S.C. 10401 et seq.); and
- (2) the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925 et seq.);

Whereas there is a need to continue to support programs and activities aimed at domestic violence intervention and domestic violence prevention in the United States; and

Whereas individuals and organizations that are dedicated to preventing and ending domestic violence should be recognized: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the Senate supports the goals and ideals of “National Domestic Violence Awareness Month”; and

(2) it is the sense of the Senate that Congress should—

(A) continue to raise awareness of domestic violence in the United States and the corresponding devastating effects of domestic violence on survivors, families, and communities; and

(B) pledge continued support for programs designed—

- (i) to assist survivors;
- (ii) to hold perpetrators accountable; and
- (iii) to bring an end to domestic violence.

SENATE RESOLUTION 294—DESIGNATING OCTOBER 26, 2015, AS DAY OF THE DEPLOYED

Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mr. PETERS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 294

Whereas more than 2,000,000 individuals serve as members of the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas several hundred thousand members of the Armed Forces rotate each year through deployments to 150 countries in every region of the world;

Whereas more than 2,700,000 members of the Armed Forces have deployed to the area of operations of the United States Central Command since the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks;

Whereas the United States is kept strong and free by the loyal military personnel from the total force (the regular components, the National Guard, and the Reserves), who protect the precious heritage of the United States through their declarations and actions;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces serving at home and abroad have courageously answered the call to duty to defend the ideals of the United States and to preserve peace and freedom around the world;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces personify the virtues of patriotism, service, duty, courage, and sacrifice;

Whereas the families of members of the Armed Forces make important and significant sacrifices for the United States; and

Whereas the Senate designated October 26 as “Day of the Deployed” in 2011, 2012, 2013, and 2014: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates October 26, 2015, as “Day of the Deployed”;

(2) honors the deployed members of the Armed Forces of the United States and the families of the members;

(3) calls on the people of the United States to reflect on the service of those members of the Armed Forces, wherever the members serve, past, present, and future; and

(4) encourages the people of the United States to observe Day of the Deployed with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 295—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF NOVEMBER 2 THROUGH NOVEMBER 6, 2015 AS “NATIONAL VETERANS SMALL BUSINESS WEEK”

Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. COONS, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RISCH, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 295

Whereas the Armed Forces of the United States train individuals with the skills, discipline, and leadership necessary to establish and operate a successful business;

Whereas there are approximately 2,500,000 veteran-owned small businesses in the United States, employing nearly 6,000,000 individuals;

Whereas veteran-owned businesses make up nearly 10 percent of all businesses in the United States;

Whereas veterans account for more than \$1,200,000,000,000 in business receipts every year;

Whereas veterans are 45 percent more likely to be self-employed than non-veterans;

Whereas the number of veteran owned small businesses grew at nearly double the rate for non-veteran owned small businesses from 2007 to 2012;

Whereas women veterans’ business ownership has increased significantly, from 97,114 in 2007 to 384,549 in 2012;

Whereas the Office of Veterans Business Development of the Small Business Administration is dedicated to maximizing the availability and usability of small business programs for veterans, members of a reserve component of the Armed Forces of the United States, members of the Armed Forces of the United States serving on active-duty, transitioning service members, and the spouses, dependents, or survivors of those members and veterans;

Whereas the Small Business Administration serves more than 200,000 veterans, service-disabled veterans, women veterans, and military spouses annually;

Whereas, in 2014, the Small Business Administration increased loans to veterans by more than 100 percent, guaranteeing more than \$1,000,000,000 in small business loans;

Whereas the entrepreneurship training program of the Small Business Administration, Boots to Business, has trained more than 30,000 service members, veterans, and spouses of service members and veterans since launching in 2013;

Whereas the Small Business Administration will be hosting events honoring National Veterans Small Business Week from November 2 through November 6, 2015;

Whereas the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate will be commemorating National Small Business Week during the week of November 2 through November 6, 2015; and

Whereas November 2 through November 6, 2015 would be an appropriate time to designate as “National Veterans Small Business Week”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of November 2 through November 6, 2015 as “National Veterans Small Business Week”; and

(2) expresses appreciation for the continued service to the United States by the Nation’s veterans through small business ownership and entrepreneurship.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 22, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. GARDNER. 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 October 22, 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 THE JUDICIARY

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 22, 2015, at 10 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. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 22, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGULATORY AFFAIRS AND FEDERAL MANAGEMENT

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 22, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, “Improving Pay Flexibilities in the Federal Workforce.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 5 p.m.

on Monday, October 26, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 140; that there be up to 30 minutes of debate on the nomination; that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on the nomination without intervening action or debate; that following disposition of the nomination, the motion 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 nomination; that any statements related to the nomination 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.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of Calendar Nos. 308 through 320; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; 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; 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.

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army Nurse Corps to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 624 and 3064:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Barbara R. Holcomb

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Jack Weinstein

The following Air National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be brigadier general

Col. Michael E. Flanagan

The following Air National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be brigadier general

Col. David W. Silva, II

The following Air National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be brigadier general

Col. Philip R. Sheridan

The following Air National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be brigadier general

Col. Timothy J. LaBarge

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Kristan L. K. Hericks

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Jody J. Daniels

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Frank C. Pandolfo

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Raquel C. Bono

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. David C. Johnson

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601, and for appointment as a Senior Member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations under title 10, U.S.C., section 711:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Kenneth F. McKenzie, Jr.

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade of lieutenant general while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. William D. Beydler

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

VETERANS' COMPENSATION COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 202, S. 1493.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1493) to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2015, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. 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. 1493) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1493

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 "Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN RATES OF DISABILITY COMPENSATION AND DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION.

(a) RATE ADJUSTMENT.—Effective on December 1, 2015, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall increase, in accordance with subsection (c), the dollar amounts in effect on November 30, 2015, for the payment of disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation under the provisions specified in subsection (b).

(b) AMOUNTS TO BE INCREASED.—The dollar amounts to be increased pursuant to subsection (a) are the following:

(1) WARTIME DISABILITY COMPENSATION.—Each of the dollar amounts under section 1114 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR DEPENDENTS.—Each of the dollar amounts under section 1115(1) of such title.

(3) CLOTHING ALLOWANCE.—The dollar amount under section 1162 of such title.

(4) DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION TO SURVIVING SPOUSE.—Each of the dollar amounts under subsections (a) through (d) of section 1311 of such title.

(5) DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION TO CHILDREN.—Each of the dollar amounts under sections 1313(a) and 1314 of such title.

(c) DETERMINATION OF INCREASE.—Each dollar amount described in subsection (b) shall be increased by the same percentage as the percentage by which benefit amounts payable under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) are increased effective December 1, 2015, as a result of a determination under section 215(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)).

(d) SPECIAL RULE.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may adjust administratively, consistent with the increases made under subsection (a), the rates of disability compensation payable to persons under section 10 of Public Law 85-857 (72 Stat. 1263) who have not received compensation under chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code.

(e) PUBLICATION OF ADJUSTED RATES.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall publish in the Federal Register the amounts specified in subsection (b), as increased under subsection (a), not later than the date on which the matters specified in section 215(i)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)(2)(D)) are required to be published by reason of a determination made under section 215(i) of such Act during fiscal year 2016.

COMMEMORATING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PEACEFUL AND DEMOCRATIC REUNIFICATION OF GERMANY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 264, S. Res. 274.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows: A resolution (S. Res. 274) commemorating the 25th anniversary of the peaceful and democratic reunification of Germany.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to considering the resolution.

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. 274) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of October 1, 2015, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

FILIPINO AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 283 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. 283) designating October 2015 as "Filipino American History Month."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

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. 283) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of October 8, 2015, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

CONDEMNING THE SENSELESS MURDER AND WOUNDING OF 18 INDIVIDUALS IN ROSEBURG, OREGON

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 287 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. 287) condemning the senseless murder and wounding of 18 individuals (sons, daughters, fathers, mothers, uncles, aunts, cousins, students, and teachers) in Roseburg, Oregon, on October 1, 2015.

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. 287) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of October 8, 2015, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all Senators be added as cosponsors to the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ENACTMENT OF THE HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Environment and Public Works Committee be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 288.

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. 288) commemorating October 22, 2015, as the 50th anniversary of the enactment of the Highway Beautification Act of 1965.

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 laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 288) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of October 19, 2015, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

DAY OF THE DEPLOYED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 294, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 294) designating October 26, 2015, as Day of the Deployed.

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 laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 294) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

NATIONAL VETERANS SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 295, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 295) designating the week of November 2 through November 6, 2015 as "National Veterans Small Business Week."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

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. 295) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2200

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2200) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to strengthen equal pay requirements.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I now ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, OCTOBER 26, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, October 26; 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; that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; finally, at 5 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, OCTOBER 26, 2015, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. MCCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:55 p.m., adjourned until Monday, October 26, 2015, at 3 p.m.

DISCHARGED NOMINATION

The Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs was discharged from further consideration of the following nomination under the authority of the order of the Senate of 01/07/2009 and the nomination was placed on the Executive Calendar:

*ANN CALVARESI BARR, OF MARYLAND, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

*Nominee has committed to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 22, 2015:

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. BARBARA R. HOLCOMB

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JACK WEINSTEIN

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. MICHAEL E. FLANAGAN

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. DAVID W. SILVA II

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. PHILIP R. SHERIDAN

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. TIMOTHY J. LABARGE

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. KRISTAN L. K. HERICKS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JODY J. DANIELS

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED

WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. FRANK C. PANDOLFE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. RAQUEL C. BONO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. DAVID C. JOHNSON

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601, AND FOR APPOINTMENT AS A SENIOR MEMBER OF THE MILITARY STAFF COMMITTEE OF THE UNITED NATIONS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 711:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. KENNETH F. MCKENZIE, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM D. BEYDLER

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JULIE FURUTA-TOY, OF WYOMING, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF EQUATORIAL GUINEA.

DENNIS B. HANKINS, OF MINNESOTA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF GUINEA.

HARRY K. THOMAS, JR., OF NEW YORK, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF ZIMBABWE.

ROBERT PORTER JACKSON, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF GHANA.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DEFAULT PREVENTION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SUZANNE BONAMICI

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 21, 2015

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, Congress should be discussing how to pay its obligations in a responsible manner, which is why I will oppose H.R. 692. This legislation would irresponsibly result in the payment of some obligations but not others. Importantly, this bill could result in payments going to China, but not to active-duty military, veterans, national security, and other important obligations.

Instead of spending time on H.R. 692, which is likely to be vetoed, Congress should be working to raise the debt ceiling in a way that will prevent a default. Raising the debt ceiling permits payment of obligations already incurred. If we are unable to raise the debt ceiling by November 3rd, the Treasury will not be able to meet its obligations and the nation's credit rating would be in peril. The result would be devastating to our economic recovery.

We can quickly put an end to this unnecessary crisis and the uncertainty it creates. Members of Congress can and must work together to prevent the United States from a catastrophic default, starting with a responsible approach to debt payment. Again, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting no on H.R. 692.

SCHOLARSHIPS FOR OPPORTUNITY AND RESULTS REAUTHORIZATION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. TOM COLE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 21, 2015

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10) to reauthorize the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act, and for other purposes:

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chair, I support the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act which has been a remarkable success with overwhelming support among parents whose children participate.

Every American child deserves the opportunity to receive a great education. Education is the key to success no matter your background, race or religion. As a former educator, I know the importance of making sure our children learn the skills they need to succeed in life. And while education is, and should remain, primarily a state and local issue, Congress has constitutional authority for the District of Columbia. I am committed to making sure the parents and teachers in Washington, D.C., and throughout the country, have the

tools necessary to provide a world class education to all children.

No child should have to attend a low performing public school when alternatives are available and those alternatives provide positive and long-lasting benefits for a lifetime. I believe strongly in the authority of parents to direct the education and upbringing of their children with minimal interference from government at any level. Consequently, I am an advocate of charter schools, vouchers, and opportunity scholarships—all of which are supported through this legislation. Choice and the possibility to have an opportunity to attend the highest performing schools is what all parents want for their children.

I am hopeful that with the passage of this legislation many more families will have the opportunity to take advantage of public, charter, and private schools. Research has found voucher recipients are more likely to graduate from high school than their public school counterparts—82 percent of students who took advantage of a scholarship program graduated high school, while only 70 percent of students who applied but did not receive a scholarship graduated high school.

Education is essential to not only individual success, but the success of this great nation. H.R. 10 continues the emphasis on educational quality across D.C. and brings opportunity to those most in need by providing them with the option and means to attend a private school. By providing the opportunity to choose, children in D.C. will have an opportunity for a brighter future. For these reasons, I support this legislation, and thank Speaker BOEHNER for bringing this legislation to the floor.

HONORING MATTHEW SHAFER

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Matthew Shafer. Matthew is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1125, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Matthew has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Matthew has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Matthew has earned the rank of Warrior in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say. Matthew has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Matthew constructed an asphalt handicap access trail at the community baseball fields in Lawson, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Matthew Shafer for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America

and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ROTARY CLUB OF HONOLULU

HON. MARK TAKAI

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to recognize the 100th Anniversary of the founding of the Rotary Club of Honolulu.

First chartered on July 1, 1915 with 29 members, membership has now grown to more than 200 members that strive to embody the "service above self" motto of the Rotary Club. The Honolulu Chapter has truly exemplified this motto at every turn. For the last fifty years, the Rotary Club of Honolulu has worked to advocate on the behalf of children, starting with the committee that grew into the Children's Advocacy Center for sexually abused children. Every year, this Rotary Club hosts a Christmas Party for foster children and their families that celebrates the special relationship that they share. The work that they do shows the passion that each member has for serving others and the city and county of Honolulu.

Not only do they work for the betterment of Honolulu, they also work internationally on major humanitarian projects in the Philippines. The projects they do cannot be understated and I would like to extend a heartfelt thanks (mahalo) for all the great work that they do.

Congratulations on this milestone accomplishment to the Rotary Club of Honolulu and I look forward to continue seeing the great work that the Rotary Club of Honolulu does for the next hundred years.

WAZEE PARTNERS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Wazee Partners for receiving the City of Wheat Ridge's Mayor's Partnership Award. Selected by Wheat Ridge Mayor Joyce Jay, the Mayor's Partnership Award recognizes businesses showing strong community ties and a positive reflection of Wheat Ridge values.

Wazee Partners has been a critical ally in revitalization efforts in Wheat Ridge. In recent years, they have constructed more than 130 affordable senior housing units. The walkable placement of the Wheat Ridge Town Center Apartments makes the community an ideal place for older Coloradans to enjoy and take advantage of a thriving Colorado city. Wazee's dedication to the residents and their responsiveness to the city make Wazee Partners an asset to the Wheat Ridge community.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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

I applaud Wazee Partners for being the recipient of this well-deserved honor by the City of Wheat Ridge, and I congratulate them on their success.

HONORING DON CARPENTER

HON. JOSEPH P. KENNEDY III

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of a friend, mentor and tremendous public servant, Don Carpenter. After 20 years as a district court judge and 42 years in the practice of law, Judge Carpenter retired from the bench on October 2, 2015.

Mr. Carpenter began his legal career in 1973 as an associate at a Cape Cod law firm. Deeply dedicated to the local community, he became a public prosecutor shortly thereafter. And for the next 21 years, he faithfully served the people of Barnstable, Dukes and Nantucket Counties, working his way through the ranks to become the First Assistant District Attorney.

He was known as a firm but fair prosecutor who embraced our responsibility to apply the law equally to all. He knew that, while the law could not heal all wounds or right every wrong, it is the strongest tool we have to deliver on the promises of a just society.

His commitment to the Cape Cod community led to his nomination to the state bench. I cannot tell you how many cases Judge Carpenter heard over his two decades in that role. How many disputes he resolved. How many lives he impacted. How many addicts he helped get healthy. How many victims he helped find closure. But I can tell you that there is at least one young prosecutor he helped mentor.

I will never forget knocking on his door after a trial, seeking insight into what I could have done differently or advice on which pitfalls to watch out for the next time. His door was always open, to prosecutors and defense attorneys alike. And, for me, his advice was simple and direct—do what you think is right. The law grants you the ability to request the loss of someone's liberty. Use it wisely. Don't take it lightly.

Mr. Speaker, over the span of a 40-year career in our justice system, Judge Carpenter used the practice of law wisely, fairly and honestly. His retirement is a loss for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the residents of Cape Cod. We wish him and his family well in this new chapter in their lives.

IN HONOR OF COLONEL EDMUND J. BARRETT

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate Colonel Edmund J. Barrett of New Jersey on his retirement from the United States Army for his military achievements, contributions, and service to the people of New Jersey and the United States of America.

Originally from Moorestown, New Jersey, Colonel Barrett enlisted into the Army Signal Corps in 1984. After a tour in Germany, he attended Rutgers University and the University of Pennsylvania, where he was a ROTC Distinguished Military Graduate.

Over the course of his 31-year career, Colonel Barrett served in Operations Desert Storm and Iraqi Freedom and in a multitude of countries including Germany, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Bosnia, Iraq, Afghanistan and Brussels. He studied and mastered Arabic at the Defense Language Institute. He served the Joint Staff, at the Pentagon, working on Iraq, and later, broader Middle East issues, as a Joint Staff Planner. After deployment to Baghdad, Iraq, in 2006 Colonel Barrett became a staff officer at the National Security Agency.

In June, 2012 the Colonel was deployed to Afghanistan with the NATO training Mission as the Senior Advisor to the Afghan National Army (ANA). His work with the ANA prevented over a dozen "Insider Attacks" from Afghan Soldiers or infiltrators on U.S. and Coalition soldiers. After saving countless lives in Afghanistan he came home and returned to NSA as a valuable asset providing firsthand knowledge from his time in the Middle East as he directed the Afghan Mission Management team as a Senior Strategist.

His extraordinary service has earned Colonel Barrett numerous decorations and awards including the Bronze Star Medal, Defense Meritorious Service Medal (with 1 Oak Leaf Cluster), the Meritorious Service Medal (2 OLC), the NATO Medal, the German Armed Forces Proficiency Badge, and the Knowlton Award for Excellence in Military Intelligence, and he was presented with the MacArthur Leadership Award in 2000 by the Chief of Staff of the Army.

Additionally, he has been a loving husband and father of four and even made time to coach youth soccer, lead three Habitats for Humanity Church Youth Ministry Builds, and climb to the peak of Kilimanjaro with his then 16 year old son.

Mr. Speaker, Colonel Edmund J. Barrett is a great American whose self-sacrifice, leadership, and love of country exemplifies the American spirit. I join his family, friends, and all of New Jersey in wishing him a happy retirement and thanking him for his outstanding service to our country.

RIDLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT YOUTH ADVISORY BOARD GRANT

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the students of Ridley School District for receiving a grant of nearly \$100,000 to support community service and work on behalf of their community.

For almost 15 years, horticulture classes offered at Ridley High School have provided students the opportunity to grow and harvest fresh fruits and vegetables through the use of greenhouses. A growing interest in these classes has led the school district to expand the program into a year-long student effort to donate their fruits and vegetables to a local food bank. The grant, from the State Farm

Youth Advisory Board, will allow the school district to build more greenhouses and expand the program into the summer, when students can volunteer their time to continue working on their harvests. This will mean more food is sent to those who need it and fewer members of the Delaware County community will go hungry.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the students of Ridley School District and commend them on their hard work and community service.

LA FONDA'S MEXICAN RESTAURANT

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud La Fonda's Mexican Restaurant for receiving the City of Wheat Ridge's Council Partnership Award. Selected by the Wheat Ridge City Council, the Council Partnership Award recognizes businesses showing strong community ties and a positive reflection of Wheat Ridge values.

La Fonda's Mexican Restaurant has been a staple of the Wheat Ridge community for decades, and is well known for its delicious Mexican food as well as its rich history. Mexican immigrant Luis Abarca and his partners founded the restaurant in 1971 and were at the forefront of Mexican food becoming a mainstream American tradition. Just as the Abarca family was a critical partner in supporting Colorado culture, La Fonda's Mexican Restaurant is a generous partner and contributor to the Wheat Ridge community today.

I applaud La Fonda's Mexican Restaurant for being the recipient of this well-deserved honor by the City of Wheat Ridge, and I congratulate them on their success.

IN TRIBUTE TO DENNIS G. BABCOCK

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Mr. Dennis G. Babcock, a loyal veteran and resident of Enfield, Connecticut who passed away last month.

Born in Albany, New York in 1940, Dennis served in the U.S. Navy's submarine force from 1958 to 1960. After his service in the Navy, Dennis moved to Connecticut in 1960 where he would launch a 37 year career at Pratt & Whitney Aircraft. A self-identified "post-Korea, pre-Vietnam" veteran, Dennis served as a stalwart advocate for the Connecticut veterans. He served veterans across my district as a driver and advocate for the Disabled American Veterans group.

After joining the Enfield Chapter in 1995, Dennis was appointed commander, remaining in that post until 2015. Dennis was exceptionally devoted to his fellow veterans, pouring his heart out to those who gave their lives for this country. He was a firm believer that "vets help vets," and he would regularly clock in more than 250 miles per day shuttling veterans across the state to their medical appointments.

In addition to serving as the Commander for the State of Connecticut Disabled American Veterans group, Dennis also was a member of the Veterans Council of Enfield, the Amvets Post 18 of Enfield, the American Legion Post 0114 of Ravena, NY, and an honorary member of Veterans Who Care. He received the Patriot Award in Enfield in 2012. In addition to these accomplishments, Dennis served as an active member of the Enfield Fire Department from 1972 to 1981, and he was elected as a Fire Commissioner for the last 18 years.

Dennis was a beloved member of the Enfield community, and he will be missed greatly by all of those who benefited from his loyalty and service to helping those in need, especially Connecticut veterans. He is survived by his wife of 52 years, Diane, as well as his two daughters and their husbands, and four grandchildren.

I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing our deepest sorrow to Dennis's family for their loss, and to the eastern Connecticut region who lost a loyal community member.

HEALTH INSURANCE TAX

HON. ROBERT J. DOLD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I recently sat down with several small business owners in my district for a roundtable discussion in Lincolnshire, Illinois. The roundtable discussion focused attention on the Health Insurance Tax on small businesses. These local business owners are extremely concerned about the consequences of a \$500 per employee per year insurance expense they will have to incur.

One business owner at the roundtable, Rick, reiterated that politicians in Washington need to understand that each new tax or expense isn't just some exercise in congressional budget scorekeeping—these are a real-world burdens that harm businesses and make it difficult to keep the doors open and workers employed. This business owner wasn't talking about it as an abstract economic theory; rather, he was worried that his business cannot handle the influx of new expenses. Rick asked me to make sure that leaders in Washington are fighting for Main Streets across the nation. Rick is right. As a small business owner myself, I believe that we need to continue to remind Members of Congress that small businesses are the lifeblood of our economy and that we need to encourage a healthy environment that promotes innovation and entrepreneurship.

According to research by the National Federation of Independent Business Research Foundation, the Health Insurance Tax, also known as the HIT, will jeopardize between 152,000 and 286,000 private-sector jobs across the U.S. by 2023.

The harmful and misguided Health Insurance Tax will add a new strain to small businesses on Main Street. Illinois is home to more than 1.1 million small businesses, which employ more than 2.3 million workers. That is why I am a cosponsor of H.R. 928 and why I encourage my colleagues in the House on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

HONORING SPECIALIST 5TH CLASS
EULA JETT

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an outstanding citizen, Specialist 5th Class Eula Jett for her dedicated and honorable service. She is an exceptional American in both the military and civilian worlds.

Enlisting in the US Women's Army Corps in 1967, SP5 Jett served as a Medical Records Technician where she achieved her rank of Specialist 5th Class. During her 9 year tenure, she completed two tours in Bad Cannstatt, Germany before ending her career at Fort Hood. While there, SP5 Jett worked in the Coding Section and served on the Medical Records Committee at the Darnall Army Hospital. Recognizing her dedication, she received numerous Letters of Appreciation from the Darnall Army Hospital as well as a Letter of Commendation. SP5 Jett is a decorated U.S. Army Veteran whose awards include the National Defense Service Medal and the Good Conduct Medal among others.

SP5 Jett was honorably discharged from the Army in 1976 after 9 years, but that did not stop her from continuing to support the Army she loves. Upon leaving the service, she remained an active supporter of the Army and continued to work at Darnall Army Hospital as a civilian employee. A few years later SP5 Jett would return to support our Veterans as a civilian employee at the Olin E. Teague Veterans Center in Temple, TX.

Continuing in her selfless service, SP5 Jett showed her dedication and love to the Temple, Texas community after her retirement. She currently serves as Chair on the Salvation Army advisory board and the Advisory Council of Safe Kids Mid-Texas coalition. As a woman of faith, she involves herself in numerous capacities in the Church Women of the Temple Area, including serving as the President in 2011–2012.

SP5 Jett's devotion to our country is matched only by her commitment to serving others in her community. I commend her for her service to the nation, United States Army, and her community in Temple, Texas. I wish her all the best in the years to come.

CONFLUENT DEVELOPMENT

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Confluent Development for receiving the City of Wheat Ridge's Reinvestment Award. The Reinvestment Award recognizes businesses who play an active role in improving the City of Wheat Ridge.

Confluent Development brought its diverse expertise in office, industrial, retail and multi-family/senior housing development to the 38th and Kipling development, transforming a blighted area into a retail and housing destination for Wheat Ridge residents. The new de-

velopment is home to Sprouts Farmer's Market, a soon-to-be Morning Star Senior Living and a newly updated Starbucks.

I applaud Confluent Development for being the recipient of this well-deserved honor by the City of Wheat Ridge, and I congratulate them on their success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 25, 2015, I was unable to be present for a recorded vote. I would have voted "Yes" on roll call vote Number 387 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1615, as amended).

HONORING JOHN MILTON THOMAS

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and accomplishments of John Milton Thomas of Shelbyville, Indiana.

Born in Fairland on Oct. 1, 1926 to Milton and Carris Thomas, John lived a long and full life. Last month, at the age of 88, he passed away surrounded by his loved ones. John is survived by his loving wife of 68 years Mary "Jean" Kerr, his children, grandchildren, great-grandchildren, and one great-great grandchild. I had the pleasure of knowing John through both his work with my wife for the town of Morristown, Indiana, and my friendship with his son J. Mark Thomas. I am honored to speak of his accomplishments today.

Mr. Thomas was a member of the greatest generation. He was a U.S. Army veteran and served as a first sergeant during World War II. Just last month, John came here to Washington, D.C. on an honor flight to see the World War II Memorial and pay tribute to those he fought alongside, who didn't make it home.

John loved to serve his community. He was a former member of the Shelby County Council and at one time was the Shelby County Clerk. His other memberships included the Indiana National Guard and Sugar Creek Masonic Lodge No. 279 F & AM. John attended First United Methodist Church, where he also volunteered and held many leadership positions.

John was also a referee for both high school and college basketball, and he was inducted into the Indiana Basketball Hall of Fame for officiating a ballgame with a record-setting nine overtimes, a record which he still holds.

John was a true friend and a great man with a big heart. My thoughts and prayers go out to the Thomas family during this difficult time. It is my hope that their fond memories of John will comfort them during this difficult time.

HONORING PLANNED PARENTHOOD
HUDSON PECONIC**HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Planned Parenthood Hudson Peconic (PPHP). For years, PPHP has been an instrumental partner in keeping my constituents both healthy and educated about their reproductive health.

Operating 11 health centers in Westchester, Rockland, Putnam and Suffolk Counties, PPHP served over 33,000 men and women in 2014 alone. In addition, last year PPHP provided 13,113 HIV tests, 81,941 individual STI tests, 5,896 breast examinations and education and training programs to over 42,000 participants.

While these figures alone are laudable, it is important to note that PPHP affords these invaluable services to our area's most vulnerable patients. In 2014, 76 percent of PPHP patients had incomes at or below 150 percent of the Federal Poverty Limit. For low-income New Yorkers, care is already too hard to come by. I am so pleased to know that these New Yorkers can rely on PPHP.

In recent months, Planned Parenthood has faced prolonged, politically-motivated attacks. It is during times like this that it is most important for us to remember not only the work that Planned Parenthood does, but the people Planned Parenthood serves. PPHP is keeping thousands of New Yorkers healthy, many of whom might have nowhere else to turn. I am pleased to have this opportunity to thank PPHP and its allies for their work. As a Member of Congress, one of my primary responsibilities is to ensure the well-being of my constituents. I am honored to call PPHP a partner in that goal.

On October 21, 2015, PPHP will honor Jill Scheuer, Keith Pattiz and the St. Faith's House Foundation during its Empower Gala. I commend these partners for championing Planned Parenthood's mission. It is only with the aid of allies like Ms. Scheuer, Mr. Pattiz and the St. Faith's House Foundation that Planned Parenthood can continue to provide those most in need with quality, accessible care.

COLORADO ACTS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Colorado ACTS for receiving the City of Wheat Ridge's Cultural Commission Award. The Cultural Commission Award recognizes local businesses or organizations actively contributing to the enrichment of the culture of Wheat Ridge.

Colorado ACTS is a theater school open to children from four to eighteen. They strive to bring drama and arts education to the local community, and they currently serve about 200 families. The organization teaches confidence, discipline and an appreciation for the arts, while strengthening community ties.

Since its inception 15 years ago, Colorado ACTS has produced more than 100 shows.

I applaud Colorado ACTS for being the recipient of this well-deserved honor by the City of Wheat Ridge, and I congratulate them on their success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 13, 2015, I was unable to be present for a recorded vote. I would have voted "No" on roll call vote Number 221 (on agreeing to the resolution H. Res. 255).

HONORING DR. J. RANDALL
O'BRIEN**HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Dr. J. Randall O'Brien is one of the most respected educators in the Nation.

He took over the reins of Carson-Newman University at a real low point in the school's history.

In fact, just a few years ago, the University had such difficult financial problems that some people thought it could go under.

Under Dr. O'Brien's leadership, the University has undergone a major turnaround, increasing its enrollment, adding new programs, and becoming the most forward-looking small university in the Nation.

Dr. O'Brien recently wrote a lead column for the Knoxville News Sentinel concerning the proposed new college scorecard put forth by the White House and Department of Education.

Because this issue has ramifications for colleges and universities all across the Nation, I would like to call it to the attention of my colleagues and other readers.

J. RANDALL O'BRIEN: SCORECARD FOR
COLLEGES UNFAIR AND DAMAGING

There are so many fatal flaws in President Barack Obama's recently unveiled New College Scorecard it is difficult to know where to begin our nation's imperative critique. For starters, how shocking it is to see that our educational leaders housed within the U.S. Department of Education could prove so inept in collecting, interpreting and providing our president reliable data.

College educators fully agree with current public opinion that evaluation and reform of higher education is overdue. To be sure, college accessibility, affordability and accountability are critical issues that rightfully belong on our nation's agenda. Assessment, however, formulated on the basis of incomplete questioning and misleading data may prove far more damaging than having no published assessment at all.

The New College Scorecard notes the annual cost of attending each college, the graduation rate of the school and the average starting salary of its graduates. However, the scorecard includes only data of federal student-loan borrowers. All other students are excluded from the report.

Moreover, the starting salary numbers fail to take into consideration the geographical region hosting the institution. A New York or California salary, for example, would be expected to be significantly higher than an Appalachian one. Should not per capita wealth and cost of living in the institution's region be noted?

In addition, no consideration is given to the correlation of salary and field of study. Teachers, social workers and ministers, for instance, do not expect to earn salaries commensurate to business graduates in metropolitan areas.

Do we wish to undermine and imperil the vitally important work of our nation's service sector, and its college providers, by placing value on salary alone? Do we really wish to discourage the graduation of relatively low-income teachers? Moreover, should not a premium be placed on a broad-based liberal arts education, and the intellectual (and holistic) transformation of the student, which prepares the student remarkably well for any job, including corporate, legal, political, church, community, scientific and educational leadership? Dare we risk reducing the college experience to little more than participation in an elite job training program?

Lastly, despite the White House's insistence on access to higher education for all, the new scorecard fails to acknowledge accessibility of lower socio-economic students to each college. Research clearly shows the correlation in retention and graduation rates to a student's socioeconomic status, family finances and support, and proper academic preparation and encouragement. Should we not value accessibility and accurately factor in its consequences?

I fear the Department of Education, with encouragement from the White House, will seek to employ the New College Scorecard in determining the amount of financial aid for which a student would be eligible at each college. Students attending one school may qualify for 100 percent of available federal grants, while students attending another school may qualify for only 75 percent. This, I fear, would have the unintended consequence of closing hundreds of colleges, which are vital to regional economic well-being and to the attainment of our nation's educational needs and goals.

I regret to say I find the New College Scorecard, however well-intended, seriously flawed, patently unfair and exceedingly disappointing. Can we please do better?

J. Randall O'Brien is president of Carson-Newman University.

HONORING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY
OF THE WILL COUNTY
COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTER**HON. BILL FOSTER**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 20th Anniversary of the Will County Community Health Center in Joliet, Illinois.

Since 1995, the Will County Community Health Center has been serving uninsured and underinsured patients as well as providing a crucial safety net for families and individuals struggling to afford adequate health care. As the oldest Federally Qualified Health Center in Will County, the Community Health Center has maintained its commitment to patient-centered care for the medically underserved in our community.

I would like to congratulate the Will County Community Health Center, the Community Health Center Governing Council, and the Will County Health Department on this important milestone.

QUALITY AUTO CARE AND TIRE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Quality Auto Care and Tire for receiving the City of Wheat Ridge's Business of the Year Award.

The Business of the Year Award recognizes local businesses who demonstrate a commitment to their community, strong management practices and are a positive reflection of Wheat Ridge values.

Quality Auto Care and Tire takes pride in providing reliable auto maintenance and putting the customer's interest before their own. Through high-quality service and transparency, Quality Auto Care has earned the trust of many Wheat Ridge residents. Beyond auto work, the business has shown its dedication to the Wheat Ridge Community by becoming a Premier Sponsor to the city's Carnival Festival.

I applaud Quality Auto Care and Tire for being the recipient of this well-deserved honor by the City of Wheat Ridge, and I congratulate them on their success.

RECOGNIZING SFC DEBRA L. NEWTON, UPON HER RETIREMENT

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize an outstanding member of the Connecticut National Guard, Sergeant First Class Debra Newton. Debbie's service has transcended her title and encompassed a range of National Guard responsibilities and volunteer positions throughout her more than 35 years of National Guard service. Although she has served in multiple capacities as a Public Affairs Officer, ultimately as the Chief Public Affairs NCO, Debbie has always strived to go beyond her responsibilities and further serve the Guard community in Connecticut and beyond.

Debbie is an accomplished member of the Guard, whose work has been recognized by the Department of the Army and the National Guard Bureau. Debbie has acted as editor of the national award winning newspaper Connecticut Guardian since she created it in 2000. She has served as the Federal Women's Program manager and on the Joint Force Headquarters of Connecticut Common Task Testing Committee, and the 169th Leadership Regiment as the regimental Public Affairs Officer.

Debbie has been a member of the National Guard Association of Connecticut since 1980 and has served on the executive board for 13 of the past 15 years as President and Secretary. She is also an active and lifetime member of the Enlisted Association of the National

Guard of the United States (EANGUS). In both capacities, she provided a regular and effective presence in Washington to educate members of the Connecticut Congressional Delegation on the priorities of her members in Connecticut and around the country.

Debbie provided critical support to advance the priorities of Connecticut's National Guard in Washington and back home in Connecticut. Over the years, she was knee-deep with us in the critical fights that would determine the future of the Guard in Connecticut, including working to oppose the BRAC 2005 recommendation that removed A-10s from Connecticut, years of work towards securing a permanent flying mission for the 103rd Flying Yankees, advocating for the recognition of members of the National Guard as veterans, and promoting fairness for dual status military technicians.

Debbie's experience, commitment, and energy are unmatched. The Connecticut National Guard, and all those who serve in the uniform of our state and nation, is stronger thanks to her efforts. I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Debbie for her decades of service and wish her well in her retirement.

CONGRATULATING THE EFFORTS OF DIAGEO

HON. JAMES A. HIMES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, today, I am proud to congratulate the efforts of Diageo to make nutritional and alcohol-content information on alcoholic beverages more accessible to consumers.

Diageo is voluntarily taking steps to list this information in a way that is easily understood by most people. For many of us, it is not very useful to know how many calories a drink has per 50 milliliters, or what the alcohol content of one-third of a beer is. That's why Diageo will list this information by typical serving size, so consumers will know how much alcohol and how many calories are in a single can of beer or one mixed drink, for example.

While the labeling will begin in Europe right away, it is the company's plan to roll it out to all approved markets as soon as possible.

I am supportive of these efforts because I believe that consumers want more access to information about the food and beverages they consume, and want that information presented in a way that is relevant to the consumption decisions they make. I also think that any increase in transparency and labelling in the alcohol industry can help curtail alcohol over-consumption and drunk driving.

Diageo has been a longtime and upstanding member of the business community in the 4th Congressional District of Connecticut, and I am once again pleased to see them setting trends in their industry, especially when those trends could lead to a healthier and safer world.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 22, 2015, I was unable to be present for recorded votes. Had I been present, I would have voted: "NO" on roll call vote Number 42 (on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 42), "NO" on roll call vote Number 43 (on agreeing to the resolution H. Res. 42), and "YES" on roll call vote Number 44 (on the motion to recommit H.R. 7, with instructions).

ANTHONY M'S VISIONS IN GOLD

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Anthony M's Visions in Gold for receiving the City of Wheat Ridge's Business of the Year Award.

The Business of the Year Award recognizes local businesses who demonstrate a commitment to their community, strong management practices and are a positive reflection of Wheat Ridge values.

After tremendous growth last year, Anthony M's Visions in Gold expanded their store and are adding a CAD-CAM system to personalize the jewelry-buying experience for their customers. Additionally, the business continuously gives back to the Wheat Ridge community, regularly participating in the Feed the Future back pack program and working with Wheat Ridge High School to display jewelry students' work.

I applaud Anthony M's Visions in Gold for being the recipient of this well-deserved honor by the City of Wheat Ridge, and I congratulate them on their success.

HONORING CHRIS MAPLES FOR EARNING THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA'S WOOD BADGE

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a special individual, and a member of my staff, Chris Maples, for earning the Boy Scouts Leader Wood Badge on October 15, 2015. Chris has worked extremely hard on his Wood Badge recognition, and is finally being rewarded for his efforts and the impact those efforts have had on the Scouts under his leadership. Chris has spent eight years with Troop 527 of Richmond County, North Carolina, and has spent the last four years as the group's Scout Master.

The Wood Badge, which is the highest level of adult Scout training available through the Boy Scouts of America, is an advanced-learning and team-building training series that gives Scout Leaders the opportunity to better understand the purpose and goals of the Scouting

program, as well as strengthen their long-term commitment to Scouting and provide them with valuable leadership skills. In order to earn the Wood Badge, the Scout Leader must go through the Wood Badge course, in which the Scout Leader must complete two separate phases: the practical phase and the application phase. During the practical phase, the Scout Leader will spend two weekends at camp with a group of fellow Scout Leaders, learning how to better lead their troop with a hands-on camp experience. Also during the practical phase, the Scout Leader will develop what is called a "Ticket," which is a set of five tasks or goals developed to strengthen and improve their troop. After completing the practical phase and developing their ticket, the Scout Leader will move in to the application phase, in which the Scout Leader will complete their five tasks within eighteen months of finishing the practical phase.

Chris began his Wood Badge journey in October of 2014, and finished his requirements in June of this year. For his ticket, Chris worked with his troop to allow some of the young men to become patrol leaders, which allowed them to take up leadership positions within the troop and provide these members the opportunity to gain valuable leadership experience. In addition, Chris recruited more members to Troop 527 and created a "Scouter of the Year" award, as well as a special summer camp just for his troop. Chris has worked tirelessly to improve the scouting experience for the members of Troop 527, and his efforts have certainly made a difference.

During Chris' Wood Badge ceremony, he received the Wood Badge beads and regalia, as well as a certificate detailing his accomplishments. This is a very special ceremony that I am sure Chris will remember for the rest of his scouting days, and he should be extremely proud of the hard work it took to accomplish this feat. As a former Boy Scout, I am thankful Chris took the time to better himself so that he could better serve the members of Troop 527. I am confident they will be better off as a result of Chris' hard work.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in thanking Chris Maples for his service to the young men of Troop 527, and to congratulate him for earning the distinguished Boy Scouts of America's Wood Badge Leader recognition.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF JOHN NAVARRETTE

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. John Navarrette as he celebrates 31 years of service to the County of Fresno. Mr. Navarrette will be retiring as the Chief Administrative Officer of Fresno County, a position that he has served in for the last six and a half years of his career. John's extraordinary career and service to the County of Fresno deserves to be honored.

John was born and raised in Mendota, California. He attended Mendota Unified schools including Tranquility High School, and graduated from California State University, Fresno in his early twenties. Throughout his career, John has achieved a multitude of goals while

working in government. He started his career with the County of Fresno in 1985 as an entry level staff analyst. John subsequently went to work in Sacramento for the California State Legislature in 1997, retaining a position in the Speaker's Office. One of his early achievements was obtaining funds for City and County parks, as well as the now infamous book-mobile.

In 1999, Mr. Navarrette got a job in the Lieutenant Governor's office. During his time there, he managed special projects and economic development trade missions to Mexico and Italy. In 2003, returned to his roots in California's Central Valley and went back to work for the County of Fresno, becoming the Director of General Services in 2004.

As previously mentioned, the last six and a half years, John has served as the County Administrative Officer, and led 5,000 Fresno County employees towards solving many of the community's issues. He was able to form a senior team that showed drive and dedication, and his extensive experience in government has allowed him to implement policies in an effective manner.

John's tenacity and willingness to work hard got him where he is today. His leadership skills allowed him to lead Fresno County during one of the most difficult times his community has ever experienced. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Mr. John Navarrette for the contributions he has made to the State of California and County of Fresno. His dedication to our community is inspiring and deserving of recognition.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO REMOVE J. EDGAR HOOVER'S NAME FROM THE FBI BUILDING IN WASHINGTON, DC

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a bill I introduced today to remove J. Edgar Hoover's name from the Federal Bureau of Investigation building in Washington, DC.

J. Edgar Hoover did terrible things when he served as FBI Director.

His infamous "COINTELPRO" program harassed civil rights workers, political activists and homosexuals.

He was downright abusive.

His efforts to silence Martin Luther King, Jr. and out homosexuals working for the federal government were deplorable.

It has been reported that, at one point, he even had a letter sent to Dr. King threatening to expose information about his private life. The letter appeared to suggest that Dr. King should kill himself to save himself from the embarrassment.

The letter said, "King, there is only one thing left for you to do. You know what it is. You have just 34 days in which to do (this exact number has been selected or a specific reason, it has practical significant [sic]. You are done. There is but one way out for you. You better take it before your filthy, abnormal fraudulent self is bared to the nation."

His treatment of homosexuals was no better. He called them "sex deviates."

He ordered the FBI to undertake extraordinary efforts to identify everyone who was even suspected of being homosexual in the federal government.

There is a very good documentary about this by Michael Isikoff on Yahoo News entitled "Uniquely Nasty: J. Edgar Hoover's war on gays". I encourage my colleagues to see it.

In 1951, Hoover issued a memo to top FBI officials saying that "Each supervisor will be held personally responsible to underline in green pencil the names of individuals . . . who are alleged to be sex deviates."

The FBI eventually collected more than 360,000 files on gays and lesbians.

It has been reported that in 1952, Hoover outed a young campaign aide who was in line to be hired by President-elect Eisenhower. The young man, Arthur Vandenberg, Jr., was the son of Republican U.S. Senator Arthur Vandenberg. But that didn't matter.

The young Vandenberg was promptly rejected.

And Hoover didn't even stop there. Years later, the FBI went on to out the young man to Confidential magazine, which then outed him publicly—reporting, "Once upon a time there was a famous senator's son who had a limp wrist."

J. Edgar Hoover was a terrible man. Even the FBI's own web site declares that his infamous COINTELPRO program was, "rightly criticized by Congress and the American people for abridging first amendment rights and for other reasons."

Yet, his name continues to adorn the FBI building in Washington, DC—one of the most prominent buildings in our nation's capital.

This is just wrong.

I urge my colleagues to pass this bill, and remove his name from the FBI building.

HONORING THE LIFE OF PHIL RATLIFF

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Phil Ratliff who passed away unexpectedly on August 9, 2015, after suffering a cardiac event. We send our prayers and sincerest condolences to his wife, Jenni, and their two children, Haley and Dylan.

Coach Ratliff dedicated his life to inspiring young student athletes through the game of football. After an impressive collegiate career, twice being named to the nation's All-American team, Coach Ratliff passed along his understanding of the game of football and inspirational outlook on life as an assistant coach at his alma mater, Marshall University, and then at James Madison University.

Coach Ratliff later joined the new football program at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, my alma mater, as the program's Offensive Line Coach and Recruiting Coordinator. Under his leadership, the Charlotte 49ers' offense averaged more than 484 yards per game last season. A beloved father, husband, friend, and coach, he will be deeply missed by all who had the pleasure of knowing him.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in commemorating the life of Coach Phil Ratliff for his service to the student athletes of Marshall University, James Madison University, and the University of North Carolina at Charlotte; in addition to the countless lives he impacted in his community.

RECOGNIZING DONALD ELLIS
WILLIAMSON, M.D.

HON. ROBERT B. ADERHOLT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the long and devoted public service of Donald Ellis Williamson, M.D. After serving more than two decades as Alabama's State Health Officer and three years as the state Medicaid Commissioner, Dr. Williamson is stepping down from these positions next month.

Dr. Williamson attended the University of Mississippi School of Medicine, graduating Cum Laude in 1979. He pursued his internship and residency at the University of Virginia, and was certified by the American Board of Internal Medicine in 1982.

With his education complete, Dr. Williamson then began his long career in public health. After serving four years as the State Tuberculosis Control Officer in Mississippi (1982–1986), he held a series of positions in the Alabama Department of Public Health. He began as the Director of the Division of Disease Control (1986–1989) before serving as the Director of the Bureau of Preventive Health Services (1989–1992). On November 18, 1992, he started his service as the head of the Department.

During his tenure, Dr. Williamson became known for addressing key public health issues, such as disaster preparedness and advancing the health of children, in the name of improving health for all Alabamians. For example, in recent years, he led the state health efforts related to Hurricane Katrina in 2005, and also those related to the April 2011 tornadoes. He was responsible for the design & implementation of the state's Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP), known as ALLKIDS. This was one of the first Children's Health Insurance Programs in the nation and lowered the rate of uninsured children in Alabama from 20 percent to under 7 percent. He was also intent on doing a better job of reducing infant mortality and increasing children's immunization rates.

I wish Dr. Williamson all the very best as he steps down from the Department of Public Health and moves into his new role as president of the Alabama Hospital Association. I know that he will bring fresh insight to the Association and carry the organization to new heights. I look forward to working with him in this new position.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF
MASON GREGORY

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Mason Gregory of Mooreville, Mississippi who joined his Heavenly Father on Monday, October 12, 2015.

Only 12 years old, Mason was a 7th grade student at Mooreville Middle School. He excelled at sports and was a member of the Mooreville Junior High Football team as well as Salttillo Park and Recreation baseball.

Outside of school, Mason was an active member of New Hope Baptist Church where he loved being a part of the youth group.

Mason spent most of his time outdoors, and his favorite activity was hunting with his dad.

Full of happiness and love, Mason was adored by his family, friends, and teammates.

Survivors include his parents, Bert and Angel Gregory of Tupelo; sister, Anna Gregory; grandparents, Mike Seawright (Norma) of Flora and Betty Stembidge (Mike) of Mooreville; his special cousin, Ally Grace Bounds who was like a sister to him.

He was preceded in death by his grandparents, Anderson and Nudeane Gregory.

My thoughts and prayers are with Mason's family and friends during this difficult time.

HONORING DONNA CARPENTER
FOR RECEIVING THE SOUTHEAST
TOURISM SOCIETY'S BEACON
AWARD

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Donna Carpenter, who serves as President and CEO of the Cabarrus County Convention and Visitors Bureau, for receiving the Southeast Tourism Society's Beacon Award. The Beacon Award recognizes an individual who best exemplifies outstanding leadership in the pursuit of excellence and who has advanced the tourism industry.

Ms. Carpenter joined the Cabarrus County Convention and Visitors Bureau as President and CEO in 2009, but has been actively involved in the Charlotte area for nearly fifteen years. Ms. Carpenter has been instrumental in the improvement of the Cabarrus County and Charlotte-area tourism industry, working with leaders in the area to improve infrastructure development and create long-lasting relationships between local municipalities. One of Ms. Carpenter's greatest achievements during her time at the Cabarrus County Convention and Visitors Bureau has been her leadership in ensuring the implementation of the "Destination 2020 Plan," a proposal to develop Cabarrus County as a premier travel destination and outline key components for reaching this goal.

Furthermore, Ms. Carpenter has worked tirelessly to grow the image of Cabarrus County's tourism industry and connect with visitors and residents alike. Under her leadership, the Cabarrus County Convention and Visitors Bu-

reau office, as well as the Visitor's Center, were relocated to better serve the area and act as a central hub for visitor activity. As a result of her efforts to improve the tourism industry in our area, the Cabarrus County Convention and Visitors Bureau was accredited by the Destination Marketing Accreditation Program by Destination Marketing Association International in 2013.

In addition to her work within the Cabarrus County and Charlotte-area tourism industry, Ms. Carpenter is actively involved in our community. She is a member of several area organizations and serves on multiple boards, including the Cabarrus County Chamber of Commerce. As a proud alumnus of the university I am extremely grateful for her involvement on the University of North Carolina at Charlotte's Advisory Board. Clearly, Ms. Carpenter is an asset to our area, and I look forward to seeing all that she will accomplish in the future.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in congratulating Donna Carpenter for receiving the Southeast Tourism Society's Beacon Award, as well as her dedication to making Charlotte and Cabarrus County a world-class tourism destination.

COMMENDING THE WORK OF DR.
EARL BROOKS, II

HON. MARLIN A. STUTZMAN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the fifteen-year tenure of Dr. Earl Brooks, as President of Trine University in Angola, Indiana.

Having once been a student at Trine University, it is an honor to recognize Dr. Brooks for his many years of service to the academic community in Northeast Indiana.

During his fifteen years at Trine, Dr. Brooks has significantly increased enrollment while maintaining a remarkable, above-average career-placement percentage for his students. He transitioned the university from undergraduate to graduate and doctoral degree status and even moved university athletics to the NCAA.

Mr. Speaker, I submit an article from the publication, *Business People*, highlighting Dr. Brooks' fifteen-year tenure and his many notable accomplishments.

In closing, I would like to thank Dr. Brooks for his distinguished service and wish him well as he continues to lead Trine University.

[From *Business People*, August 1, 2015]

GIVING CREDIT WHERE IT'S DUE

(By Jon Detweiler)

While The American College President Study reports a downtrend nationally in average leadership tenure—from eight and a half years in 2006 to an average of seven years in 2011—Trine University President Dr. Earl D. Brooks II completes 15 years at the helm, with ongoing plans firmly in place for years to come. When Brooks stepped into leadership 15 years ago, he was the youngest college president in the state. Now, he ranks second on the list of longest tenures at Indiana colleges and universities.

Why is Trine celebrating Dr. Brooks' tenure? What has defined his success over the past 15 years? His list of accomplishments is

too long to enumerate here, but some highlights include:

Total enrollment up from 1,350 to 3,800; 78% of that increase experienced over the past five years, with an additional 15% projected for Fall 2015

Transition from undergraduate to graduate and doctorate degree status

Upgrade of athletic programs from NAIA to NCAA

Successful completion of the largest capital campaign in Trine's history (\$90 million) and raised 55% of current \$75 million Invest in Excellence campaign

Update and revitalization of the physical campus through a \$100 million investment in new projects, including eight new apartment-style student housing units

Renovation of the Health Sciences Education Center

Expansion of welcome/admissions center
New university center and library

New athletic and recreation center, complete with a new stadium

Renovation of the administration building and the T. Furth Center for Performing Arts
Renovation of Ford Hall, home of the Ketter School of Business

Construction of the Jim and Joan Bock Center for Innovation & Biomedical Engineering

New College of Engineering and Business
Full-time faculty bolstered by 60%, from 53 to 89

A career-placement average of 99.7% for Trine graduates, compared to the national average of 75.6% as reported by the National Association of Colleges and Employers in 2013-2014

To celebrate what has been accomplished under Dr. Brooks' leadership, however, must lead naturally to a discussion of why he has been so successful. "I started in the classroom teaching, which I still love," says Brooks. "You never grow tired of that exposure to young people." After teaching biology and physiology, Brooks worked his way up from classroom professor to department chair, then to school dean. At universities in Tennessee and Delaware, he served as both vice president for academic affairs and executive vice president/chief operating officer, eventually becoming immersed in the various operations of a college campus.

But three years into his role as chief academic officer at Lincoln Memorial University in Harrogate, Tennessee, Brooks awakened to the crucial function of fundraising and development. Consequently, his academic history and his fundraising experience together produced a love for administration that prompted his desire to pursue the presidency. "I'd learned through that process the two most critical areas for the success of an institution," says Brooks: "The enrollment aspect and the fundraising aspect." He attributes part of Trine's success as a team to understanding and focusing on those two priorities. "Financially, enrollment and fundraising drive the institution."

The fact that higher education has seen drastic changes during Dr. Brooks' tenure emphasizes its focus. "Higher education has become more and more of a business," he says. "We've learned to operate like a business." Schools are becoming consumer-driven now, which makes the student a customer. "Kids arriving today need an education with a career in mind."

Trine's astonishing 99.7 percent career-placement average for graduates is hardwired directly to the school's career focus. "We're fortunate to be a school that is more professional-oriented in our degree offerings, which gives us a clear advantage," says Brooks. Possibly the greater advantage for students, however, is the school's connection to local business and industry. By ar-

ranging practicums and internships with local companies, the faculty sets up its students to gain valuable experience outside the classroom and to build relationships with potential employers. "The key to success today—particularly on the education side, but also the job-placement side—is that linkage to business and industry," says Brooks. In fact, all new programming at Trine is seen through the lens of its potential for career outcomes.

If Dr. Brooks had a word of advice for his peers, he might add two elements to the list of reasons why he has succeeded as a leader. "Don't be afraid to take a risk. Be bold," he says. "Be bold in your vision, stick to your beliefs, listen to the market but don't be afraid to take a calculated risk." Second, drop the long-range planning. "I'm not sure that long-range planning fits higher education," he says. "Ten-year plans don't fit, so we've adopted a philosophy we call a rolling three-year plan."

Here again, a look at why Dr. Brooks has succeeded must be cut short, primarily because the president would rather talk about who has made him successful. "People make the institution. You try to hire great people with talents greater than yours and not be threatened by that," he says with warmth and a wry smile. Indeed, the plaque on his desk reads, "There is no limit to what a man can do or where he can go if he doesn't mind who gets the credit."

Whether luck or talent, Brooks has the knack for attracting good people to an organization at all levels—faculty, staff, board of trustees, donors and, of course, students. "You need good people to lead an amazing transformation," he says.

And while Brooks is no longer in the classroom, he still finds multiple ways to engage the students. He maintains an open-door policy with them, an ideal that one might question until Brooks hands you his business card, which includes his home phone number. "That connection with students is something that just never goes away," he says.

This year, Trine University is celebrating the 15-year tenure of its president, Dr. Earl D. Brooks II, and for good reason. He has done much and he has gone far, and for that, he deserves a fair share of the credit.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FRANK DAVIS

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Frank Davis of Concord, North Carolina, who passed away on August 24, 2015. We send our prayers and sincerest condolences to his wife, Joan, and the entire Davis family.

Born on November 7, 1944, Mr. Davis dedicated his life to serving our nation's students. After receiving his degree from Berry College, Mr. Davis taught high school English in a nationwide linguistic research and development project in Rome, GA. After completing this project, Mr. Davis transitioned to the field of higher education, where he served three decades as an admissions and chief development officer at several universities, including his alma mater. In 1998, Mr. Davis joined The Cannon Foundation, later becoming the Foundation's Executive Director in 2000.

I had the honor of becoming friends with Mr. Davis during his time at the Cannon Foundation, and I was immediately struck by his hum-

ble attitude and sincere dedication to service to others and to improving educational opportunities for all students. Not only that, he inspired each of us to be better people and to give back to our communities through kindness, charity and service.

I recently had the honor to present Mr. Davis posthumously with the Order of the Long Leaf Pine, the highest award the Governor of North Carolina can bestow. The Order was created in 1963, and has been presented to honor persons who have a proven record of service to the State of North Carolina. While Mr. Davis made his mark in other states, like Georgia and Alabama, it seems like he always had North Carolina on his mind.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in commemorating the life of Frank Davis for his commitment to his community and the numerous lives he impacted throughout his life.

HONORING RICHARD K. DONAHUE

HON. NIKI TSONGAS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, the City of Lowell, Massachusetts is well-known for its historic contributions to this nation, from its roots in the founding of modern industry, to world-renowned authors and artists, to public officials who helped shape the national conversation. Lowell recently lost one of those titanic figures with the passing of Richard K. Donahue.

Richard Donahue will be remembered across Massachusetts and the country for his expertise and leadership in the legal world, as well as his acumen and achievements in politics, policy and business.

A valued citizen of Lowell, his professional career existed on the national stage, through his storied involvement in the successful campaign of President John F. Kennedy, his tenure as a confidant and advisor at the Kennedy White House, as a highly-regarded and nationally respected lawyer, and as President of NIKE, a major worldwide company. He was an exemplary role model for young Lowellians coming of age in the 60s and 70s, setting a standard of excellence and accomplishment that he made seem quite easy.

As much as Dick was a national figure, he never lost touch with his home city. He remained deeply committed to Lowell throughout his entire life. Dick represented the fighting spirit and dedication to community that is Lowell's trademark. He always had the community's best interests at heart.

His wife, Nancy, the founder of Merrimack Repertory Theater has been its guiding light from its inception. Dick and Nancy's tremendous philanthropic support to the theater and across the region reflected their unflagging generosity and willingness to share the fruits of a very successful life and devote it to the best interests of the City of Lowell.

Dick also understood that the City and its University rise and fall together, and devoted himself to being a leader at the University of Massachusetts Lowell, helping to position that institution for future success.

Even in recent years, when Dick's health was not good, you'd still see him attend events he thought were important. It reflected

his ongoing affection and love for his city and the many good things that happen here.

Dick Donahue was a remarkable Lowellian. I know I'm not alone when I say thank you to him for his endless dedication to his country and his city; and to his wife and family for sharing him with us. He will be greatly missed, but his legacy will be felt across this region for generations to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 16, 2015, I was unable to be present for a recorded vote. I would have voted "YES" on roll call vote Number 443 (on agreeing to the Garamendi Amendment to H.R. 2898).

REMEMBERING PEGGY DeLOACH NOBLES

HON. EARL L. "BUDDY" CARTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of Peggy DeLoach Nobles who entered into eternal rest Wednesday, September 30, 2015.

Born on September 24, 1936, Mrs. Nobles was the daughter of Henry William DeLoach and Navada Todd DeLoach. Mrs. Nobles was raised on a farm in Tattall County and graduated from Glennville High School in 1954. She was also a graduate of Draughton's Business College in Savannah, Georgia.

Mrs. Nobles was active in business, and for decades worked as the administrator of the Long County Sherriff's Office alongside her husband, Cecil Nobles, who was the sheriff of Long County from 1969 until 2012. Mrs. Nobles continued her work with the Sherriff's Office as her son, Craig, was elected sheriff in 2012. Mrs. Nobles was a very active member of her community and the Long County Chamber of Commerce. She was also a longtime member of the Jones Creek Baptist Church in Ludowici, Georgia.

Perhaps most important to Mrs. Nobles was her love for her family and extended family with whom she always enjoyed spending time. She is survived by her three sons and daughters-in-law: James Cecil Jr. and Stephanie, Kenneth Elliot and Bonnie, and Craig William and Elizabeth; 5 grandchildren and 4 great-grandchildren; sisters, Gaynell DeLoach Paulk of Alexandria, Louisiana, and Ava Jean DeLoach Rooker of Glennville; brothers, Charles P. DeLoach of Glennville and Larry L. DeLoach of Lakeland, Florida; brother-in-law, Raymond Gus Nobles of Ludowici; and several nieces and nephews.

HONORING RICHARD P. HOWE

HON. NIKI TSONGAS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, the City of Lowell, Massachusetts has a long and storied tradition of public service, forged by countless dedicated men and women who utilized innovative and open-minded ideas to better the lives of others and further progress in their community. Lowell recently lost one of those titanic figures with the passing of Richard P. Howe.

For all of us who were privileged to know Dick Howe, Sr., this is a moment to celebrate the life and the legacy of a devoted Lowellian.

My family first came to know Dick and his family when my husband Paul Tsongas served alongside him as a member of the Lowell City Council. They also shared a law office until Paul was elected to Congress. Dick was an important mentor and role model to Paul, exemplifying unwavering integrity, courageous leadership, and an abiding belief in the City.

Dick held office during Lowell's extraordinary transformation and was one of the creative community leaders who helped turn a shared vision to revitalize Lowell into reality.

Two years ago, we celebrated the dedication of The Richard P. Howe Bridge, which is a fitting tribute to a man who helped bridge many divides to bring people together in the name of the city he loved. He will be greatly missed.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF EDUCATIONAL TALENT SEARCH IN DURHAM, NEW HAMPSHIRE

HON. FRANK C. GUINTA

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of Educational Talent Search (ETS) in Durham, New Hampshire. I am pleased to join with the University of New Hampshire in recognizing this great milestone for ETS and its supporters.

This is a great achievement for both ETS and the University that supports it, and speaks highly to the outstanding services and guidance the program has offered to first-generation college students of the communities they serve. For the past 50 years, Educational Talent Search has been a leader in helping students with academic advising, postsecondary placement, academic preparation and career exploration.

Through the leadership of ETS, thirty-one middle schools and high schools throughout New Hampshire are being provided academic advising, career planning, and financial aid and financial literacy information, to better increase educational opportunities for those youth it supports. ETS has an impressive record of having 100% of the students it works with graduate from high school, and helping 86% of those students go on to attend college.

I am proud to join with my fellow Granite Staters in recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Educational Talent Search, and wish them all the best in their future years.

THE RUSSIAN GOVERNMENT VIOLATES ITS SECURITY, ECONOMIC, HUMAN RIGHTS COMMITMENTS AGREEMENTS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I chaired a hearing of the Helsinki Commission that examined the Russian government's repeated violations of its international security, economic, and human rights commitments.

In accord with the three dimensions of security promoted by the OSCE and the Helsinki Final Act of 1975, the Commission looked at Russia's respect for the rule of law through the lens of three "case studies" current to U.S.-Russian relations—arms control agreements; the Yukos litigation; and instances of abduction, unjust imprisonment, and abuse of prisoners.

Forty years after the signing of the Helsinki Final Act, we face a set of challenges with Russia, a founding member of the organization, that mirror the concerns that gave rise to the Helsinki Final Act.

At stake is the hard-won trust between members—now eroded to the point that armed conflict rages in the OSCE region. The question is open whether the principles continue to bind the Russian government with other states in a common understanding of what the rule of law entails.

In respect of military security, under the 1994 Budapest Memorandum Russia reaffirmed its commitment to respect Ukraine's independence, sovereignty, and existing borders. Russia also committed to refrain from the threat or use of force or economic coercion against Ukraine. There was a quid pro quo here: Russia did this in return for transferring Soviet-made nuclear weapons on Ukrainian soil to Russia.

Russia's annexation of Crimea and subsequent intervention in the Donbas region not only clearly violate this commitment, but also every guiding principle of the 1975 Helsinki Final Act. It appears these are not isolated instances. In recent years, Russia appears to have violated, undermined, disregarded, or even disavowed fundamental and binding arms control commitments such as the Vienna Document and binding international agreements, including the Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE), Intermediate Nuclear Forces (INF), and Open Skies treaties.

In respect of commercial issues, the ongoing claims regarding the Russian government's expropriation of the Yukos Oil Company are major tests facing the Russian government. In July 2014, GML Limited and other shareholders were part of a \$52 billion arbitration claim awarded by the Hague Permanent Court of Arbitration and the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR).

In response, the Russian government is threatening to withdraw from the ECHR and seize U.S. assets should American courts freeze Russian holdings on behalf of European claimants, while filing technical challenges that will occupy the courts for years to come. All of this fundamentally calls into question Russia's OSCE commitment to develop

free, competitive markets that respect international dispute arbitration mechanisms such as that of the Hague.

I note that U.S. Yukos shareholders are not covered by the Hague ruling for their estimated \$6 billion in losses. This is due to the fact that the United States has not ratified the Energy Charter Treaty, under which European claimants won their case, as well as the continued absence of a bilateral investment treaty with Russia. This has handicapped U.S. investors in Russia's energy sector, leaving them solely dependent of a State Department espousal process with the Russian government.

We were all relieved to learn that Mr. Kara-Murza is recovering from the attempt on his life—by poisoning—in Russia earlier this year. His tireless work on behalf of democracy in Russia, and his personal integrity and his love of his native country is an inspiration—it is true patriotism, a virtue sadly lacking among nationalistic demagogues.

Sadly, the attempt on Mr. Kara-Murza's life is not an isolated instance. Others have been murdered—most recently Boris Nemtsov—and both his and Mr. Kara-Murza's cases remain unsolved.

In other cases, such as the abductions, unjust imprisonments, and abuses of Nadiya Savchenko, Oleg Sentsov, and Eston Kohver, we are dealing the plain and public actions of the Russian government. Nadiya Savchenko, a Ukrainian pilot and elected parliamentarian, was abducted by Russian government agents, imprisoned, subjected to a humiliating show trial, and now faces 25 years in prison for allegedly murdering Russian reporters—who in fact were killed after she was in Russian custody.

Meanwhile, a Russian court has sentenced Ukrainian film director Oleg Sentsov on charges of terrorism. Tortured during detention, Sentsov's only transgressions appear to be his refusal to recognize Russia's annexation of the peninsula and his effort to help deliver food to Ukrainian soldiers trapped on their Crimean bases by invading Russian soldiers. And the kidnaping and subsequent espionage trial against Estonian law enforcement officer Eston Kohver demonstrates the Russia's readiness to abuse its laws and judicial system to limit individual freedoms both within and beyond its borders.

The Magnitsky Act that I had the honor to co-sponsor was in part meant to address human rights abuses such as these. It sanctions those involved in the abuse, and works to discourage further human rights violations while protecting those brave enough to call attention to their occurrence. It troubles me greatly to hear that the Administration's listings of sanctioned individuals has thus far only targeted 'minor players,' rather than those who pull the strings.

HONORING KEVIN DORAN

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Kevin Doran, who passed away earlier this week.

Mr. Doran was a long-time radio personality from Hornell, New York. He began his broad-

casting career by working odd jobs at WLEA, a local radio station, while in high school. After graduating from college, Mr. Doran worked as a reporter for the Hornell Evening Tribune while teaching history at Hornell High School. In 1972, he purchased WLEA and became general manager of the station. His family continues to operate the station to this day.

Mr. Doran was well-known through the Hornell area for his iconic voice, personality, and sense of humor. He was best known for hosting the popular Newsmaker Show, which won several awards for excellence from the New York State Broadcasters Association. He reported on a variety of topics, ranging from national politics to social issues and local events. Many residents remember his reports on the devastating 1972 flood in Hornell, during which he worked non-stop to provide information to his neighbors in need. On a lighter note, Mr. Doran famously allowed local children to call into his show with questions for Santa Claus, whom he "interviewed" live from the North Pole.

Mr. Doran was a larger-than-life personality who was beloved throughout the Hornell community. He leaves behind a proud legacy of broadcasting excellence, which will be continued by the numerous local reporters and broadcasters that he mentored during his career. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in honoring and remembering the life of Kevin Doran.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 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 \$18,152,658,224,184.62. We've added \$7,525,781,175,271.54 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.

HONORING FORMER LAKES REGION COMMUNITY COLLEGE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS VICE PRESIDENT TOM GOULETTE ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT AFTER 39 YEARS WITH THE COLLEGE

HON. FRANK C. GUINTA

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my congratulations to Mr. Thomas Goulette on his retirement after 39 years with Lakes Region Community College, and thank him for the outstanding work he did during his career.

Mr. Goulette's broad expertise in education has been instrumental to the growth of Lakes Region Community College, and his continuous progression from teacher to vice presi-

dent exemplifies his commitment to excellence. Over the last 39 years, Mr. Goulette has been an integral part of the education community and his leadership will be greatly missed.

It is with great admiration that I congratulate Mr. Goulette on his retirement, and wish him the best on all future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BEN RAY LUJÁN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 546 I regrettably missed roll call vote 546. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

HONORING THE REDLANDS CHRISTIAN MIGRANT ASSOCIATION

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Redlands Christian Migrant Association on their 50th anniversary, and to commend its exemplary service to the Florida community.

The Redlands Christian Migrant Association (RCMA) was founded by members of the Mennonite Church in 1965. They had noticed that the children of migrant workers faced extraordinarily dangerous conditions when they went into the fields with their parents. Parents had no other option but to bring their children with them into fields as they harvested crops. The RCMA brought in caregivers from the cultures of the workers to establish trust between the parents and their children's caregivers. The level of trust and close contact with the community formed the basis of the RCMA's successful model of provider to many cultures.

The RCMA began its service with seventy-five children in two facilities. It now serves over 8,000 children in over eighty-five centers. These facilities serve a large range of needs in the community. The RCMA's Early Head Start centers accept children as young as six weeks, while its after-school programs cater to ages 6 through 16. On all levels, the association prioritizes safety, health, and education.

Having dealt with the RCMA for a number of years, I know the level of commitment and dedication that the entire organization has for its work. It has served thousands of families and become an integral part of our community. I am proud to say that the RCMA serves so many families in our state. They are truly a model of an organization that cares. I look forward to many more years of working with the RCMA, and wish them nothing but the best.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to the Redlands Christian Migrant Association for its continued service in Florida and I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this remarkable organization.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF HUMAN FACTORS RESEARCH

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight an often-overlooked field of research, but one that affects all of us in our daily lives—human factors.

For over 50 years, the U.S. federal government has funded scientists and engineers to explore and better understand the relationship between people, technology, and the environment. Originally stemming from urgent needs to improve the performance of people using complex systems such as aircraft during World War II, the field of human factors works to develop safe, effective, and practical human use of technology, and the design of technology for effective human use, particularly in challenging settings. Prior to this, considerations of how people effectively and safely interacted with machines were not a priority, resulting in wasted economic output and efficiency, and more importantly, the avoidable loss of human life.

Today, organizations like the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society, or HFES, which counts over 4,500 psychologists, scientists, engineers among its members, are devoted to creating safe and effective human interaction with technology in diverse fields such as transportation, military equipment, consumer products, energy systems, medical devices, manufacturing, farming, health, sports and recreation, and education.

The group defines “human factors” as the scientific body of knowledge of how people use technology. It is applied at critical points of evaluation and assessment to the design and use of equipment, systems, facilities, procedures, jobs, environments, and training, leading to safe and efficient operation and implementation.

For example, based on human factors expertise and research, the Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, found that implementing high-intensity activated crosswalks reduced total crashes by 29% and pedestrian-vehicle crashes by 69%. Also showing positive effects for pedestrian and bicycle safety were the implementation of shared-lane markings for bicycles and transverse markings for crosswalks as well as cars designed to reduce distracted driving.

Organizations like HFES and its individual members help ensure that whether it's the latest model of an American-made car or the tools that equip our men and women in uniform, how we interact with technology is a critical component of its development. I support the increased use of human factors research in new technologies and hope our federal agencies like the Department of Transportation will continue to make use of these important results.

RECOGNIZING DR. STEVEN D. CHAN INSTALLATION AS PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE OF DENTISTS

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Steven D. Chan, an accomplished pediatric dentist who most recently was installed as the first Asian American President of the American College of Dentists. It is my great pleasure to commend Dr. Chan for his lifelong achievements and expertise in the field of dentistry. He is involved in a number of professional and civic activities that truly make him an exemplar of leadership.

The American College of Dentists is the oldest major honorary organization for dentists. It was founded in 1920 to recognize dentists who have made significant contributions to the advancement of dentistry. The mission of the American College of Dentists is to advance excellence, ethics, professionalism, and leadership in dentistry—all qualities that embody Dr. Chan.

I have had the honor of meeting and speaking with Dr. Chan and am impressed with his distinguished professional background. Dr. Chan is a third generation Californian—born and raised in Los Angeles. A graduate of UCLA, he earned his dental degree at Georgetown University and completed his special training in pediatric dentistry at a Los Angeles County Hospital Trauma Center.

He's received various professional honors and fellowships from different organizations such as the American Academy of Pediatric Dentists, the Asian Business Alliance, and the Asian Pacific Islander American Public Affairs Association. He holds membership to several professional associations like the California Society of Pediatric Dentistry and the American Academy of Pediatrics. Individuals like Congressman ERIC SWALWELL and former California State Senator Majority Leader Ellen Corbett have also recognized his illustrious career.

In addition to his numerous professional accomplishments, Dr. Chan is a civic leader in his community. His community service includes: Service on the Alameda County Grand Jury, Chair of the Ohlone Community College Bond Oversight Committee, and City of Fremont Library Commission.

It has been a great privilege to have shared a friendship and working partnership with Dr. Steven Chan over the years. I commend him for his 35 years of distinguished leadership in the American community of dentistry and the City of Fremont. Dr. Chan has made significant contributions to the advancement of dentistry and I thank him for his years of dedicated service to Silicon Valley.

Dr. Chan's exemplary leadership will be well placed in the American College of Dentists. I rise today to wish him my very deepest congratulations for his exceptional level of advancement of dentistry and his commitment to public service in the Silicon Valley. I extend him my greatest personal wishes for success and happiness throughout his very well earned appointment.

FOREST PRODUCTS WEEK

HON. SUZAN K. DeIBENE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Ms. DeIBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Forest Products Week and the forest products industry's contributions to greener manufacturing practices. In Washington State, we have over 58 sawmill, millwork and wood treating facilities; 12 engineered wood and panel facilities; and 16 facilities manufacturing other wood products.

We know that forests play a critical role in filtering and renewing our air. Trees absorb carbon dioxide and water, and release oxygen. Some of the carbon absorbed by trees is stored for a long period of time. In fact, one-half the weight of wood is carbon.

Wood can be manufactured into many useful products. In addition, a large portion of the energy used in forest products manufacturing is produced from biomass like bark and sawdust, meaning the amount of energy used to produce wood products can be vastly lower than other materials.

Finally, wood is also renewable and provides for an increase in “green” buildings that have a positive carbon footprint. Recently, Secretary Vilsack visited my district and described the many benefits to building with wood products such as cross-laminated timber.

During Forest Products Week, let's all recognize the many employees and products that contribute to an increased environmental awareness in sustainable building materials as well as in many other areas.

CONDOLENCES TO THE TURKISH PEOPLE

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my sincere condolences to the Turkish people regarding the terrorist attack in Ankara on October 10, 2015 that took the lives of more than 90 innocent people. The attack was orchestrated through an apparent double suicide bombing at a rally organized to promote peace.

Turkey has been a longtime NATO ally and friend. For decades, they served on the front lines of the Cold War and contained Soviet expansionism to its north. Today, Turkey finds itself with a new threat to the south, as militant extremists attempt to expand their control over large parts of Syria and Iraq. It is heartbreaking to see evidence of this form of terrorism spreading to Turkish soil.

We stand with the Turkish people as they confront the growing threat of terrorism. Our thoughts and prayers go out to the families affected by this latest tragedy.

HONORING ALBERT M. ELÍAS

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Albert M. Elías, who sadly passed away on October 16, for over 60 years of service to organized labor and to the progressive political community in Tucson and Pima County as a member of the International Typographical Union/Communications Workers of America Local 7026.

Albert M. Elías represented the highest ideals of the labor movement. While others talk about the need for a strong labor movement to protect and enhance the lives of working people, Albert, for more than 60 years, worked to advance these goals. While others have talked about how Pima County and southern Arizona need progressive political success to empower the ordinary and disadvantaged among us, Albert worked long hours helping politicians and movements advocate on behalf of these people.

Using the printing skills he honed for most of his life, the knowledge he gained over more than six decades of how the printed word can help realize worthy goals, and the personal contacts his honesty, integrity and goodwill forged, Albert achieved much and has helped others achieve even more in advancing political movements, and the labor movement in particular.

Albert, a fourth-generation Tucson native, joined the International Typographical Union of his maternal grandfather Francisco S. Moreno in January 1954 and committed himself to a career in the printing trade. Albert believed that union membership would improve the professional quality of his work as a printer, and enable him to develop meaningful, long-term relationships in his community that would benefit himself and his family, as well as his union brothers and sisters. Union membership, he believed, also would provide him with better income and with vacations and holidays off to spend quality time with his family. It was Albert's goal to provide his children with the wherewithal to excel in education through high school and go on to college if they desired. Time proved Albert to be correct. All three of the children of he and his wife, Viola Baine, are college graduates who are serving others in pursuit of their careers.

Albert and his sister Aida Elías, the children of Alberto Spring Elías and Ermelinda Moreno Elías, always lived their lives as Christians and were dedicated to their religious faith. Albert maintained an active lifetime role in his Roman Catholic parish, based at St. Augustine's Cathedral in downtown Tucson. He served for many years as a member of its Parish Council.

Albert's interest in the printing trade went back to his childhood in the 1930s. His grandfather Moreno had begun publishing the Spanish language *El Tucsonense* weekly newspaper as a member of the Typographical Union in 1915, but he died an early death in 1929. *El Tucsonense* continued publication under ownership of his wife, Rosa E. Moreno, and with the help of her five children—Ermelinda, Gilberto, Federico, Arturo and Elías. Before Albert's 10th birthday he was delivering *El Tucsonense* by bicycle to the Latino

barrios that dominated much of downtown Tucson. He worked his way into the print shop during his years at Tucson High School to be a "printer's devil," sweeping the floors, cleaning presses, and remelting the lead used to make ingots for the shop's linotype machines.

After graduating from Tucson High School in January 1946, Albert went to the Frank Wiggins Trade School in Los Angeles to learn more about printing. After completing those studies in 1948, Albert went to work in the print shop that published *El Tucsonense*, now being run by his uncle Arturo Moreno. That ended in late 1951 when Albert was drafted into the U.S. Army. He served in the infantry for two years before being honorably discharged. After his discharge, Albert returned to Tucson. But instead of rejoining *El Tucsonense*, Albert sought membership in the Typographical Union as a journeyman, skipping apprenticeship because of his experience. His skills earned him a position as a linotype operator in early 1954 with the Tucson daily newspapers, *The Arizona Daily Star* and *Tucson Citizen*.

A bitter and ultimately unsuccessful Typographical Union strike at the *Star-Citizen* in 1966, over job-depleting automation and the companies' rejection of the union's demand for a pension plan, ended Albert's 12-year stint with the daily newspapers. Fortuitously for Albert, *El Tucsonense* was in the process of folding and he and a partner, Oscar Araiza, bought his uncle's printing shop. Araiza retired in 1991 and Albert ran *Old Pueblo Printers* alone thereafter.

Upon taking control of the business in 1966, Albert and his partner began doing printing work for Tucson-area labor union locals and Democratic Party candidates for political office. One of the first campaigns for which Albert's shop printed the political literature was one of the late U.S. Representative Morris K. Udall's bids for office. Udall continued to use his services after that, as did Robert Kennedy for his assassination-truncated 1968 presidential campaign. Albert printed campaign materials for Raul Castro, who was elected as the first Latino governor of Arizona; for Ed Pastor, who was elected as the first Latino Congressman from Arizona; and for longtime Pima County Supervisors Sam Lena and Dan Eckstrom. I, too, came to Albert for my printing needs when I first launched what became a 12-year stint on the Tucson Unified School District Board. I continued to use Albert's services through 13 years on the Pima County Board of Supervisors and, finally, on my 2002 bid for Congress.

During his career, Albert supported labor leader César Chávez of the United Farm Workers, he supported the efforts of local Latino activists to get their fair share of federal funds to improve the homes and neighborhoods of their people, and he supported a landmark lawsuit forcing Tucson Unified School District to desegregate its schools. Albert was always fighting battles against those who seek to use their financial influence to their own advantage—and at the expense of ordinary working people.

Albert M. Elías deserves special recognition, honor and respect for his six decades of union membership—and for his meritorious achievements during that time on behalf of working people and the less fortunate of Pima County and Southern Arizona. We will miss him dearly.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 557, I was unavoidably detained.

Had I been present, I would have voted AYE.

CELEBRATING TAP'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, community action agencies in the United States have established a history of giving individuals a much-needed hand-up out of poverty. Whether it's assistance with housing, finding a job, providing early childhood education, or even offering help to those recovering from abuse or addictions, community action agencies are the "Golden Rule" at work. I wish to honor an agency located in the Sixth Congressional District of Virginia that is actively fulfilling this mission.

Originally founded as Total Action Against Poverty by Cabell Brand, Total Action for Progress—known in Roanoke, Virginia simply as TAP—is celebrating its 50th anniversary as the Roanoke Valley's sheltering umbrella. Cabell Brand saw poverty was due to more than just an individual's financial circumstances. He believed that in order to be a full participant in society, an individual needed opportunities to improve one's life. A half-century later, Cabell Brand's vision of an organization that would allow someone to "TAP Into Hope" remains at work.

Cabell Brand met with Sargent Shriver when he was planning to form an organization that could grow from the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. A partnership in the community formed the non-profit that came to be called TAP, offering assistance to low-income individuals living in the area. Community action, the likes of which Brand and Shriver dreamed of, came to life in the Roanoke Valley and was embraced by the local governments.

Since taking office, I have come to understand the benefits that community action agencies provide to the downtrodden. In turn, I have enjoyed every opportunity I have had to work with this organization as they have displayed the "can-do" spirit that has helped transform TAP into one of our country's most successful community action organizations.

From its roots in Roanoke, TAP now serves men, women, and children in 11 localities in western and southwest Virginia. The focus is on self-reliance and self-determination with TAP's dedicated staff providing a unique brand of strength. It's that strength that I came to see in Cabell Brand, in his successor Ted Edlich—who marked his retirement last year—and in Annette Lewis, the current President and CEO. I congratulate TAP on its 50th anniversary, and I look forward to continuing to tell its story as a model for the good that can come from a sense of hope.

RESEARCH TIES GUN VIOLENCE
TO AMERICA'S ANGER PROBLEM,
EASY ACCESS TO GUNS

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following article:

[From National Catholic Reporter, Oct. 19, 2015]

FEWER GUNS, FEWER GUN-RELATED DEATHS
(By Vinnie Rotondaro)

Fewer guns, fewer gun-related deaths.

A simple enough concept, so knock-you-over-the-head obvious that it practically begs for an equally blunt—if totally oblivious—response, one made by plenty of pro-gun rights advocates: more guns make us safer.

But a look at the social science literature surrounding the U.S. gun violence debate shows how painfully real the gun prevalence-gun death correlation is, and suggests that it could prove very difficult to dig the country out of the hole it finds itself in.

In America today, more than 310 million firearms are estimated to be in the hands of private citizens. That is roughly 97 guns for every 100 people.

Studies regularly show that where there are more guns, there is more homicide.

Jeffrey Swanson, a Duke University psychiatry and behavioral sciences professor, and a leading expert on U.S. gun violence, believes that the more we look into the question of gun access and prevalence in society, the less myths surrounding the gun control debate will hold sway.

Some gun rights activists argue that more armed citizens will make for less crime, but “we don’t have an exceptionally high crime problem in the United States, or an exceptionally high violent crime problem compared to other industrialized countries,” Swanson said. Conversely, “we do have an exceptionally high firearm homicide problem.”

Others react to mass shootings where the gunmen are seriously mentally ill, and say that we need to fix the country’s broken mental healthcare system.

But doing so would not solve our gun violence problem, Swanson said.

“Mass shooters are really atypical,” he explained. “They are atypical of people with serious mental illnesses, the vast majority of whom are never going to be violent. And they are also atypical of the perpetrators of gun violence. Most of them don’t have serious mental illness.”

Swanson’s research points to a far more mundane explanation for the more than 11,000 firearm homicides that occur in the U.S. annually, the majority of which are the result of arguments, often involving alcohol, often occurring in underprivileged areas, or in troubled domestic settings.

America has an anger problem, and far too many angry Americans have easy access to guns.

According to a study that he and other researchers published in *Journal of Behavioral Sciences and the Law* earlier this year, near-

ly nine percent of the U.S. population has a serious anger problem and access to guns at home. The study culled data from a National Institute of Mental Health funded survey estimating the prevalence of the different kinds of mental disorders across the U.S.

“Anger is a normal human emotion,” Swanson said. “Everybody gets angry. But these are people who, when they get angry, break and smash things, and get into physical fights. . . . People who have a really short fuse,” and who can at times be “uncontrollable and destructive.”

They are wound-up, loose cannons, but not seriously mentally ill—the kind of people who should not have access to guns, but too often do.

According to Swanson’s research, about 1.5 percent of the population “have this impulsive, angry behavior and are carrying a gun around with them out in public.”

THE FINGER PULLS THE TRIGGER?

Other social science research sheds additional light on the toxic quality of guns in society.

Studies show that higher exposure to guns leads to more suicide—the leading cause of gun death in the U.S. One nationwide study found that people who committed suicide were 17 times more likely to have lived in homes with guns compared to people who did not.

Exposure to guns also leads to increased aggression. In 1967, researchers from the University of Wisconsin demonstrated the reality of a disturbing psychological phenomenon called the “weapons effect.”

The researchers sat one group of participants at a table with a shotgun and a revolver laying on it. Another group of participants were seated at a table with badminton racquets and shuttlecocks. The participants were then “angered” by an experimenter, told to ignore the objects on the table, and given the opportunity to administer a retaliatory electric shock to the level of their liking. Those seated at the table with guns opted for more aggressive shocks.

“Guns not only permit violence, they can stimulate it as well,” wrote researcher Leonard Berkowitz at the time, explaining the phenomenon. “The finger pulls the trigger, but the trigger may also be pulling the finger”

Today, the “weapons effect” has been replicated inside and outside of laboratory settings in dozens of studies.

Brad Bushman, a professor of communication and psychology at Ohio State University who studies human aggression and serves on President Barack Obama’s committee on gun violence, performed a 2013 meta-analysis of over 50 “weapons effect” studies involving over 5000 participants.

“The mere presence of a weapon can increase aggressive thoughts, angry feelings, hostile appraisals, aggressive behavior,” he said, “just seeing one, just the object itself”

“Weapons effect” studies tend to focus on guns. One field study found that people stuck behind a pickup truck at a green light were quicker to honk their horn if a rifle was visibly mounted to the rear window, Bushman said. Another study showed that people with guns in their car were more likely to drive aggressively than people without guns in their car.

A 2006 study published in *Psychological Science*, the flagship journal of the Associa-

tion for Psychological Science, found that exposure to guns led to “significantly greater increases in testosterone” in men.

“I think this is really an important component missing in the [gun control] debate,” Bushman said. “Just merely seeing a gun can make people more aggressive.”

“Recent research shows that humans are as fast to notice guns as they are to notice spiders and snakes,” he said, and “what this illustrates is the fact that in the human brain, there is a very strong link between guns and danger, guns and violence, guns and aggression.”

L. Rowell Huesmann, director of the Research Center for Group Dynamics and head of the Aggression Research Program in the Center at the University of Michigan, agrees.

“The research is compelling that just the sight of a gun increases the risk of violent behavior by the people who see it,” he wrote in an email. “If they have a gun available they will be more likely to use it, but, even if they don’t have a gun available, they will be more likely to behave violently in some other way.”

SLIPPERY SOLUTIONS

Vincent DeMarco, national coordinator of Faiths United to Prevent Gun Violence, believes that “the fundamental problem as to why we don’t have more gun violence prevention is that people don’t know that there is something out there that works.”

“The problem is not knowing that gun violence is terrible,” he said, “everybody knows that. And the gun violence prevention movement has spent too much time focusing on and emphasizing that.”

DeMarco advocates for stronger handgun purchaser licensing requirements. A webpage titled “A Tale of Two States” and put out by Faiths United to Prevent Gun Violence illustrates his thinking.

“In 2007, Missouri repealed its purchaser licensing and background check requirement, resulting in a 25% increase in firearm homicides and an overall 14% increase in murders over the subsequent five years,” it reads. “The rise in gun deaths is directly attributable to the repeal of the licensing and background check requirement as the firearm homicide rate during the same period did not increase in adjoining states nor did the national average rise.”

By comparison, “Connecticut . . . continues to benefit from its handgun purchaser licensing law passed in 1994. A new study estimates that the law led to a 40% decline in homicides committed with a firearm during the 10 years following the implementation of the licensing requirement.”

Swanson believes these studies offer a powerful argument for the effectiveness of background check laws in reducing firearm homicides. He would like to see more background checks take into consideration the potential for anger issues in individuals seeking a gun.

But in a country as saturated with guns as America already is, merely stopping more guns from getting out into society may not be enough, he cautioned.

“If you have a bunch of laws that are focused on making sure risky people can’t buy a gun,” he said, “but meanwhile we’ve got 97 guns per 100 people, that doesn’t mean that somebody needs to go buy a gun to commit suicide, or hurt someone else.”

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S7427–S7478

Measures Introduced: Twelve bills and four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2194–2205, and S. Res. 292–295. **Pages S7470–71**

Measures Reported:

S. 1868, to extend by 15 years the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to conduct the quarterly financial report program, with an amendment. (S. Rept. No. 114–157) **Page S7470**

Measures Passed:

Protecting Our Infants Act: Senate passed S. 799, to address problems related to prenatal opioid use, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute and committee title amendment. **Pages S7439–41**

Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act: Senate passed S. 1493, to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2015, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans. **Page S7476**

25th Anniversary of the Reunification of Germany: Senate agreed to S. Res. 274, commemorating the 25th anniversary of the peaceful and democratic reunification of Germany. **Page S7476**

Filipino American History Month: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 283, designating October 2015 as “Filipino American History Month”, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S7476**

Condemning the Senseless Murder and Wounding in Roseburg, Oregon: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 287, condemning the senseless murder and wounding of 18 individuals (sons, daughters, fathers, mothers, uncles, aunts, cousins, students, and teachers) in Roseburg, Oregon, on October 1, 2015, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Pages S7476–77**

50th Anniversary of the Highway Beautification Act: Committee on Environment and Public

Works was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 288, commemorating October 22, 2015, as the 50th anniversary of the enactment of the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S7477**

Day of the Deployed: Senate agreed to S. Res. 294, designating October 26, 2015, as Day of the Deployed. **Page S7477**

National Veterans Small Business Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 295, designating the week of November 2 through November 6, 2015 as “National Veterans Small Business Week”. **Page S7477**

Measures Considered:

Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, after taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S7430–39, S7441–45**

Rejected:

By 32 yeas to 65 nays (Vote No. 282), Burr (for Paul) Modified Amendment No. 2564 (to Amendment No. 2716), to prohibit liability immunity to applying to private entities that break user or privacy agreements with customers. **Pages S7430, S7434–35**

Pending:

Burr/Feinstein Amendment No. 2716, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S7430**

Burr (for Cotton) Modified Amendment No. 2581 (to Amendment No. 2716), to exempt from the capability and process within the Department of Homeland Security communication between a private entity and the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the United States Secret Service regarding cybersecurity threats. **Page S7430**

Feinstein (for Coons) Modified Amendment No. 2552 (to Amendment No. 2716), to modify section 5 to require DHS to review all cyber threat indicators and countermeasures in order to remove certain personal information. **Page S7430**

Burr (for Flake/Franken) Amendment No. 2582 (to Amendment No. 2716), to terminate the provisions of the Act after six years. **Page S7430**

Feinstein (for Franken) Further Modified Amendment No. 2612 (to Amendment No. 2716), to improve the definitions of cybersecurity threat and cyber threat indicator. **Page S7430**

Burr (for Heller) Modified Amendment No. 2548 (to Amendment No. 2716), to protect information that is reasonably believed to be personal information or information that identifies a specific person. **Page S7430**

Feinstein (for Leahy) Modified Amendment No. 2587 (to Amendment No. 2716), to strike the FOIA exemption. **Page S7430**

Feinstein (for Mikulski/Cardin) Amendment No. 2557 (to Amendment No. 2716), to provide amounts necessary for accelerated cybersecurity in response to data breaches. **Page S7430**

Feinstein (for Whitehouse/Graham) Modified Amendment No. 2626 (to Amendment No. 2716), to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect Americans from cybercrime. **Page S7430**

Feinstein (for Wyden) Modified Amendment No. 2621 (to Amendment No. 2716), to improve the requirements relating to removal of personal information from cyber threat indicators before sharing. **Page S7430**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 83 yeas to 14 nays (Vote No. 281), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on Burr/Feinstein Amendment No. 2716 (listed above). **Page S7434**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding rule XXII, that at 11 a.m., on Tuesday, October 27, 2015, the post-cloture time be considered expired on Burr/Feinstein Amendment No. 2716, and Senate vote on or in relation to the following amendments in the order listed: Feinstein (for Wyden) Modified Amendment No. 2621 (to Amendment No. 2716), Burr (for Heller) Modified Amendment No. 2548 (to Amendment No. 2716), Feinstein (for Leahy) Modified Amendment No. 2587 (to Amendment No. 2716), Burr (for Flake/Franken) Amendment No. 2582 (to Amendment No. 2716), and Feinstein (for Franken) Further Modified Amendment No. 2612 (to Amendment No. 2716); that following the disposition of Feinstein (for Franken) Further Modified Amendment No. 2612 (to Amendment No. 2716), Senate recess until 2:15 p.m. for the weekly conference meetings; that the time from 2:15 p.m. until 4 p.m. be equally divided in the usual form, and that at 4 p.m., Senate vote on or in relation to the following amendments in the order listed: Feinstein (for Coons) Modified Amendment No. 2552 (to Amendment No. 2716), Burr (for Cotton) Modified Amendment

No. 2581 (to Amendment No. 2716), and Burr/Feinstein Amendment No. 2716, as amended, if amended; and that if cloture is invoked on the bill, all post-cloture time be yielded back, and Senate vote on passage of the bill, as amended, if amended, without any intervening action or debate. **Page S7439**

Vilardo Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing at 5 p.m., on Monday, October 26, 2015, Senate begin consideration of the nomination of Lawrence Joseph Vilardo, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of New York; that there be up to 30 minutes of debate on the nomination, and that following the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination, without intervening action or debate; and that no further motions be in order to the nomination. **Page S7475**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By a unanimous vote of 93 yeas (Vote No. EX. 283), Julie Furuta-Toy, of Wyoming, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Equatorial Guinea. **Page S7439**

Dennis B. Hankins, of Minnesota, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Guinea. **Page S7439**

Harry K. Thomas, Jr., of New York, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Zimbabwe. **Page S7439**

Robert Porter Jackson, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Ghana. **Page S7439**

5 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

3 Army nominations in the rank of general.

2 Marine Corps nominations in the rank of general.

3 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Pages S7475–76, S7477–78

Nomination Discharged: The following nomination were discharged from further committee consideration and placed on the Executive Calendar:

Ann Calvaresi Barr, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, United States Agency for International Development, which was sent to the Senate on May 11, 2015, from the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs. **Page S7477**

Messages from the House: **Page S7460**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Pages S7431, S7460**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S7460, S7477**

Executive Communications: **Pages S7460–62**

Petitions and Memorials: **Pages S7462–70**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S7471–72**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S7472–75**

Additional Statements: Pages S7459–60

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S7475

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—283) Pages S7434–35, S7439

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 5:55 p.m., until 3 p.m. on Monday, October 26, 2015. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S7477.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

GLOBAL CHALLENGES

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine global challenges, United States national security strategy, and defense organization, after receiving testimony from Eliot A. Cohen, and Thomas G. Mahnken, Advanced Strategy Program, both of Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, and Kathleen H. Hicks, Center for Strategic and International Studies International Security Program, all of Washington, D.C.; and Walter Russell Mead, The Hudson Institute, New York, New York.

PUERTO RICO

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Puerto Rico, focusing on the economy, debt, and options for Congress, after receiving testimony from Representative Pierluisi; Antonio Weiss, Counselor to the Secretary, Department of the Treasury; Puerto Rico Governor Alejandro J. Garcia Padilla, and Sergio M.

Marxuach, Center for a New Economy, both of San Juan; and Steven M. Fetter, Regulation UnFettered, Port Townsend, Washington.

PAY FLEXIBILITIES IN THE FEDERAL WORKFORCE

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management concluded a hearing to examine improving pay flexibilities in the Federal workforce, after receiving testimony from Brenda Roberts, Deputy Associate Director, Pay and Leave, Employee Services, Office of Personnel Management; Debra A. Warner, Director of Civilian Force Management, Deputy Chief of Staff for Manpower, Personnel and Services, Department of the Air Force, Department of Defense; Linda Jacksta, Assistant Commissioner, Office of the Human Resources Management, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security; and Anthony M. Reardon, National Treasury Employees Union, and William R. Dougan, National Federation of Federal Employees, both of Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported S. 2123, to reform sentencing laws and correctional institutions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

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: 18 Public bills, H.R. 3797–3814; and 4 resolutions, H.J. Res. 70; and H. Res. 486–488 were introduced.

Pages H7137–38

Additional Cosponsors: Pages H7138–39

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows: H.R. 1090, to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide protections for retail customers, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 114–304, Part 1); and

H.R. 2583, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for greater transparency and efficiency in the procedures followed by the Federal Communications Commission, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–305).

Page H7137

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Fleischmann to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Page H7093

Recess: The House recessed at 10:42 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon.

Page H7097

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Reverend Rod Cannon, New Vision Worship Center, Zolfo Springs, Florida. **Page H7097**

Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015—Rule for consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 483, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3762) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, by a yea-and-nay vote of 240 yeas to 187 nays, Roll No. 567, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 244 yeas to 185 nays, Roll No. 566. Consideration is expected to resume tomorrow, October 23rd. **Pages H7101–07, H7124–26**

National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2015: The House passed H.R. 1937, to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness, by a yea-and-nay vote of 254 yeas to 177 nays, Roll No. 565. **Pages H7107–24**

Rejected the Peters motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 184 yeas to 246 noes, Roll No. 564. **Pages H7122–24**

Agreed to:

Pearce amendment (No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 114–301) that clarifies that the bill does not affect Secretarial Order 3324, issued by the Department of the Interior. **Pages H7117–18**

Rejected:

Lowenthal amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 114–301) that sought to replace the bills definition of “strategic and critical minerals” with the accepted definition from the National Research Council (by a recorded vote of 176 yeas to 253 noes, Roll No. 560); **Pages H7114–15, H7120**

Dingell amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 114–301) that sought to ensure that mining permits are fully reviewed under the National Environmental Policy Act (by a recorded vote of 181 yeas to 248 noes, Roll No. 561); **Pages H7115–16, H7120–21**

Cartwright amendment (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 114–301) that sought to strike sections of the bill that would limit judicial review of agency actions and prevent the awarding of attorney’s fees under the Equal Access to Justice Act (by a recorded vote of 184 yeas to 245 noes, Roll No. 562); and **Pages H7116–17, H71212**

Hastings (FL) amendment (No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 114–301) that sought to require demonstration for proposed projects that domestic capacity to

produce strategic and critical minerals is less than 80 percent of domestic requirements and requires publication of intent to transport or sell strategic and critical mineral intermediate and final products outside of the United States unless the domestic capacity exceeds 80 percent (by a recorded vote of 183 yeas to 246 noes, Roll No. 563).

Pages H7118–19, H7121–22

H. Res. 481, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1937), was agreed to yesterday, October 21st.

Recess: The House recessed at 2:57 p.m. and reconvened at 3:32 p.m. **Page H7119**

Presidential Veto Message—National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016: Read a message from the President wherein he transmitted his Memorandum of Disapproval of H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, and explained his reasons therefore—ordered printed (H. Doc. 114–70). **Page H7127**

Pursuant to the order of the House of October 21, 2015, further consideration of the veto message and the bill are postponed until the legislative day of November 5, 2015, and that on that legislative day, the House shall proceed to the constitutional question of reconsideration and dispose of such question without intervening motion. **Page H7127**

Senate Messages: Messages received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appear on pages H7101, H7135–36.

Senate Referral: S. 799 was held at the desk.

Pages H7135–36

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and five recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H7120, H7120–21, H7121, H7122, H7123–24, H7124, H7125 and H7125–26. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Committee Meetings

COUNTERING ADVERSARIAL PROPAGANDA: CHARTING AN EFFECTIVE COURSE IN THE CONTESTED INFORMATION ENVIRONMENT

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities held a hearing entitled “Countering Adversarial Propaganda: Charting an

Effective Course in the Contested Information Environment”. Testimony was heard from Matthew Armstrong, Broadcasting Board of Governors; Major General Christopher K. Haas, USA, Director, Force Management and Development Directorate, United States Special Operations Command (SOCOM) (J-39); Michael Lumpkin, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict; and Brigadier General Charles Moore, USAF, Deputy Director for Global Operations, Joint Staff (J-39).

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR RURAL WATER SYSTEMS: S. 611, THE GRASSROOTS RURAL AND SMALL COMMUNITY WATER SYSTEMS ASSISTANCE ACT

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy held a hearing entitled “Technical Assistance for Rural Water Systems: S. 611, the Grassroots Rural and Small Community Water Systems Assistance Act”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EPA’S CO₂ REGULATIONS FOR NEW AND EXISTING POWER PLANTS: LEGAL PERSPECTIVES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power held a hearing entitled “EPA’s CO₂ Regulations for New and Existing Power Plants: Legal Perspectives”. Testimony was heard from Elbert Lin, Solicitor General of West Virginia; and public witnesses.

THE FUTURE OF HOUSING IN AMERICA: 50 YEARS OF HUD AND ITS IMPACT ON FEDERAL HOUSING POLICY

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The Future of Housing in America: 50 Years of HUD and Its Impact on Federal Housing Policy”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

WORDS HAVE CONSEQUENCES: PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY INCITEMENT TO VIOLENCE; MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Words Have Consequences: Palestinian Authority Incitement to Violence”; and a markup on H. Res. 293, expressing concern over anti-Israel and anti-Semitic incitement within the Palestinian Authority. Testimony was heard from public witnesses. H. Res. 293 was ordered reported, as amended.

RUSSIAN ENGAGEMENT IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere held a hearing entitled “Russian Engagement in the Western Hemisphere”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

NORTH KOREA: BACK ON THE STATE SPONSOR OF TERRORISM LIST?

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade held a hearing entitled “North Korea: Back on the State Sponsor of Terrorism List?”. Testimony was heard from Sung Kim, Special Representative for North Korea Policy, Department of the State; and Hilary Batjer Johnson, Deputy Coordinator for Homeland Security, Screening, and Designations, Bureau of Counterterrorism, Department of State.

AFRICA’S GREAT LAKES REGION: A SECURITY, POLITICAL, AND HUMANITARIAN CHALLENGE

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations held a hearing entitled “Africa’s Great Lakes Region: A Security, Political, and Humanitarian Challenge”. Testimony was heard from Linda Thomas-Greenfield, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of African Affairs, Department of State; and Thomas Perriello, Special Envoy for the Great Lakes Region of Africa, Department of State.

READY AND RESILIENT?: EXAMINING FEDERAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE CAPABILITIES

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications held a hearing entitled “Ready and Resilient?: Examining Federal Emergency Preparedness and Response Capabilities”. Testimony was heard from W. Craig Fugate, Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security; Chris P. Currie, Director, Emergency Management, National Preparedness and Critical Infrastructure Protection, Homeland Security and Justice Team, Government Accountability Office; and a public witness.

OVERSIGHT OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Oversight of the Federal Bureau of Investigation”. Testimony was heard from James B. Comey, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water, Power and Oceans held a hearing on H.R. 3094, the “Gulf States Red Snapper Management Authority Act”. Testimony was heard from Robert Barham, Secretary, Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, State of Louisiana; Alan Risenhoover, Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries; Nick Wiley, Executive Director, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission; and public witnesses.

EPA’S 2015 OZONE STANDARD: CONCERNS OVER SCIENCE AND IMPLEMENTATION

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “EPA’s 2015 Ozone Standard: Concerns Over Science and Implementation”. Testimony was heard from Seyed Sadredin, Executive Director and Air Pollution Control Officer, San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District; Michael Honeycutt, Director, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, Toxicology Division; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 3763, the “Surface Transportation Reauthorization and Reform Act of 2015”. H.R. 3763 was ordered reported, as amended.

EVALUATING VA PRIMARY CARE DELIVERY, WORKLOAD, AND COST

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled “Evaluating VA Primary Care Delivery, Workload, and Cost”. Testimony was heard from Randall B. Williamson, Director, Health Care, Government Accountability Office; and Thomas Lynch, M.D., Assistant Deputy Under Secretary for Health Clinical Operations, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs.

A REVIEW OF VA’S VETSUCCESS ON CAMPUS PROGRAM

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity held a hearing entitled “A Review of VA’s VetSuccess on Campus Program”. Testimony was heard from Jack Kammerer, Director, Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment Service, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

HEARING 4

Select Committee on Benghazi: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Hearing 4”, regarding testimony of Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton. Testimony was heard from Former Secretary of State Hillary R. Clinton. A vote to include material in the hearing record failed.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, OCTOBER 23, 2015

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled “Reviewing the Accuracy of Medicaid and Exchange Eligibility Determinations”, 9:00 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing and Trade, hearing entitled “Fighting Fraud Against the Elderly, an Update”, 9:15 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises, hearing entitled “Oversight of the SEC’s Division of Investment Management”, 9:15 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade, hearing entitled “Evaluating the Export-Import Bank in the Global Economy”, 9:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

3 p.m., Monday, October 26

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, October 23

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will be in a period of morning business. At 5 p.m., Senate will begin consideration of the nomination of Lawrence Joseph Vilardo, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of New York, and vote on confirmation of the nomination at 5:30 p.m.

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Consideration of H.R. 3762—Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Aderholt, Robert B., Ala., E1513
 Bonamici, Suzanne, Ore., E1507
 Carter, Earl L. "Buddy", Ga., E1515
 Carter, John R., Tex., E1509
 Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1516
 Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E1512
 Cole, Tom, Okla., E1507
 Costa, Jim, Calif., E1512
 Courtney, Joe, Conn., E1508, E1511
 DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E1519
 DeBene, Suzan K., Wash., E1517
 Diaz-Balart, Mario, Fla., E1516

Dold, Robert J., Ill., E1509
 Duncan, John J., Jr., Tenn., E1510
 Engel, Eliot L., N.Y., E1510
 Foster, Bill, Ill., E1510
 Goodlatte, Bob, Va., E1518
 Graves, Sam, Mo., E1507
 Grijalva, Raúl M., Ariz., E1518
 Guinta, Frank C., N.H., E1515, E1516
 Himes, James A., Conn., E1511
 Honda, Michael M., Calif., E1517
 Hudson, Richard, N.C., E1511, E1512, E1513, E1514
 Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E1517
 Kelly, Trent, Miss., E1513
 Kennedy, Joseph P., III, Mass., E1508

Lipinski, Daniel, Ill., E1517
 Lujan, Ben Ray, N.M., E1516
 Meehan, Patrick, Pa., E1508
 Messer, Luke, Ind., E1509
 Norcross, Donald, N.J., E1508
 Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E1507, E1508, E1509, E1510, E1511, E1511
 Reed, Tom, N.Y., E1516
 Roskam, Peter J., Ill., E1518
 Smith, Adam, Wash., E1509, E1510, E1511, E1515
 Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E1515
 Stutzman, Marlin A., Ind., E1513
 Takai, Mark, Hawaii, E1507
 Tsongas, Niki, Mass., E1514, E1515



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.gpo.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.