United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 2015 No. 60

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 23, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROB WOODALL to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

Reverend Terry Ribble, Grace Bible Church, Dunmore, Pennsylvania, offered the following prayer:

Our gracious Heavenly Father, we come into Your presence today acknowledging that You alone are God and worthy of all worship.

We declare that You are the Creator and Sustainer of all things and the one who provides the means of forgiveness to all mankind.

We recognize Your sovereign rule over Heaven and Earth and that we, Your created beings, are Your stewards.

Father, we thank You that You allow us to live in a nation where everyone has freedom to worship You according to the dictates of their own hearts.

We pray for wisdom for our elected officials. Give them the ability to discern the times in which we live and to see the consequences of their actions. Guide them in making decisions that will serve our Nation best.

May Your spirit move across our land, bringing a new spiritual awakening.

Father, cause Your face to shine upon our Nation and give us peace.

In Jesus' name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ 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 TERRY RIBBLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, as much as I am tempted to tell stories about my brother this morning, I will digress. It is my honor this morning to welcome as our guest chaplain my brother, Pastor Terry Ribble.

It is no surprise to me to find Terry in the full-time ministry. For as long as I can remember, he possessed the heart of a pastor. Terry left home at the age of 18 to go into foreign missions. Years later, he returned to the United States with his wife, Madeline, and has spent his entire life in full-time pastoral service. No one who knows my family is taken aback by his chosen work. Today, Terry is the senior pastor at Grace Bible Church in Dunmore, Pennsylvania. He possesses the acumen, compassion, and intellect uniquely suited for this purpose.

The work that churches like his do in our communities changes and affects the lives of thousands of Americans as they reach out to the less fortunate, the sick, and the hungry, improving the lives of whom they touch. They enrich our communities.

I have watched Terry do all of these things. I am proud of him and of his work, and I thank him for his service today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am so thrilled we are beginning our day talking about doing good things for other people. Today, I rise to recognize and to pay tribute to the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Tomorrow, April 24, is recognized as Federation Day, and it is the 125th anniversary of the Women's Club Federation. This organization has such an interesting beginning.

Jane Croly, who was a journalist, was denied attendance at a dinner in New York to honor Charles Dickens, and she was denied because of her gender. So she got busy with that, and she organized a women's club convention. On April 24, 1890, 63 clubs from around the country came together to form the Federation to focus on helping our communities. They have over 90,000

Printed on recycled paper.

members, and, last year, they did 100,000 different community service projects with 4.5 million volunteer hours.

They are coming to Tennessee in June for their convention. We look forward to welcoming them and to celebrating doing good for other people.

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the Senate's action yesterday on the passage of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, and I urge the House leadership to bring this legislation up for final passage.

The measures included in this trafficking package will provide survivors of human trafficking the desperately needed resources and services to recover and rebuild their lives and to put traffickers and buyers behind bars.

I am thrilled this package of bills also includes three pieces of legislation I am proud to be leading in the House, including the HERO Act, which trains wounded military veterans to aid law enforcement in investigating child exploitation; the Rape Survivor Child Custody Act, which encourages States to allow a woman to terminate the parental rights of a rapist; and my friend Representative RENEE ELLMERS' bill, which I am proud to colead, to train health care providers in identifying and assisting victims of trafficking.

Survivors of child exploitation, rape, and trafficking have waited long enough. They need health, housing, and legal services now. They need legal and civil protections now. I urge the House to bring the Senate's Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act up for a vote without delay.

PETE WHEELER AND JAY SHAW

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

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember two great civil servants from the great State of Georgia who passed away this week: Pete Wheeler, commissioner of the Georgia Department of Veterans Service, and former State representative and transportation board member Jay Shaw.

Mr. Wheeler served in the Army infantry and in the Georgia Army National Guard, retiring as a brigadier general and receiving several awards for his service, including the Veterans of Foreign Wars Silver and Gold Medals of Merit. He was a longtime attorney who used his past military service to advocate on behalf of veterans in Georgia. Mr. Wheeler served as VA commissioner for 61 years. If you couldn't get it done any other way, you just called Pete.

Mr. Shaw began his public service as mayor of Lakeland for 10 years. He also served in the Georgia House of Representatives, supporting improvements to the transportation system in Georgia. Mr. Shaw was an active member of the Georgia State Transportation Board and served as its chairman in the past.

These two Georgians did so much for our great State, and I offer my condolences to their families and friends, and I would like to thank them for their service.

IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THIS GOVERNMENT TO PROTECT ITS CITIZENS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this morning, we will be addressing the issue of cybersecurity, one of the responsibilities of the Homeland Security Department and of the Homeland Security Committee.

In a briefing, many of us had the opportunity to hear a number of challenging and difficult representations regarding the gyrocopter. Let me simply say that the responsibility of this Nation and of this government is to protect its citizens, and I am appalled at what seems to be the inability or the inaction of certain agencies.

I stand today on the floor of the House to say that it is intolerable and unacceptable when tourists and Americans come to their capital. I want them to expect the highest grade of security for their families, for their peace of mind. The Commander in Chief resides in Washington, D.C. That Commander in Chief has the right to have the highest degree of security.

I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that we immediately demand a response from the appropriate agencies so that nothing of this kind happens ever again.

CONGRATULATING STUDENTS FROM HIGHLANDS HIGH SCHOOL

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

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and to congratulate the students from Highlands High School in Fort Thomas, Kentucky.

These hard-working students in my district recently won the We the People State-level competition and will represent the State of Kentucky in the national competition this weekend in Washington, D.C.

The We the People program is a project of the Center for Civic Education. It works to further students' knowledge of constitutional history and government, and it gives students a foundation in civics education that will prepare them to be effective future leaders. The program sponsors student debates and discussions of issues, such as the similarities between the United States Congress and the British Parliament, the differences between the Constitution and the Articles of Confederation, and the merits of the anti-Federalist arguments versus those of the Federalists.

I am proud of these students' hard work and dedication. I wish them all the best in their competition this weekend and in all of their future endeavors.

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

(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, as I stand before you today, it is with a heavy heart that I think back to the events and to the atrocities that began 100 years ago.

This week, millions of us will gather around the world to mark the centennial of the Armenian genocide. Today, I stand to remember the 1.5 million Armenians who perished from 1915 to 1923.

As a crime against all humanity, the Armenian genocide has left an indelible mark on all of us. Unfortunately, Turkey, the successor to the Ottoman Empire, has never accepted responsibility for these atrocities. Instead, Turkey continues to hide behind the bullying tactics that conceal violations of human rights.

As a world leader and as a country that stands for freedom and justice for all, we must recognize the events that occurred and work to change the policies that ignore the actions of the Ottoman Empire against the people of Armenia. The continued campaign of denial sets a dangerous precedent that makes future atrocities and genocides more likely. As the greatest force for human dignity in the world, the United States is long overdue to stand with the Armenian people. We cannot continue to play politics with something that is this important.

For me, it is incredibly disappointing that the administration will not follow in the footsteps of many world leaders, most recently those of Germany, Austria, and the Vatican, who have recognized this genocide on its 100th anniversary.

CYBERSECURITY FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

(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, during a time when our digital world is so insecure, new policies are needed to help defend against cyber attacks. The attacks against Sony Pictures, Target, and Anthem are just a few of the most recent examples.

According to a report released by the Center for Strategic and International

Studies, cyber crimes in 2013 cost more than $100 billion in the United States and, roughly, half a trillion dollars globally.

Mr. Speaker, Congress needs to resolve these problems by working together to improve our Nation's cyber defenses rather than having President Obama try to solve the problem one executive order at a time, and that is exactly what the House is doing this week. Determined to protect the American people from future cyber attacks, last night, the House passed one bipartisan bill—and it will vote on another today—which seeks to balance security while protecting privacy.

Mr. Speaker, after years of inaction, the White House has indicated it is willing to work with Congress on this issue, signaling that we may finally put the policies in place that are necessary to protect our digital world in the 21st century.

□ 0915

NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY PROTECTION ADVANCEMENT ACT OF 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill, H.R. 1731.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 212 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. 1731.

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

□ 0916

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. 1731) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to enhance multi-directional sharing of information related to cybersecurity risks and strengthen privacy and civil liberties protections, and for other purposes, with Mr. WOODALL 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.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

I am pleased to bring to the floor H.R. 1731, the National Cybersecurity Protection Advancement Act, a proprivacy, prosecurity bill that we desperately need to safeguard our digital networks.

I would like to commend the subcommittee chairman, Mr. RATCLIFFE, for his work on this bill as well as our minority counterparts, including Ranking Member THOMPSON and subcommittee Ranking Member RICHMOND for their joint work on this bill. This has been a noteworthy, bipartisan effort. I would also like to thank House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence Chairman DEVIN NUNES and Ranking Member ADAM SCHIFF for their input and collaboration. Lastly, I would like to thank Committee on the Judiciary Chairman GOODLATTE and Ranking Member CONYERS for their contribution.

Make no mistake, we are in the middle of a silent crisis. At this very moment, our Nation's businesses are being robbed, and sensitive government information is being stolen. We are under siege by a faceless enemy whose tracks are covered in cyberspace.

Sophisticated breaches at companies like Anthem, Target, Neiman Marcus, Home Depot, and JPMorgan have compromised the personal information of millions of private citizens. Nation-states like Iran and North Korea have launched digital bombs to get revenge at U.S.-based companies, while others like China are stealing intellectual property. We recently witnessed brazen cyber assaults against the White House and the State Department, which put sensitive government information at risk.

In the meantime, our adversaries have been developing the tools to shut down everything from power grids to water systems so they can cripple our economy and weaken our ability to defend the United States.

This bill will allow us to turn the tide against our enemies and ramp up our defenses by allowing for greater cyber threat information sharing. This bill will strengthen the Department of Homeland Security's National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center, or NCCIC. The NCCIC is a primary civilian interface for exchanging cyber threat information, and for good reason. It is not a cyber regulator. It is not looking to prosecute anyone, and it is not military or a spy agency. Its sole purpose, Mr. Chairman, is to prevent and respond to cyber attacks against our public and private networks while aggressively protecting Americans' privacy.

Right now we are in a pre-9/11 moment in cyberspace. In the same way legal barriers and turf wars kept us from connecting the dots before 9/11, the lack of cyber threat information sharing makes us vulnerable to an attack. Companies are afraid to share because they do not feel they have the adequate legal protection to do so.

H.R. 1731 removes those legal barriers and creates a safe harbor, which will encourage companies to voluntarily exchange information about attacks against their networks. This will allow both the government and private sector to spot digital attacks earlier and keep malicious actors outside of our networks and away from information that Americans expect to be defended.

This bill also puts privacy and civil liberties first. It requires that personal information of our citizens be protected before it changes hands—whether it is provided to the government or exchanged between companies—so private citizens do not have their sensitive data exposed.

Significantly, both industry and privacy groups have announced their support for this legislation because they recognize that we need to work together urgently to combat the cyber threat to this country.

Today, we have a dangerously incomplete picture of the online war being waged against us, and it is costing Americans their time, money, and jobs. It is time for us to safeguard our digital frontier. This legislation is a necessary and vital step to do exactly that.

Mr. Chairman, before I reserve the balance of my time, I would like to enter into the RECORD an exchange of letters between the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, Mr. GOODLATTE, and myself, recognizing the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on the Judiciary in H.R. 1731.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, April 21, 2015.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL: I am writing with respect to H.R. 1731, the ''National Cybersecurity Protection Advancement Act of 2015.'' As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions in H.R. 1731 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I agree to waive 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. 1731 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the 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 appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding, and 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. 1731.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, April 21, 2015.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1731, the ''National Cybersecurity Protection Advancement Act of 2015.'' I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Judiciary will not seek a sequential referral on the bill.

The Committee on Homeland Security concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing a sequential referral of this bill at this time, the Judiciary does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this bill or similar legislation in the future. In addition, should a conference on this bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Judiciary represented on the conference committee.

I will insert copies of this exchange in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. I thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. MCCAUL. With that, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 1731, the National Cybersecurity Protection Advancement Act of 2015.

Mr. Chairman, every day U.S. networks face hundreds of millions of cyber hacking attempts and attacks. Many of these attacks target large corporations and negatively impact consumers. They are launched by common hackers as well as nation-states. As the Sony attack last year demonstrated, they have a great potential for harm and put our economy and homeland security at risk.

Last week, it was reported that attacks against SCADA industrial control systems rose 100 percent between 2013 and 2014. Given that SCADA systems are essential to running our power plants, factories, and refineries, this is a very troubling trend.

Just yesterday, we learned about an advanced persistent threat that has targeted high-profile individuals at the White House and State Department since last year. According to an industry expert, this cyber threat—nicknamed CozyDuke—includes malware, information-stealing programs, and antivirus back doors that bear the hallmarks of Russian cyber espionage tools.

Mr. Chairman, cyber terrorists and cyber criminals are constantly innovating. Their success is dependent on their victims not being vigilant and protecting their systems. Cyber terrorists and cyber criminals exploit bad practices, like opening attachments and clicking links from unknown senders. That is why I am pleased that H.R. 1731 includes a provision authored by Representative WATSON COLEMAN to authorize a national cyber public awareness campaign to promote greater cyber hygiene.

Another key element of cybersecurity is, of course, information sharing about cyber threats. We have seen that when companies come forward and share their knowledge about imminent cyber threats, timely actions can be taken to prevent damage to vital IT networks. Thus, cybersecurity is one of those places where the old adage ''knowledge is power'' applies.

That is why I am pleased H.R. 1731 authorizes private companies to voluntarily share timely cyber threat information and malware with DHS or other impacted companies. Under H.R. 1731, companies may voluntarily choose to share threat information to prevent future attacks to other systems.

I am also pleased that the bill authorizes companies to monitor their own IT networks to identify penetrations and take steps to protect their networks from cyber threats. H.R. 1731 builds on bipartisan legislation enacted last year that authorized the Department of Homeland Security's National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center, commonly referred to as NCCIC.

H.R. 1731 was unanimously approved by the committee last week and represents months of outreach to a diverse array of stakeholders from the private sector and the privacy community. Importantly, H.R. 1731 requires participating companies to make reasonable efforts prior to sharing to scrub the data to remove information that could identify a person when that person is not believed to be related to the threat.

H.R. 1731 also directs DHS to scrub the data it receives and add an additional layer of privacy protection. Additionally, it requires the NCCIC to have strong procedures for protecting privacy, and calls for robust oversight by the Department's chief privacy officer, its chief civil rights and civil liberties officer, and inspector general, and the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board.

I am a cosponsor of H.R. 1731, but as the White House observed earlier this week, improvements are needed to ensure that its liability protections are appropriately targeted. In its current form, it would potentially protect companies that are negligent in how they carry out authorized activities under the act.

Mr. Chairman, before reserving the balance of my time, I wish to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) regarding the liability protection provisions of H.R. 1731.

At the outset, I would like to express my appreciation for the gentleman's willingness to work with me and the other Democrats on the committee to develop this bipartisan legislation. We have a shared goal of bolstering cybersecurity and improving the quality of information that the private sector receives about timely cyber threats so that they can act to protect their networks and the valuable data stored on them.

Therefore, it is concerning that the liability protection provision appears to undermine this shared goal insofar as it includes language that on its face incentivizes companies to do nothing about actionable cyber information. Specifically, I am speaking of the language on page 36, line 18, that extends liability protections to a company that fails to act on timely threat information provided by DHS or another impacted company.

I would ask the gentleman from Texas to work with me to clarify the language as it moves through the legislative process to underscore that it is not Congress' intent to promote inaction by companies who have timely threat information.

Mr. MCCAUL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for his question and would say that I do not completely share your view of that clause. I assure you that incentivizing companies to do nothing with timely threat information is certainly not the intent of this provision, as the author of this bill.

On the contrary, I believe it is important that we provide companies with legal safe harbors to encourage sharing of cyber threat information and also believe that every company that participates in this information-sharing process, especially small- and medium-sized businesses, cannot be required to act upon every piece of cyber threat information they receive.

As such, I support looking for ways to clarify that point with you, Mr. THOMPSON. I commit to working with you as this bill moves forward to look for ways to refine the language to ensure that it is consistent with our shared policy goal of getting timely information into the hands of businesses so that they can protect their networks and their data.

□ 0930

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, my close ally and colleague on this legislation.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the opportunity to work with Chairman MCCAUL in crafting the National Cybersecurity Protection Advancement Act. I would also like to thank Ranking Members RICHMOND and THOMPSON for their hard work on this issue; and a special thank you to the Homeland Security staff, who worked incredibly

hard to bring this important bill to the floor today.

Mr. Chairman, for years now, the private sector has been on the front lines in trying to guard against potentially devastating cyber attacks.

Just 2 months ago, one of the Nation's largest health insurance providers, Anthem, suffered a devastating cyber attack that compromised the personal information and health records of more than 80 million Americans.

The consequences of that breach hit home for many of those Americans just a week ago, on tax day, when thousands of them tried to file their tax returns, only to see them be rejected because cyber criminals had used their information to file false tax returns.

Mr. Chairman, attacks like these serve as a wake-up call to all Americans and provide clear evidence that our cyber adversaries have the upper hand. The consequences will get even worse if we fail to tackle this issue head on because even greater and more frightening threats exist, ones that extend to the critical infrastructure that support our very way of life.

I am talking about cyber attacks against the networks which control our bridges, our dams, our power grids, rails, and even our water supply. Attacks on this critical infrastructure have the potential to produce sustained blackouts, halt air traffic, shut off fuel supplies, or, even worse, contaminate the air, food, and water that we need to survive.

These scenarios paint a picture of economic crisis and physical chaos that are, unfortunately, all too real and all too possible right now.

Mr. Chairman, 85 percent of our Nation's critical infrastructure is controlled by the private sector, not by the government, a fact which underscores the reality that America's security, when it comes to defending against cyber attacks, largely depends on the security of our private networks.

The simple truth is that many in the private sector can't defend their networks or our critical infrastructure against these threats.

H.R. 1731 provides a solution for the rapid sharing of important cyber threat information to minimize or, in some cases, prevent the cyber attacks from being successful.

Through the Department of Homeland Security's National Cybersecurity Communication and Integration Center, or NCCIC, this bill will facilitate the sharing of cyber threat indicators between the private sector entities and between the private sector and the Federal Government.

With carefully crafted liability protections, private entities would finally be able to share cyber threat indicators with their private sector counterparts through the NCCIC without fear of liability.

The sharing of these cyber threat indicators, or, more specifically, the tools, techniques, and tactics used by cyber intruders, will arm those who protect our networks with the valuable information they need to fortify our defenses against future cyber attacks.

Because some have said that prior proposals didn't go far enough in safeguarding personal privacy, this bill addresses those concerns with robust privacy measures that ensure the protection of Americans' personal information and private data.

H.R. 1731 will provide protection only for sharing that is done voluntarily with the Department of Homeland Security's NCCIC, which is a civilian entity. It does not provide for or allow sharing with the NSA or the Department of Defense. In fact, this bill expressly prohibits information from being used for surveillance purposes.

This bill also limits the type of information that can be shared, and it requires the removal of all personally identifiable information, which is scrubbed out before the cyber threat indicators can be shared.

In short, this bill improves and increases protection for the personal privacy of Americans, which currently remains so vulnerable to malicious attacks from our cyber adversaries.

Mr. Chairman, the status quo isn't working when it comes to defending against cyber threats. The need to better secure Americans' personal information and better protect and safeguard our critical infrastructure is precisely what compels congressional action right now.

I strongly endorse the passage of this vital legislation, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it as well. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his leadership.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to be back on the floor today to support the House's second major piece of cybersecurity legislation in less than 24 hours.

As I said yesterday afternoon, it has been a long time coming, for sure. Cybersecurity has been a passion of mine for nearly a decade, and I am absolutely thrilled that, after years of hard work, the House, the Senate, and the President finally are beginning to see eye-to-eye.

The National Cybersecurity Protection Advancement Act has at its core three basic authorizations. First, it authorizes private entities and the DHS's NCCIC to share, for cybersecurity purposes only, cyber threat indicators that have been stripped of personal information and details. Second, it allows businesses to monitor their networks in search of cybersecurity risks. And third, it authorizes companies to deploy limited defensive measures to protect their systems from malicious actors.

Those three authorizations perfectly describe the information-sharing regime we so desperately need. Under the act, companies would collect information on threats, share it with their peers and with a civilian portal, and then use the indicators they have received to defend themselves.

Data are scrubbed of personal identifiable information before they are shared and after they are received by the NCCIC. Companies are offered limited liability protections for sharing information they gather in accordance with this bill.

This legislation also provides for the deployment of rapid automated sharing protocols—something DHS has been hard at work on with the STIX/TAXII program—and it expands last year's NCCIC authorization.

Mr. Chairman, I do believe that the liability protections contained in this bill may prove overly broad, and I certainly hope that we can address that point as the legislative process continues, particularly, hopefully, when we get to a conference committee on this issue.

Overall, though, it is a fine piece of legislation, and I wholeheartedly congratulate Chairman MCCAUL, Ranking Member THOMPSON, Subcommittee Chairman RATCLIFFE, and Ranking Member RICHMOND, as well as the other members of the committee and especially committee staff, for a job well done.

Information-sharing legislation, Mr. Chairman, is not a silver bullet by any means, but it will substantially improve our Nation's cyber defenses and get us to a place where our Nation is much more secure in cyberspace than where we are today.

Protecting critical infrastructure, of course, is among our chief concerns. That will allow for the type of information sharing that will get us to a much more secure place.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I hope that the Senate will quickly follow suit.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER), the vice chairman of the Homeland Security Committee.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to thank the distinguished chairman for yielding the time.

I think you can see by the comments that have been made thus far that we have a very bipartisan bill and a bipartisan approach. That is, through our committee, in no short measure because of the leadership that Chairman MCCAUL and, quite frankly, our ranking member have exhibited with the vision that they have had, these two gentlemen working together, and both the chair and the ranking member on our Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Mr. RATCLIFFE and Mr. RICHMOND as well.

This really has been a tremendous effort, and so important for our country. This particular issue, obviously, is certainly a bipartisan issue.

I say that, Mr. Chairman, because our Constitution makes the first and foremost responsibility of the Federal Government to provide for the common defense. That is actually in the preamble of our Constitution.

In our modern world, those who are seeking harm to our Nation, to our citizens, to our companies, can use many different means, including attacks over the Internet to attack our Nation.

Recent cyber attacks on U.S. companies like Sony, Target, and Home Depot not only harm these companies, Mr. Chairman, but they harm the American citizens who do business with them, putting their most personal private information at risk.

These threats, as are well known, are coming from nation-states like North Korea, Russia, Iran, China, as well as cyber criminals seeking to steal not only personal information but also intellectual property and sensitive government information.

In today's digital world, we have a duty to defend ourselves against cyber espionage, and the best way to combat these threats is to first recognize the threat and combine private and government resources and intelligence. Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what this bill does.

Mr. Chairman, I think this bill will help to facilitate greater cooperation and efforts to protect our Nation's digital infrastructure, including power grids and other utilities and other services that everyday Americans rely on each and every day.

By removing barriers, which will allow private companies to voluntarily share their cybersecurity threat information with the Department of Homeland Security and/or other companies, I think we will in a very large way improve earlier detection and mitigation of potential threats.

Additionally, this legislation that we are debating on the floor today ensures that personal identification information is removed prior to sharing information related to cyber threats and that very strong safeguards are in place to protect personal privacy and civil liberties.

Mr. Chairman, I point that out because that was something that was discussed a lot by practically every member of the Homeland Security Committee. We were all very, very united on that issue. And I think that is an important critical component, a point to make, and it is reflected in this legislation.

As Mr. RATCLIFFE mentioned just earlier, 85 percent of America's critical infrastructure is owned and operated by the private sector—think about that, 85 percent—which means that cyber threats pose as much of an economic threat to the United States as they do to our security, and we have a constitutional responsibility, as I pointed out in the beginning, to protect ourselves, to protect our Nation, to protect our American citizens from this ever-evolving threat.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would urge that all of my colleagues join me, join all of us on our committee, in voting in favor of this important legislation that will provide an additional line, and a very important line, of defense against cyber attacks.

The CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 178. An act to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY PROTECTION ADVANCEMENT ACT OF 2015

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my dear friend from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), and I commend him and the distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. MCCAUL, for their wonderful work on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot wait. America cannot wait for a cyber Pearl Harbor. This issue—cybersecurity—may be the most complex and difficult challenge we confront long term as a nation.

In the wired 21st century, the line between our physical world and cyberspace continues to blur with every aspect of our lives, from social interaction to commerce. Yet the remarkable gains that have accompanied an increasingly digital and connected society also have opened up new, unprecedented vulnerabilities that threaten to undermine this progress and cause great harm to our country's national security, critical infrastructure, and economy.

□ 0945

It is long overdue for Congress to modernize our cyber laws to address those vulnerabilities present in both public and private networks. The bills before us this week are a step in the right direction, and I am glad to support them, but they are a first step.

Information sharing alone does not inoculate or even defend us from cyber attacks. Indeed, in the critical three P's of enhancing cybersecurity—people, policies, and practices—the measures before us make improvements primarily to policy.

I commend the two committees for working in a bipartisan fashion to improve privacy and transparency protections. More is still needed to safeguard the civil liberties of our constituents.

Further, I hope that the broad liability protections provided by these bills will, in fact, be narrowed upon further consultation with the Senate. Cybersecurity must be a shared public-private responsibility, and that includes the expectation and requirement that our partners will, in fact, take reasonable actions.

Moving forward, I hope Congress will build on this effort to address the security of critical infrastructure, the vast majority of which, as has been already pointed out, is owned and operated by the private sector.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CONNOLLY. We also need to strengthen our Nation's cyber workforce, devise effective data breach notification policies, and bring about a wholesale cultural revolution so that society fully understands the critical importance of good cyber hygiene.

The bottom line is that our vulnerability in cyberspace demands that we take decisive action and take it now, but much like the tactics used in effective cybersecurity, we must recognize that enhancing our cyber defenses is an iterative process that requires continuous effort.

I congratulate the staffs and the leadership of the committee.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK), a member of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chairman, over the past 40 years, we have experienced advancements in information technology that literally have transformed business, education, government; it has even transformed our culture.

Information research that only a couple of decades ago would take days, months, maybe even years to accomplish is available, quite literally, at our fingertips and instantaneously.

Other aspects of our lives have also been shaped by this immediate access to information. Shopping, you can go shopping without ever going to a store. You can conduct financial transactions without ever going to a bank. You can even have access to entertainment without ever going to a theater.

These advancements in technology have not only transformed the way we access and store information, but it has also transformed the way we communicate.

No longer is instantaneous voice-to-voice communication only available through a phone call, but people around the world instantly connect with one another with a variety of methods, from email, instant text messaging, even video conferencing, and

this can be all down while you are on the move. You don't even have to be chained to a desk or in your business office.

Really, every aspect of our culture has been affected by the advancements in information technology, and, for the most part, our lives have been improved by these advancements.

As an IT professional, with 30-plus years' experience in both the military and private sector, I know firsthand the benefits of this instant access to endless amounts of information, but, on the other hand, I know all too well the vulnerabilities of these systems.

For the past 20 years, I have assisted businesses and governments to automate their operations and ensure they can access their networks anytime and from anywhere.

However, this global access to information requires a global interconnection of these systems. At almost any time during the day, Americans are connected to this global network through their phones, tablets, health monitors, and car navigation systems. Even home security systems are now connected to the Internet.

We have become dependent on this interconnection and so have the businesses and government entities that provide crucial services that we rely on, but as our dependence on technology has grown, so have our vulnerabilities.

Cyberspace is the new battleground, a battleground for a multitude of adversaries. Foreign nations, international terrorist organizations, and organized crime regularly target our citizens, businesses, and government.

Unlike traditional combat operations, cyber attackers don't require sophisticated weaponry to carry out their warfare. On the cyber battlefield, a single individual with a laptop computer can wreak havoc on business, the economy, even our critical infrastructure.

In the past several months, we have seen an increasing number of cyber attacks on national security systems and private company networks, breaching critical information. Earlier this year, Anthem BlueCross BlueShield's IT system was hacked by a highly sophisticated cyber attacker, obtaining personal employee and consumer data, including names, Social Security numbers, and mailing addresses.

An old adage among IT professionals states: There are two types of computer users, those who have been hacked and those who don't know that they have been hacked.

Today, this is truer than ever before. The incredible advancements made by the IT industry over the past three decades have been predominantly due to the competitive nature of the free market.

Without the overbearing constraints of government bureaucracy, oversight, and regulation, technology entrepreneurs have had the freedom to bring new innovations to the market with little cost and in record amount of time.

It is clear that our greatest advancements in technology have come from the private sector. That is why it is imperative that the government partner with the private sector to combat cyber attacks against our Nation.

The bill being debated in this House today, the National Cybersecurity Protection Advancement Act, puts in place a framework for voluntary partnership between government and the private sector to share information to protect against and combat against cyber attacks.

Through this voluntary sharing of critical information, businesses and government will voluntarily work together to respond to attacks and to prevent our enemies from corrupting networks, attacking our highly sensitive data systems, and compromising our personal privacy information.

While protecting individual privacy, this legislation also includes liability protections for the sharing of cyber threat information and thereby promotes information sharing that enhances the national cybersecurity posture.

We are no longer solely dealing with groups of hackers and terrorists, but individuals who target large networks, corrupt our database, and get hold of private material.

With today's evolving technology, we must make sure we are affirming individual privacy rights and safeguarding both government and private sector databases from cyberterrorism.

Protecting the civil liberties of the citizens of the United States is a top priority for me, and it should be for this Congress.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. LOUDERMILK. That is why I do support H.R. 1731, because it provides that framework of cooperation between the government and the private industry, and it provides the protections and liability protections our industries need.

We must have this bill. I do stand in support of it, and I thank you for allowing me this time to speak.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I have no additional requests for time, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD), a member of the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have spent almost 9 years, or a little bit over 9 years, as an undercover officer in the CIA. I chased al Qaeda, Taliban. Towards the end of my career, we started spending a lot more time focusing on cyber criminals, Russian organized crime, state sponsors of terror like Iran.

What this bill does is it helps in the protection of our digital infrastructure, both public and private, against this increasing threat.

I had the opportunity to help build a cybersecurity company, and seeing the threats to our infrastructure is great. This bill, which I rise in support of, is going to create that framework in order for the public and the private sector to work together against these threats.

When I was doing this for a living, you give me enough time, I am going to get in your network. We have to change our mindset and begin with the presumption of breach. How do we stop someone? How do we detect someone getting in our system? How do we corral them? And how do we kick them off? H.R. 1731 is a great start in doing this and making sure that we have the right protections.

We also are helping small- and medium-sized businesses with this bill, making sure that a lot of them have the resources that some larger businesses do and making sure that the Department of Homeland Security is providing as much information to them so that they can keep their company and their customers safe.

I would like to commend everyone on both sides of the aisle that is working to make this bill happen, and I look forward to seeing this get past this House and our colleagues in the Senate.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time. I am prepared to close if the gentleman from Mississippi is prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As someone involved in this issue for many years, I am not surprised by the overwhelming support that H.R. 1731 has garnered. Today, the House has the opportunity to join with the President and stakeholders from across our critical infrastructure sectors to make our Nation more secure.

By casting a vote in favor of H.R. 1731, you will be putting the Department of Homeland Security, the Federal civilian lead for cyber information sharing, on a path to fully partnering with the private sector to protect the U.S. networks.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, we are at a pivotal moment today and face a stark reality. The cyber threats to America have gone from bad to severe, and in many ways, we are flying blind.

The current level of cyber threat information sharing won't cut it. In the same way that we failed to stop terrorist attacks in the past, we are not connecting the dots well enough to prevent digital assaults against our Nation's networks.

The information we need to stop destructive breaches is held in silos, rather than being shared, preventing us from mounting an aggressive defense. In fact, the majority of cyber intrusions go unreported, leaving our networks vulnerable to the same attacks. When sharing does happen, it is often too little and too late.

If we don't pass this legislation to enhance cyber threat information sharing, we will be failing the American people and ceding more ground to our adversaries.

I hope, today, that we have the momentum to reverse the tide and to do what the American people expect of us, pass prosecurity, proprivacy legislation to better safeguard our public and private networks. Our inaction would be a permission slip for criminals, hacktivists, terrorists, and nation-states to continue to steal our data and to do our people harm.

I appreciate the collaboration from Members across the aisle and from other committees in developing this legislation. I would like to specifically commend, again, subcommittee Chairman RATCLIFFE for his work on this bill, as well as our minority counterparts, including Ranking Member THOMPSON and subcommittee Ranking Member RICHMOND for their joint work on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 1731.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I rise today to oppose H.R. 1731, the National Cybersecurity Protection Advancement Act of 2015. I commend Chairman MCCAUL and Ranking Member THOMPSON for crafting a cybersecurity bill that improves upon legislation this body has previously voted on, but ultimately I cannot support it in its current form.

As was the case with yesterday's bill, the Protecting Cyber Networks Act (H.R. 1560), I continue to have concerns about the ambiguous liability provisions in this legislation. Specifically, H.R. 1731 would grant immunity to companies for simply putting forth a "good faith" effort when reporting security threats to the Department of Homeland Security. Like H.R. 1560, companies would receive liability protection even if they fail to act on threat information in a timely manner. I was disappointed that Republicans did not allow a vote on any of the seven amendments offered to improve the liability provisions in this bill.

I strongly believe that we must take steps to protect against these cyber threats while not sacrificing our privacy and civil liberties. It is my hope that many of these murky liability provisions can be resolved in the Senate, but I cannot support this bill as it stands today.

THE CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Homeland Security, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill, for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114–12. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 1731

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 Cybersecurity Protection Advancement Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY AND COMMUNICATIONS INTEGRATION CENTER.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of the second section 226 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 148; relating to the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking "and" at the end;

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(5) the term 'cyber threat indicator' means technical information that is necessary to describe or identify—

"(A) a method for probing, monitoring, maintaining, or establishing network awareness of an information system for the purpose of discerning technical vulnerabilities of such information system, if such method is known or reasonably suspected of being associated with a known or suspected cybersecurity risk, including communications that reasonably appear to be transmitted for the purpose of gathering technical information related to a cybersecurity risk;

"(B) a method for defeating a technical or security control of an information system;

"(C) a technical vulnerability, including anomalous technical behavior that may become a vulnerability;

"(D) a method of causing a user with legitimate access to an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system to inadvertently enable the defeat of a technical or operational control;

"(E) a method for unauthorized remote identification of, access to, or use of an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system that is known or reasonably suspected of being associated with a known or suspected cybersecurity risk;

"(F) the actual or potential harm caused by a cybersecurity risk, including a description of the information exfiltrated as a result of a particular cybersecurity risk;

"(G) any other attribute of a cybersecurity risk that cannot be used to identify specific persons reasonably believed to be unrelated to such cybersecurity risk, if disclosure of such attribute is not otherwise prohibited by law; or

"(H) any combination of subparagraphs (A) through (G);

"(6) the term 'cybersecurity purpose' means the purpose of protecting an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system from a cybersecurity risk or incident;

"(7)(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term 'defensive measure' means an action, device, procedure, signature, technique, or other measure applied to an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system that detects, prevents, or mitigates a known or suspected cybersecurity risk or incident, or any attribute of hardware, software, process, or procedure that could enable or facilitate the defeat of a security control;

"(B) such term does not include a measure that destroys, renders unusable, or substantially harms an information system or data on an information system not belonging to—

"(i) the non-Federal entity, not including a State, local, or tribal government, operating such measure; or

"(ii) another Federal entity or non-Federal entity that is authorized to provide consent and has provided such consent to the non-Federal entity referred to in clause (i);

"(8) the term 'network awareness' means to scan, identify, acquire, monitor, log, or analyze information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system;

"(9)(A) the term 'private entity' means a non-Federal entity that is an individual or private group, organization, proprietorship, partnership, trust, cooperative, corporation, or other commercial or non-profit entity, including an officer, employee, or agent thereof;

"(B) such term includes a component of a State, local, or tribal government performing electric utility services;

"(10) the term 'security control' means the management, operational, and technical controls used to protect against an unauthorized effort to adversely affect the confidentially, integrity, or availability of an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system; and

"(11) the term 'sharing' means providing, receiving, and disseminating.".

(b) AMENDMENT.—Subparagraph (B) of subsection (d)(1) of such second section 226 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking "and local" and inserting ", local, and tribal";

(2) in clause (ii)—

(A) by inserting ", including information sharing and analysis centers" before the semicolon; and

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

(3) in clause (iii), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

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

"(iv) private entities.".

SEC. 3. INFORMATION SHARING STRUCTURE AND PROCESSES.

The second section 226 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 148; relating to the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking "a Federal civilian interface" and inserting "the lead Federal civilian interface"; and

(ii) by striking "cybersecurity risks," and inserting "cyber threat indicators, defensive measures, cybersecurity risks,";

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking "cybersecurity risks" and inserting "cyber threat indicators, defensive measures, cybersecurity risks,";

(C) in paragraph (5)(A), by striking "cybersecurity risks" and inserting "cyber threat indicators, defensive measures, cybersecurity risks,";

(D) in paragraph (6)—

(i) by striking "cybersecurity risks" and inserting "cyber threat indicators, defensive measures, cybersecurity risks,"; and

(ii) by striking "and" at the end;

(E) in paragraph (7)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking "and" at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

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

"(C) sharing cyber threat indicators and defensive measures;"; and

(F) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs

"(8) engaging with international partners, in consultation with other appropriate agencies, to—

"(A) collaborate on cyber threat indicators, defensive measures, and information related to cybersecurity risks and incidents; and

"(B) enhance the security and resilience of global cybersecurity;

"(9) sharing cyber threat indicators, defensive measures, and other information related to cybersecurity risks and incidents with Federal and non-Federal entities, including across sectors of critical infrastructure and with State and major urban area fusion centers, as appropriate;

"(10) promptly notifying the Secretary and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate of any significant violations of the policies and procedures specified in subsection (i)(6)(A);

''(11) promptly notifying non-Federal entities that have shared cyber threat indicators or defensive measures that are known or determined to be in error or in contravention of the requirements of this section; and

''(12) participating, as appropriate, in exercises run by the Department's National Exercise Program.'';

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (J); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraphs:

''(E) an entity that collaborates with State and local governments on cybersecurity risks and incidents, and has entered into a voluntary information sharing relationship with the Center;

''(F) a United States Computer Emergency Readiness Team that coordinates information related to cybersecurity risks and incidents, proactively and collaboratively addresses cybersecurity risks and incidents to the United States, collaboratively responds to cybersecurity risks and incidents, provides technical assistance, upon request, to information system owners and operators, and shares cyber threat indicators, defensive measures, analysis, or information related to cybersecurity risks and incidents in a timely manner;

''(G) the Industrial Control System Cyber Emergency Response Team that—

''(i) coordinates with industrial control systems owners and operators;

''(ii) provides training, upon request, to Federal entities and non-Federal entities on industrial control systems cybersecurity;

''(iii) collaboratively addresses cybersecurity risks and incidents to industrial control systems;

''(iv) provides technical assistance, upon request, to Federal entities and non-Federal entities relating to industrial control systems cybersecurity; and

''(v) shares cyber threat indicators, defensive measures, or information related to cybersecurity risks and incidents of industrial control systems in a timely fashion;

''(H) a National Coordinating Center for Communications that coordinates the protection, response, and recovery of emergency communications;

''(I) an entity that coordinates with small and medium-sized businesses; and'';

(3) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''cyber threat indicators, defensive measures, and'' before ''information'';

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''cyber threat indicators, defensive measures, and'' before ''information'';

(iii) in subparagraph (F), by striking ''cybersecurity risks'' and inserting ''cyber threat indicators, defensive measures, cybersecurity risks,'';

(iv) in subparagraph (F), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(v) in subparagraph (G), by striking ''cybersecurity risks'' and inserting ''cyber threat indicators, defensive measures, cybersecurity risks,''; and

(vi) by adding at the end the following:

''(H) the Center ensures that it shares information relating to cybersecurity risks and incidents with small and medium-sized businesses, as appropriate; and

''(I) the Center designates an agency contact for non-Federal entities;'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''cybersecurity risks'' and inserting ''cyber threat indicators, defensive measures, cybersecurity risks,''; and

(ii) by inserting ''or disclosure'' before the semicolon at the end; and

(C) in paragraph (3), by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', including by working with the Chief Privacy Officer appointed under section 222 to ensure that the Center follows the policies and procedures specified in subsection (i)(6)(A)''; and

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

''(g) RAPID AUTOMATED SHARING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary for Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection, in coordination with industry and other stakeholders, shall develop capabilities making use of existing information technology industry standards and best practices, as appropriate, that support and rapidly advance the development, adoption, and implementation of automated mechanisms for the timely sharing of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures to and from the Center and with each Federal agency designated as the 'Sector Specific Agency' for each critical infrastructure sector in accordance with subsection (h).

''(2) BIANNUAL REPORT.—The Under Secretary for Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a biannual report on the status and progress of the development of the capability described in paragraph (1). Such reports shall be required until such capability is fully implemented.

''(h) SECTOR SPECIFIC AGENCIES.—The Secretary, in collaboration with the relevant critical infrastructure sector and the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies, shall recognize the Federal agency designated as of March 25, 2015, as the 'Sector Specific Agency' for each critical infrastructure sector designated in the Department's National Infrastructure Protection Plan. If the designated Sector Specific Agency for a particular critical infrastructure sector is the Department, for purposes of this section, the Secretary is deemed to be the head of such Sector Specific Agency and shall carry out this section. The Secretary, in coordination with the heads of each such Sector Specific Agency, shall—

''(1) support the security and resilience actives of the relevant critical infrastructure sector in accordance with this section;

''(2) provide institutional knowledge, specialized expertise, and technical assistance upon request to the relevant critical infrastructure sector; and

''(3) support the timely sharing of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures with the relevant critical infrastructure sector with the Center in accordance with this section.

''(i) VOLUNTARY INFORMATION SHARING PROCEDURES.—

''(1) PROCEDURES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Center may enter into a voluntary information sharing relationship with any consenting non-Federal entity for the sharing of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures for cybersecurity purposes in accordance with this section. Nothing in this section may be construed to require any non-Federal entity to enter into any such information sharing relationship with the Center or any other entity. The Center may terminate a voluntary information sharing relationship under this subsection if the Center determines that the non-Federal entity with which the Center has entered into such a relationship has, after repeated notice, repeatedly violated the terms of this subsection.

''(B) NATIONAL SECURITY.—The Secretary may decline to enter into a voluntary information sharing relationship under this subsection if the Secretary determines that such is appropriate for national security.

''(2) VOLUNTARY INFORMATION SHARING RELATIONSHIPS.—A voluntary information sharing relationship under this subsection may be characterized as an agreement described in this paragraph.

''(A) STANDARD AGREEMENT.—For the use of a non-Federal entity, the Center shall make available a standard agreement, consistent with this section, on the Department's website.

''(B) NEGOTIATED AGREEMENT.—At the request of a non-Federal entity, and if determined appropriate by the Center, the Department shall negotiate a non-standard agreement, consistent with this section.

''(C) EXISTING AGREEMENTS.—An agreement between the Center and a non-Federal entity that is entered into before the date of the enactment of this section, or such an agreement that is in effect before such date, shall be deemed in compliance with the requirements of this subsection, notwithstanding any other provision or requirement of this subsection. An agreement under this subsection shall include the relevant privacy protections as in effect under the Cooperative Research and Development Agreement for Cybersecurity Information Sharing and Collaboration, as of December 31, 2014. Nothing in this subsection may be construed to require a non-Federal entity to enter into either a standard or negotiated agreement to be in compliance with this subsection.

''(3) INFORMATION SHARING AUTHORIZATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), and notwithstanding any other provision of law, a non-Federal entity may, for cybersecurity purposes, share cyber threat indicators or defensive measures obtained on its own information system, or on an information system of another Federal entity or non-Federal entity, upon written consent of such other Federal entity or non-Federal entity or an authorized representative of such other Federal entity or non-Federal entity in accordance with this section with—

''(i) another non-Federal entity; or

''(ii) the Center, as provided in this section.

''(B) LAWFUL RESTRICTION.—A non-Federal entity receiving a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure from another Federal entity or non-Federal entity shall comply with otherwise lawful restrictions placed on the sharing or use of such cyber threat indicator or defensive measure by the sharing Federal entity or non-Federal entity.

''(C) REMOVAL OF INFORMATION UNRELATED TO CYBERSECURITY RISKS OR INCIDENTS.—Federal entities and non-Federal entities shall, prior to such sharing, take reasonable efforts to remove information that can be used to identify specific persons and is reasonably believed at the time of sharing to be unrelated to a cybersecurity risks or incident and to safeguard information that can be used to identify specific persons from unintended disclosure or unauthorized access or acquisition.

''(D) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to—

''(i) limit or modify an existing information sharing relationship;

''(ii) prohibit a new information sharing relationship;

''(iii) require a new information sharing relationship between any non-Federal entity and a Federal entity;

''(iv) limit otherwise lawful activity; or

''(v) in any manner impact or modify procedures in existence as of the date of the enactment of this section for reporting known or suspected criminal activity to appropriate law enforcement authorities or for participating voluntarily or under legal requirement in an investigation.

''(E) COORDINATED VULNERABILITY DISCLOSURE.—The Under Secretary for Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection, in coordination with industry and other stakeholders, shall develop, publish, and adhere to policies and procedures for coordinating vulnerability disclosures, to the extent practicable, consistent with international standards in the information technology industry.

''(4) NETWORK AWARENESS AUTHORIZATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a non-Federal entity, not including a State, local, or tribal government, may, for cybersecurity purposes, conduct network awareness of—

''(i) an information system of such non-Federal entity to protect the rights or property of such non-Federal entity;

''(ii) an information system of another non-Federal entity, upon written consent of such other non-Federal entity for conducting such network awareness to protect the rights or property of such other non-Federal entity;

''(iii) an information system of a Federal entity, upon written consent of an authorized representative of such Federal entity for conducting such network awareness to protect the rights or property of such Federal entity; or

''(iv) information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system described in this subparagraph.

''(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to—

''(i) authorize conducting network awareness of an information system, or the use of any information obtained through such conducting of network awareness, other than as provided in this section; or

''(ii) limit otherwise lawful activity.

''(5) DEFENSIVE MEASURE AUTHORIZATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B) and notwithstanding any other provision of law, a non-Federal entity, not including a State, local, or tribal government, may, for cybersecurity purposes, operate a defensive measure that is applied to—

''(i) an information system of such non-Federal entity to protect the rights or property of such non-Federal entity;

''(ii) an information system of another non-Federal entity upon written consent of such other non-Federal entity for operation of such defensive measure to protect the rights or property of such other non-Federal entity;

''(iii) an information system of a Federal entity upon written consent of an authorized representative of such Federal entity for operation of such defensive measure to protect the rights or property of such Federal entity; or

''(iv) information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system described in this subparagraph.

''(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to—

''(i) authorize the use of a defensive measure other than as provided in this section; or

''(ii) limit otherwise lawful activity.

''(6) PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES PROTECTIONS.—

''(A) POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary for Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection shall, in coordination with the Chief Privacy Officer and the Chief Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Officer of the Department, establish and annually review policies and procedures governing the receipt, retention, use, and disclosure of cyber threat indicators, defensive measures, and information related to cybersecurity risks and incidents shared with the Center in accordance with this section. Such policies and procedures shall apply only to the Department, consistent with the need to protect information systems from cybersecurity risks and incidents and mitigate cybersecurity risks and incidents in a timely manner, and shall—

''(I) be consistent with the Department's Fair Information Practice Principles developed pursuant to section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the 'Privacy Act of 1974' or the 'Privacy Act'), and subject to the Secretary's authority under subsection (a)(2) of section 222 of this Act;

''(II) reasonably limit, to the greatest extent practicable, the receipt, retention, use, and disclosure of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures associated with specific persons that is not necessary, for cybersecurity purposes, to protect a network or information system from cybersecurity risks or mitigate cybersecurity risks and incidents in a timely manner;

''(III) minimize any impact on privacy and civil liberties;

''(IV) provide data integrity through the prompt removal and destruction of obsolete or erroneous names and personal information that is unrelated to the cybersecurity risk or incident information shared and retained by the Center in accordance with this section;

''(V) include requirements to safeguard cyber threat indicators and defensive measures retained by the Center, including information that is proprietary or business-sensitive that may be used to identify specific persons from unauthorized access or acquisition;

''(VI) protect the confidentiality of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures associated with specific persons to the greatest extent practicable; and

''(VII) ensure all relevant constitutional, legal, and privacy protections are observed.

''(ii) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section and annually thereafter, the Chief Privacy Officer and the Officer for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties of the Department, in consultation with the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board (established pursuant to section 1061 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee)), shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate the policies and procedures governing the sharing of cyber threat indicators, defensive measures, and information related to cybsersecurity risks and incidents described in clause (i) of subparagraph (A).

''(iii) PUBLIC NOTICE AND ACCESS.—The Under Secretary for Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection, in consultation with the Chief Privacy Officer and the Chief Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Officer of the Department, and the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board (established pursuant to section 1061 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee)), shall ensure there is public notice of, and access to, the policies and procedures governing the sharing of cyber threat indicators, defensive measures, and information related to cybersecurity risks and incidents.

''(iv) CONSULTATION.—The Under Secretary for Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection when establishing policies and procedures to support privacy and civil liberties may consult with the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

''(B) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Chief Privacy Officer of the Department, on an ongoing basis, shall—

''(i) monitor the implementation of the policies and procedures governing the sharing of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures established pursuant to clause (i) of subparagraph (A);

''(ii) regularly review and update privacy impact assessments, as appropriate, to ensure all relevant constitutional, legal, and privacy protections are being followed;

''(iii) work with the Under Secretary for Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection to carry out paragraphs (10) and (11) of subsection (c);

''(iv) annually submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report that contains a review of the effectiveness of such policies and procedures to protect privacy and civil liberties; and

''(v) ensure there are appropriate sanctions in place for officers, employees, or agents of the Department who intentionally or willfully conduct activities under this section in an unauthorized manner.

''(C) INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORT.—The Inspector General of the Department, in consultation with the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board and the Inspector General of each Federal agency that receives cyber threat indicators or defensive measures shared with the Center under this section, shall, not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this subsection and periodically thereafter submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report containing a review of the use of cybersecurity risk information shared with the Center, including the following:

''(i) A report on the receipt, use, and dissemination of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures that have been shared with Federal entities under this section.

''(ii) Information on the use by the Center of such information for a purpose other than a cybersecurity purpose.

''(iii) A review of the type of information shared with the Center under this section.

''(iv) A review of the actions taken by the Center based on such information.

''(v) The appropriate metrics that exist to determine the impact, if any, on privacy and civil liberties as a result of the sharing of such information with the Center.

''(vi) A list of other Federal agencies receiving such information.

''(vii) A review of the sharing of such information within the Federal Government to identify inappropriate stove piping of such information.

''(viii) Any recommendations of the Inspector General of the Department for improvements or modifications to information sharing under this section.

''(D) PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OFFICERS REPORT.—The Chief Privacy Officer and the Chief Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Officer of the Department, in consultation with the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, the Inspector General of the Department, and the senior privacy and civil liberties officer of each Federal agency that receives cyber threat indicators and defensive measures shared with the Center under this section, shall biennially submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report assessing the privacy and civil liberties impact of the activities under this paragraph. Each such report shall include any recommendations the Chief Privacy Officer and the Chief Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Officer of the Department consider appropriate to minimize or mitigate the privacy and civil liberties impact of the sharing of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures under this section.

''(E) FORM.—Each report required under paragraphs (C) and (D) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

''(7) USES AND PROTECTION OF INFORMATION.—

''(A) NON-FEDERAL ENTITIES.—A non-Federal entity, not including a State, local, or tribal government, that shares cyber threat indicators or defensive measures through the Center or otherwise under this section—

''(i) may use, retain, or further disclose such cyber threat indicators or defensive measures solely for cybersecurity purposes;

''(ii) shall, prior to such sharing, take reasonable efforts to remove information that can be used to identify specific persons and is reasonably believed at the time of sharing to be unrelated to a cybersecurity risk or incident, and to safeguard information that can be used to identify specific persons from unintended disclosure or unauthorized access or acquisition;

''(iii) shall comply with appropriate restrictions that a Federal entity or non-Federal entity places on the subsequent disclosure or retention of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures that it discloses to other Federal entities or non-Federal entities;

''(iv) shall be deemed to have voluntarily shared such cyber threat indicators or defensive measures;

''(v) shall implement and utilize a security control to protect against unauthorized access to or acquisition of such cyber threat indicators or defensive measures; and

''(vi) may not use such information to gain an unfair competitive advantage to the detriment of any non-Federal entity.

''(B) FEDERAL ENTITIES.—

''(i) USES OF INFORMATION.—A Federal entity that receives cyber threat indicators or defensive measures shared through the Center or otherwise under this section from another Federal entity or a non-Federal entity—

''(I) may use, retain, or further disclose such cyber threat indicators or defensive measures solely for cybersecurity purposes;

''(II) shall, prior to such sharing, take reasonable efforts to remove information that can be used to identify specific persons and is reasonably believed at the time of sharing to be unrelated to a cybersecurity risk or incident, and to safeguard information that can be used to identify specific persons from unintended disclosure or unauthorized access or acquisition;

''(III) shall be deemed to have voluntarily shared such cyber threat indicators or defensive measures;

''(IV) shall implement and utilize a security control to protect against unauthorized access to or acquisition of such cyber threat indicators or defensive measures; and

''(V) may not use such cyber threat indicators or defensive measures to engage in surveillance or other collection activities for the purpose of tracking an individual's personally identifiable information.

''(ii) PROTECTIONS FOR INFORMATION.—The cyber threat indicators and defensive measures referred to in clause (i)—

''(I) are exempt from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, and withheld, without discretion, from the public under subsection (b)(3)(B) of such section;

''(II) may not be used by the Federal Government for regulatory purposes;

''(III) may not constitute a waiver of any applicable privilege or protection provided by law, including trade secret protection;

''(IV) shall be considered the commercial, financial, and proprietary information of the non-Federal entity referred to in clause (i) when so designated by such non-Federal entity; and

''(V) may not be subject to a rule of any Federal entity or any judicial doctrine regarding ex parte communications with a decisionmaking official.

''(C) STATE, LOCAL, OR TRIBAL GOVERNMENT.—

''(i) USES OF INFORMATION.—A State, local, or tribal government that receives cyber threat indicators or defensive measures from the Center from a Federal entity or a non-Federal entity—

''(I) may use, retain, or further disclose such cyber threat indicators or defensive measures solely for cybersecurity purposes;

''(II) shall, prior to such sharing, take reasonable efforts to remove information that can be used to identify specific persons and is reasonably believed at the time of sharing to be unrelated to a cybersecurity risk or incident, and to safeguard information that can be used to identify specific persons from unintended disclosure or unauthorized access or acquisition;

''(III) shall consider such information the commercial, financial, and proprietary information of such Federal entity or non-Federal entity if so designated by such Federal entity or non-Federal entity;

''(IV) shall be deemed to have voluntarily shared such cyber threat indicators or defensive measures; and

''(V) shall implement and utilize a security control to protect against unauthorized access to or acquisition of such cyber threat indicators or defensive measures.

''(ii) PROTECTIONS FOR INFORMATION.—The cyber threat indicators and defensive measures referred to in clause (i)—

''(I) shall be exempt from disclosure under any State, local, or tribal law or regulation that requires public disclosure of information or records by a public or quasi-public entity; and

''(II) may not be used by any State, local, or tribal government to regulate a lawful activity of a non-Federal entity.

''(8) LIABILITY EXEMPTIONS.—

''(A) NETWORK AWARENESS.—No cause of action shall lie or be maintained in any court, and such action shall be promptly dismissed, against any non-Federal entity that, for cybersecurity purposes, conducts network awareness under paragraph (4), if such network awareness is conducted in accordance with such paragraph and this section.

''(B) INFORMATION SHARING.—No cause of action shall lie or be maintained in any court, and such action shall be promptly dismissed, against any non-Federal entity that, for cybersecurity purposes, shares cyber threat indicators or defensive measures under paragraph (3), or fails to act based on such sharing, if such sharing is conducted in accordance with such paragraph and this section.

''(C) WILLFUL MISCONDUCT.—

''(i) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to—

''(I) require dismissal of a cause of action against a non-Federal entity that has engaged in willful misconduct in the course of conducting activities authorized by this section; or

''(II) undermine or limit the availability of otherwise applicable common law or statutory defenses.

''(ii) PROOF OF WILLFUL MISCONDUCT.—In any action claiming that subparagraph (A) or (B) does not apply due to willful misconduct described in clause (i), the plaintiff shall have the burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence the willful misconduct by each non-Federal entity subject to such claim and that such willful misconduct proximately caused injury to the plaintiff.

''(iii) WILLFUL MISCONDUCT DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term 'willful misconduct' means an act or omission that is taken—

''(I) intentionally to achieve a wrongful purpose;

''(II) knowingly without legal or factual justification; and

''(III) in disregard of a known or obvious risk that is so great as to make it highly probable that the harm will outweigh the benefit.

''(D) EXCLUSION.—The term 'non-Federal entity' as used in this paragraph shall not include a State, local, or tribal government.

''(9) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT LIABILITY FOR VIOLATIONS OF RESTRICTIONS ON THE USE AND PROTECTION OF VOLUNTARILY SHARED INFORMATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a department or agency of the Federal Government intentionally or willfully violates the restrictions specified in paragraph (3), (6), or (7)(B) on the use and protection of voluntarily shared cyber threat indicators or defensive measures, or any other provision of this section, the Federal Government shall be liable to a person injured by such violation in an amount equal to the sum of—

''(i) the actual damages sustained by such person as a result of such violation or $1,000, whichever is greater; and

''(ii) reasonable attorney fees as determined by the court and other litigation costs reasonably occurred in any case under this subsection in which the complainant has substantially prevailed.

''(B) VENUE.—An action to enforce liability under this subsection may be brought in the district court of the United States in—

''(i) the district in which the complainant resides;

''(ii) the district in which the principal place of business of the complainant is located;

''(iii) the district in which the department or agency of the Federal Government that disclosed the information is located; or

''(iv) the District of Columbia.

''(C) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—No action shall lie under this subsection unless such action is commenced not later than two years after the date of the violation of any restriction specified in paragraph (3), (6), or 7(B), or any other provision of this section, that is the basis for such action.

''(D) EXCLUSIVE CAUSE OF ACTION.—A cause of action under this subsection shall be the exclusive means available to a complainant seeking a remedy for a violation of any restriction specified in paragraph (3), (6), or 7(B) or any other provision of this section.

''(10) ANTI-TRUST EXEMPTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), it shall not be considered a violation of any provision of antitrust laws for two or more non-Federal entities to share a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure, or assistance relating to the prevention, investigation, or mitigation of a cybersecurity risk or incident, for cybersecurity purposes under this Act.

''(B) APPLICABILITY.—Subparagraph (A) shall apply only to information that is shared or assistance that is provided in order to assist with—

''(i) facilitating the prevention, investigation, or mitigation of a cybersecurity risk or incident to an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system; or

''(ii) communicating or disclosing a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure to help prevent, investigate, or mitigate the effect of a cybersecurity risk or incident to an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system.

''(C) PROHIBITED CONDUCT.—Nothing in this section may be construed to permit price-fixing, allocating a market between competitors, monopolizing or attempting to monopolize a market, or exchanges of price or cost information, customer lists, or information regarding future competitive planning.

''(11) CONSTRUCTION AND PREEMPTION.—

''(A) OTHERWISE LAWFUL DISCLOSURES.—Nothing in this section may be construed to limit or prohibit otherwise lawful disclosures of communications, records, or other information, including reporting of known or suspected criminal activity or participating voluntarily or under legal requirement in an investigation, by a non-Federal to any other non-Federal entity or Federal entity under this section.

''(B) WHISTLE BLOWER PROTECTIONS.—Nothing in this section may be construed to prohibit or limit the disclosure of information protected under section 2302(b)(8) of title 5, United States Code (governing disclosures of illegality, waste, fraud, abuse, or public health or safety threats), section 7211 of title 5, United States Code (governing disclosures to Congress), section 1034 of title 10, United States Code (governing disclosure to Congress by members of the military), section 1104 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3234) (governing disclosure by employees of elements of the intelligence community), or any similar provision of Federal or State law.

''(C) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS.—Nothing in this section may be construed to affect any requirement under any other provision of law for a non-Federal entity to provide information to a Federal entity.

''(D) PRESERVATION OF CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATIONS AND RIGHTS.—Nothing in this section may be construed to—

''(i) amend, repeal, or supersede any current or future contractual agreement, terms of service agreement, or other contractual relationship between any non-Federal entities, or between any non-Federal entity and a Federal entity; or

''(ii) abrogate trade secret or intellectual property rights of any non-Federal entity or Federal entity.

''(E) ANTI-TASKING RESTRICTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to permit a Federal entity to—

''(i) require a non-Federal entity to provide information to a Federal entity;

''(ii) condition the sharing of cyber threat indicators or defensive measures with a non-Federal entity on such non-Federal entity's provision of cyber threat indicators or defensive measures to a Federal entity; or

''(iii) condition the award of any Federal grant, contract, or purchase on the sharing of cyber threat indicators or defensive measures with a Federal entity.

''(F) NO LIABILITY FOR NON-PARTICIPATION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to subject any non-Federal entity to liability for choosing to not engage in the voluntary activities authorized under this section.

''(G) USE AND RETENTION OF INFORMATION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to authorize, or to modify any existing authority of, a department or agency of the Federal Government to retain or use any information shared under this section for any use other than permitted in this section.

''(H) VOLUNTARY SHARING.—Nothing in this section may be construed to restrict or condition a non-Federal entity from sharing, for cybersecurity purposes, cyber threat indicators, defensive measures, or information related to cybersecurity risks or incidents with any other non-Federal entity, and nothing in this section may be construed as requiring any non-Federal entity to share cyber threat indicators, defensive measures, or information related to cybersecurity risks or incidents with the Center.

''(I) FEDERAL PREEMPTION.—This section supersedes any statute or other provision of law of a State or political subdivision of a State that restricts or otherwise expressly regulates an activity authorized under this section.

''(j) DIRECT REPORTING.—The Secretary shall develop policies and procedures for direct reporting to the Secretary by the Director of the Center regarding significant cybersecurity risks and incidents.

''(k) ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Secretary shall build upon existing mechanisms to promote a national awareness effort to educate the general public on the importance of securing information systems.

''(l) REPORTS ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection and periodically thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the range of efforts underway to bolster cybersecurity collaboration with relevant international partners in accordance with subsection (c)(8).

''(m) OUTREACH.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary for Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection, shall—

''(1) disseminate to the public information about how to voluntarily share cyber threat indicators and defensive measures with the Center; and

''(2) enhance outreach to critical infrastructure owners and operators for purposes of such sharing.''.

SEC. 4. INFORMATION SHARING AND ANALYSIS ORGANIZATIONS.

Section 212 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 131) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by inserting ''information related to cybersecurity risks and incidents and'' after ''critical infrastructure information''; and

(ii) by striking ''related to critical infrastructure'' and inserting ''related to cybersecurity risks, incidents, critical infrastructure, and'';

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking ''disclosing critical infrastructure information'' and inserting ''disclosing cybersecurity risks, incidents, and critical infrastructure information''; and

(ii) by striking ''related to critical infrastructure or'' and inserting ''related to cybersecurity risks, incidents, critical infrastructure, or'' and

(C) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''disseminating critical infrastructure information'' and inserting ''disseminating cybersecurity risks, incidents, and critical infrastructure information''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(8) CYBERSECURITY RISK; INCIDENT.—The terms 'cybersecurity risk' and 'incident' have the meanings given such terms in the second section 226 (relating to the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center).''.

SEC. 5. STREAMLINING OF DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY CYBERSECURITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION ORGANIZATION.

(a) CYBERSECURITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION.—The National Protection and Programs Directorate of the Department of Homeland Security shall, after the date of the enactment of this Act, be known and designated as the ''Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection''. Any reference to the National Protection and Programs Directorate of the Department in any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be deemed to be a reference to the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection of the Department.

(b) SENIOR LEADERSHIP OF CYBERSECURITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 103 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 113) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by amending subparagraph (H) to read as follows:

''(H) An Under Secretary for Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection.''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

''(K) A Deputy Under Secretary for Cybersecurity.

''(L) A Deputy Under Secretary for Infrastructure Protection.''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARIES.—The Deputy Under Secretaries referred to in subparagraphs (K) and (L) of paragraph (1) shall be appointed by the President without the advice and consent of the Senate.''.

(2) CONTINUATION IN OFFICE.—The individuals who hold the positions referred in subparagraphs (H), (K), and (L) of paragraph (1) of section 103(a) the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (as amended and added by paragraph (1) of this subsection) as of the date of the enactment of this Act may continue to hold such positions.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary for Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection of the Department of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the feasibility of becoming an operational component, including an analysis of alternatives, and if a determination is rendered that becoming an operational component is the best option for achieving the mission of Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection, a legislative proposal and implementation plan for becoming such an operational component. Such report shall also include plans to more effectively carry out the cybersecurity mission of Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection, including expediting information sharing agreements.

SEC. 6. CYBER INCIDENT RESPONSE PLANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 227 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 149) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking ''**PLAN**'' and inserting ''**PLANS**'';

(2) by striking ''The Under Secretary appointed under section 103(a)(1)(H) shall'' and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary for Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection shall''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(b) UPDATES TO THE CYBER INCIDENT ANNEX TO THE NATIONAL RESPONSE FRAMEWORK.—The Secretary, in coordination with the heads of other appropriate Federal departments and agencies, and in accordance with the National Cybersecurity Incident Response Plan required under subsection (a), shall regularly update, maintain, and exercise the Cyber Incident Annex to the National Response Framework of the Department.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by amending the item relating to section 227 to read as follows:

''Sec. 227. Cyber incident response plans.''.

SEC. 7. SECURITY AND RESILIENCY OF PUBLIC SAFETY COMMUNICATIONS; CYBERSECURITY AWARENESS CAMPAIGN.

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

''SEC. 230. SECURITY AND RESILIENCY OF PUBLIC SAFETY COMMUNICATIONS.

''The National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center, in coordination with the Office of Emergency Communications of the Department, shall assess and evaluate consequence, vulnerability, and threat information regarding cyber incidents to public safety communications to help facilitate continuous improvements to the security and resiliency of such communications.

''SEC. 231. CYBERSECURITY AWARENESS CAMPAIGN.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary for Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection shall develop and implement an ongoing and comprehensive cybersecurity awareness campaign regarding cybersecurity risks and voluntary best practices for mitigating and responding to such risks. Such campaign shall, at a minimum, publish and disseminate, on an ongoing basis, the following:

''(1) Public service announcements targeted at improving awareness among State, local, and tribal governments, the private sector, academia, and stakeholders in specific audiences, including the elderly, students, small businesses, members of the Armed Forces, and veterans.

''(2) Vendor and technology-neutral voluntary best practices information.

''(b) CONSULTATION.—The Under Secretary for Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection shall consult with a wide range of stakeholders in government, industry, academia, and the non-profit community in carrying out this section.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 226 (relating to cybersecurity recruitment and retention) the following new items:

''Sec. 230. Security and resiliency of public safety communications.

''Sec. 231. Cybersecurity awareness campaign.''.

SEC. 8. CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) STRATEGIC PLAN; PUBLIC-PRIVATE CONSORTIUMS.—Title III of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 318. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY FOR CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary for Science and Technology, shall submit to

Congress a strategic plan to guide the overall direction of Federal physical security and cybersecurity technology research and development efforts for protecting critical infrastructure, including against all threats. Such plan shall be updated and submitted to Congress every two years.

''(b) CONTENTS OF PLAN.—The strategic plan, including biennial updates, required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

''(1) An identification of critical infrastructure security risks and any associated security technology gaps, that are developed following—

''(A) consultation with stakeholders, including critical infrastructure Sector Coordinating Councils; and

''(B) performance by the Department of a risk and gap analysis that considers information received in such consultations.

''(2) A set of critical infrastructure security technology needs that—

''(A) is prioritized based on the risks and gaps identified under paragraph (1);

''(B) emphasizes research and development of technologies that need to be accelerated due to rapidly evolving threats or rapidly advancing infrastructure technology; and

''(C) includes research, development, and acquisition roadmaps with clearly defined objectives, goals, and measures.

''(3) An identification of laboratories, facilities, modeling, and simulation capabilities that will be required to support the research, development, demonstration, testing, evaluation, and acquisition of the security technologies described in paragraph (2).

''(4) An identification of current and planned programmatic initiatives for fostering the rapid advancement and deployment of security technologies for critical infrastructure protection, including a consideration of opportunities for public-private partnerships, intragovernment collaboration, university centers of excellence, and national laboratory technology transfer.

''(5) A description of progress made with respect to each critical infrastructure security risk, associated security technology gap, and critical infrastructure technology need identified in the preceding strategic plan required under subsection (a).

''(c) COORDINATION.—In carrying out this section, the Under Secretary for Science and Technology shall coordinate with the Under Secretary for the National Protection and Programs Directorate.

''(d) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out this section, the Under Secretary for Science and Technology shall consult with—

''(1) critical infrastructure Sector Coordinating Councils;

''(2) to the extent practicable, subject matter experts on critical infrastructure protection from universities, colleges, national laboratories, and private industry;

''(3) the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies that conduct research and development relating to critical infrastructure protection; and

''(4) State, local, and tribal governments, as appropriate.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 317 the following new item:

''Sec. 318. Research and development strategy for critical infrastructure protection.''.

SEC. 9. REPORT ON REDUCING CYBERSECURITY RISKS IN DHS DATA CENTERS.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the feasibility of the Department of Homeland Security creating an environment for the reduction in cybersecurity risks in Department data centers, including by increasing compartmentalization between systems, and providing a mix of security controls between such compartments.

SEC. 10. ASSESSMENT.

Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report that contains an assessment of the implementation by the Secretary of Homeland Security of this Act and the amendments made by this Act and, to the extent practicable, findings regarding increases in the sharing of cyber threat indicators, defensive measures, and information relating to cybersecurity risks and incidents at the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center and throughout the United States.

SEC. 11. CONSULTATION.

The Under Secretary for Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection shall produce a report on the feasibility of creating a risk-informed prioritization plan should multiple critical infrastructures experience cyber incidents simultaneously.

SEC. 12. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

The Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security shall review the operations of the United States Computer Emergency Readiness Team (US-CERT) and the Industrial Control Systems Cyber Emergency Response Team (ICS-CERT) to assess the capacity to provide technical assistance to non-Federal entities and to adequately respond to potential increases in requests for technical assistance.

SEC. 13. PROHIBITION ON NEW REGULATORY AUTHORITY.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act may be construed to grant the Secretary of Homeland Security any authority to promulgate regulations or set standards relating to the cybersecurity of non-Federal entities, not including State, local, and tribal governments, that was not in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 14. SUNSET.

Any requirements for reports required by this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall terminate on the date that is seven years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 15. PROHIBITION ON NEW FUNDING.

No funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act. This Act and such amendments shall be carried out using amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for such purposes.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 114–88. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

□ 1000

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. MCCAUL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 114–88.

Mr. MCCAUL. 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:

In section 2, strike the following:

(a) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of the second section 226

In section 2, insert before subsection (b), the following:

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of the second section 226

In section 2(a), redesignate proposed subparagraphs (A) through (C) as proposed paragraphs (1) through (3), respectively, and move such provisions two ems to the left.

Page 3, line 23, insert '', or the purpose of identifying the source of a cybersecurity risk or incident'' before the semicolon at the end.

Page 5, beginning line 6, strike ''electric utility services'' and insert ''utility services or an entity performing utility services''.

Page 5, line 15, insert ''(including all conjugations thereof)'' before ''means''.

Page 5, line 16, insert ''(including all conjugations of each of such terms)'' before the first period.

Page 6, beginning line 2, strike ''striking the period at the end and inserting '; and' '' and insert ''inserting 'and' after the semicolon at the end''.

Page 6, line 6, strike the first period and insert a semicolon.

Page 7, line 20, insert a colon after ''paragraphs''.

Page 8, line 23, strike ''(d)'' and insert ''(d)(1)''.

Page 11, line 6, insert ''the first place it appears'' before the semicolon.

Page 14, line 25, insert '', at the sole and unreviewable discretion of the Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary for Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection,'' after ''subsection''.

Page 15, line 8, insert '', at the sole and unreviewable discretion of the Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary for Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection,'' after ''section''.

Page 15, line 21, insert ''at the sole and unreviewable discretion of the Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary for Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection,'' after ''Center,''.

Page 17, line 20, insert ''or exclude'' after ''remove''.

Page 17, line 23, strike ''risks'' and insert ''risk''.

Page 23, line 23, insert '', or'' before ''that''.

Page 29, line 25, strike ''paragraphs'' and insert ''subparagraphs''.

Page 30, line 15, insert ''or exclude'' after ''remove''.

Page 32, line 4, insert ''or exclude'' after ''remove''.

Page 33, line 2, insert '', except for purposes authorized in this section'' before the period at the end.

Page 34, line 16, insert ''or exclude'' after ''remove''.

Page 36, line 18, insert ''in good faith'' before ''fails''.

Page 39, beginning line 19, strike ''of the violation of any restriction specified in paragraph (3), (6), or 7(B), or any other provision of this section, that is the basis for such action'' and insert ''on which the cause of action arises''.

Page 41, strike lines 5 through 11.

Page 44, line 19, strike ''(I)'' and insert ''(J)''.

Page 44, beginning line 19, insert the following:

''(I) PROHIBITED CONDUCT.—Nothing in this section may be construed to permit price-fixing, allocating a market between competitors, monopolizing or attempting to monopolize a market, or exchanges of price or cost information, customer lists, or information regarding future competitive planning.''.

Page 46, line 7, insert ''and'' before ''information''.

Page 48, lines 9 through 10, move the proposed subparagraph (H) two ems to the left.

Page 48, lines 13 through 16, move the proposed subparagraphs (K) and (L) two ems to the left.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 212, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

The manager's amendment to H.R. 1731 further clarifies the intent of several important provisions of the bill. These modifications were made in consultation with privacy groups, industry leaders, and both the House Intelligence Committee and House Judiciary Committee.

Among the more notable changes made are: the expansion of protections for personally identifiable information to include the ''exclusion'' of information and not just the ''removal'' of information, a modification to clarify that the use of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures is limited to the purposes authorized in the bill only, and clarifying language to say that identifying the origin of a cybersecurity threat is a valid ''cybersecurity purpose.''

Each of these changes, along with the others made in the manager's amendment, strengthen the bill and further support the committee's mission to help protect America's networks and systems from cyber attacks while, at the same time, ensuring that an individual's private information enjoys robust protection as well.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the McCaul amendment makes several technical and clarifying changes to H.R. 1731 to reflect feedback from committee Democrats, Department of Homeland Security, and stakeholders.

Last week during committee consideration, the gentleman from Louisiana, Representative RICHMOND, offered an amendment to refine the 2-year statute of limitations on citizen suits against the Federal Government for privacy violations. The underlying bill requires the clock to toll from the date when the government violated the citizen's privacy. The likelihood that a citizen will know the exact date when the personal information was mishandled is pretty remote. As such, Democrats argue that the provision was tantamount to giving the Federal Government a free pass to violate the privacy protections under this act.

I am pleased to see that the gentleman from Texas, Chairman MCCAUL, has listened to Democrats' concerns and has the amendment adjust the language, though it could use further refinement.

I am also pleased that the amendment clarifies that all public utilities—not just electric utilities—are covered under this bill.

The changes to the underlying bill that this amendment would make are in line with our shared goals of bolstering cybersecurity and improving the quality of information that the private sector receives about timely cyber threats. Accordingly, I support the McCaul amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. RATCLIFFE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 114–88.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) to offer amendment No. 2.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, line 12, insert the following (and redesignate subsequent subparagraphs accordingly):

(A) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

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

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 212, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of amendment No. 2. This is a bipartisan amendment that will help clarify language in both the Homeland Security Act and this bill.

This amendment narrows the definition of the word ''incident'' to ensure that a cybersecurity incident is limited to actions taken against an information system or information stored on that system. This amendment, Mr. Chairman, ensures that information shared with the NCCIC or other private entities is limited to threats and actions against information systems and information stored on that system.

Mr. MCCAUL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RATCLIFFE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I support this bipartisan language that will help clarify language in both the Homeland Security Act and this bill by narrowing the definition of the word ''incident'' to ensure that a cybersecurity incident is limited to actions taken against an information system or information stored on that system.

This amendment ensures that information shared with the NCCIC or other private entities is limited to threats to and actions against information systems and information stored on that system.

I also want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for being a leader on this issue and for calling this loophole, if you will, to the attention of the committee to make this a stronger bill on this floor.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment to make an important change to a definition in the act and the law.

A strength of this bill acknowledged by some in the privacy community are the limitations that the bill places on the authorizations for sharing and network monitoring. These activities can only be carried out for a ''cybersecurity purpose.'' Among other things, this limitation is intended to ensure that information is not shared for surveillance or law enforcement purposes and the authorization for network monitoring is not exploited by an overzealous employer who wants to track his employees' every move on the Internet.

However, because of the broadness of a term within the definition of ''cybersecurity purpose,'' it came to light that the language could be interpreted far more expansively than intended.

I commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE), who is now offering the amendment, for tightening up the definition of ''incident'' in this bill and the underlying law.

We use our smartphones, tablets, and computers for all manner of things, from setting up doctor appointments to buying groceries or ordering books. It is important that, even as we seek to bolster cybersecurity, we do not lose sight of the need to protect the privacy interest of ordinary Americans. That is why I support the Ratcliffe amendment. It will ensure that, in practice, the activities undertaken in this bill are limited to protecting networks and the data on them.

I urge an ''aye'' vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 114–88.

Mr. LANGEVIN. 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:

In section 2(a)(1), redesignate subparagraphs (A) and (B) as subparagraphs (B) and (C), respectively.

In section 2(a)(1), insert before subparagraph (B), as so redesignated, the following:

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

''(1)(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term 'cybersecurity risk' means threats to and vulnerabilities of information or information systems and any related consequences caused by or resulting from unauthorized access, use, disclosure, degradation, disruption, modification, or destruction of such information or information systems, including such related consequences caused by an act of terrorism;

''(B) such term does not include any action that solely involves a violation of a consumer term of service or a consumer licensing agreement;''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 212, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I am offering makes a fine bill even better. It clarifies that the definition of ''cybersecurity risk''—and, by extension, the definition of ''cybersecurity purpose''—does not apply to actions that solely involve the violation of consumer terms of service or consumer licensing agreements.

This is a small but important change that will protect Americans' privacy and ensure that white hat security researchers are not inadvertently monitored. The cyber threat data that will help turn the tide against malicious actors are security vulnerabilities, attack vectors, and indicators of compromise. What will not help is knowing that a consumer has violated a Byzantine terms of service agreement or that a researcher is testing software for exploitable bugs that he or she will then share with the security community.

While not every terms of service violation is well-meaning or born of ignorance, there is no doubt in my mind that the existing body of contract law is more than capable of facilitating dispute resolution in these cases.

The exclusion my amendment proposes is not new to this floor. Both the 2012 and the 2013 versions of CISPA, which I worked on very closely while a member of the House Intelligence Committee, contained similar exclusions, and the Protecting Cyber Networks Act that passed the House yesterday also includes this language. The amendment also makes clear that the exclusion applies only for actions that solely violate terms of service. An action that disrupted an information system in addition to being a violation of terms of service would still constitute a cybersecurity risk.

Trust is the fundamental element of any information-sharing regime. The bill that we are considering is designed to build that trust by limiting the use of information shared to cybersecurity purposes and ensuring that indicators are scrubbed of any personal information before sharing. My amendment strengthens that trust by making it clear that our focus is on the many real cyber threats out there, not on consumers and researchers.

I would like to again express my deep thanks to the chairman of the committee, Mr. MCCAUL, for his steadfast dedication on the issue of cybersecurity, and I would like to particularly thank his staff for working with us on this amendment.

The chairman and the Democratic ranking member, Mr. THOMPSON, have done this body proud, and I certainly urge the adoption of my amendment and the underlying bill.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, though I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment, which would clarify that the term ''cybersecurity risk'' does not apply to actions solely involving violations of consumer terms of service or consumer licensing agreements.

This amendment will protect consumers from having information shared with the government due to a minor or unwitting violation of the terms of service, such as a violation of one's Apple iTunes agreement, which my teenage daughters would appreciate.

This amendment and this bill are meant to enhance the sharing of cybersecurity information within the government and the public. In order to promote voluntary sharing, the public needs to feel confident that the sole act of violating a terms of service or licensing agreement won't be shared with the NCCIC and that this bill is not a tool to enforce violations regarding terms of service or licensing agreements. These violations have robust legal remedies in place and should be handled through those channels.

I think this strengthens the bill, and I appreciate the gentleman's amendment to do so. I support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the chairman for his kind words of support.

As many in this Chamber know, Chairman MCCAUL and I have a long history on the issue of cybersecurity, from our time as co-chairs of the Commission on Cybersecurity for the 44th Presidency to our current roles as the cofounders and co-chairs of the Congressional Cybersecurity Caucus, along with a variety of other collaborations that he and I have engaged in.

□ 1015

Mr. MCCAUL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MCCAUL. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would just like to highlight for all my colleagues the great work that we do in the Cybersecurity Caucus with my good friend and colleague from Rhode Island. The briefings we host every few weeks bring some of the brightest minds in both government and the private sector to the Hill to educate Members and staff on this national security issue.

When we first started the caucus in 2008, cyber was a topic very few Members knew anything about. It wasn't really cool to know about cybersecurity. We have made great progress, I believe, the gentleman and I, since that time in raising the level of debate, engagement, awareness, and education with the Members on this critical subject.

I hope that the Members and the staff will continue to take advantage of the opportunities afforded by our caucus as our lives become even more interconnected in cyberspace. I think this issue has never been more relevant and more of a threat, quite frankly, than it is today.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the chairman.

I am fond of saying that cybersecurity is not a problem to be solved but a challenge to be managed. I thank the chairman for his collaboration and his leadership on this issue, along with Ranking Member THOMPSON. I certainly look forward to the caucus' continuing contributions to the discussion.

Ms. LOFGREN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEVIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LOFGREN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just like to thank him for his amendment. It prevents this bill from becoming like the CFAA, which treats noncriminal activity as something wrong. This and the Katko-Lofgren amendment that preceded it narrow the bill, and both deserve support. I thank the gentleman for yielding and his amendment.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentlewoman for her comments and for her support.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 114–88.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. 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 10, line 11, strike ''and'' at the end.

Page 10, line 16, insert ''and'' after the semicolon.

Page 10, beginning line 17, insert the following:

''(vi) remains current on industrial control system innovation; industry adoption of new technologies, and industry best practices;''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 212, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me express my appreciation to the chairman and ranking member of the full committee. Again, they have shown the kind of leadership that the Nation needs on dealing with homeland security. My particular appreciation to the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies, as they have worked together and presented legislation that provided a very vigorous debate in the subcommittee and the full committee.

We believe that we are making enormous leaps and bounds. We are not where we need to be, but we are making leaps and bounds on the whole question of cybersecurity.

Over the last couple of years, Mr. Chairman, even someone just reaching kindergarten understands hacking, understands the collapse that we have seen in the variety of major retail entities and banking entities, and they recognize that we have a new lingo but a new problem.

Frankly, almost maybe 10 years ago, or maybe somewhere around 7 years ago, as the infrastructure of the United States was under transportation security, we made the note that 85 percent of the Nation's cyber is in the private sector. This legislation is a real approach. The National Cybersecurity Protection Advancement Act of 2015 clearly puts the Department of Homeland Security where it needs to be and provides the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center as the anchor of the information coming into the Federal Government and the vetting entity where Americans can feel that their data can be protected and our civil liberties are protected.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment deals with the industrial control systems. All of us know them. I have been to water systems and seen the impact that a cyber attack could have; the electric grid, all of these are in the eye of the storm, and they are in private hands. Attacks against industrial control systems doubled last year, according to a new report from Dell.

''We have over a million firewalls sending data to us on a minute-by-minute basis,'' said John Gordineer, director of product marketing for network security at Dell.

Gordineer said:

We anonymize the data and see interesting trends. In particular, attacks specifically targeting SCADA industrial control systems rose 100 percent in 2014 compared to the previous year—2014.

Countries most affected were Finland, the U.K., and, yes, the United States of America. The most common attack vector against these systems were buffer overflow attacks.

The underlying premise of my amendment, the public benefit of this amendment, is that taxpayer dollars provided to ensure cybersecurity of public and private computer networks will focus on real-world applications that reflect how businesses and industries function.

So I thank both my colleagues for it. This amendment, in particular, will be an important addition to the legislation, which I believe can be supported by every Member. The amendment states that the Department of Homeland Security, in carrying out the functions authorized under this bill, remain current on industrial control system innovation, industry adoption of new technologies, and industry best practices.

Industrial control systems are rarely thought of as long as they work as designed. Industrial control systems are used to deliver utility services to homes and businesses, add precision and speed to manufacturing, and process our foods into finished products. Industrial control systems are responsible for the lights that brighten our cities; for the clean drinking water, which I indicated many of us visited these systems; of the sewage; of automobiles that travel our highways; and the rows upon rows of foods that fill our shelves at grocery stores.

We only need to look recently at a contamination of ice cream across the Nation to know that industrial control systems are extremely important. They are also used in large-scale manufacturing. A day does not pass in this country when citizens' lives are not impacted.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am asking my colleagues to recognize that we are in control, but the industrial control systems may, in fact, control our daily lives. My amendment is asking that the Department of Homeland Security, in carrying out its function authorized under this bill, remain current on industrial control system innovation, industry adoption of new technologies, and industry best practices.

I ask my colleagues, as I ask to put my entire statement into the RECORD—it lists a whole litany of the private sector infrastructure dealing with industrial control. I am hoping that my amendment will be passed in order to ensure that all aspects of our cyber world are protected for the American people.

Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman MCCAUL and Ranking Member THOMPSON for their bipartisanship in bringing H.R. 1731, the ''National Cybersecurity Protection Advancement Act of 2015'' before the House for consideration.

As a senior member of the House Committee on Homeland Security, I am dedicated to protecting our nation from threats posed by terrorists or others who would wish to do our Nation harm.

This is the first of 3 Jackson Lee amendments that will be considered for H.R. 1731, the ''National Cybersecurity Protection Advancement Act of 2015.''

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 4 is simple and will be an important addition to the legislation, which I believe can be supported by every Member of the House.

The Jackson Lee amendment states that the Department of Homeland Security, in carrying out the functions authorized under this bill, will remain current on industrial control system innovation, industry adoption of new technologies, and industry best practices.

Industrial control systems are rarely thought of as long as they work as designed.

Industrial control systems are used to: deliver utility services to homes and businesses; add precision and speed to manufacturing; and process raw foods into finished products.

Industrial control systems are responsible for the lights that brighten our cities at night; the clean drinking water that flows from faucets in our homes; automobiles that travel our highways; and the rows upon rows of foods that fill the shelves of grocery stores.

Industrial control systems are also used in large-scale manufacturing of home appliances, medicines, and products large and small that are found in our homes and offices.

A day does not pass in this country when citizens' lives are not touched by the output of industrial control systems.

The critical importance electricity; water, natural gas, and other utility services are all provided by industrial control systems.

Industrial control systems help keep the cost of everyday consumer products low, and they are essential to meeting consumer demand for goods and services.

Industrial control systems undergo constant improvements as owners and operators work to address vulnerabilities and improve efficiency.

Innovation is occurring rapidly in industrial control systems.

All industrial control systems have one thing in common—they require computer software, firmware, and hardware.

In its wisdom, the Committee on Homeland Security incorporated industrial control systems in its cybersecurity legislation, because industrial control systems are vulnerable to computer errors, accidents, and cybersecurity threats.

Coupled with the cybersecurity challenges of industrial control systems is the rapid pace of innovation.

For example, a new innovation being adopted by industrial control systems involves 3-Dimential or 3–D printing.

3–D printing involves scanning a physical object with a printer made of a high-power laser that fuses small particles of plastic, metal, ceramic, or glass powders into the object's size and shape.

According to PricewaterhouseCoopers, the 3–D printing of jet engine parts to coffee mugs is possible.

3–D printing has the potential to shrink supply chains, save product development times, and increase customization of products.

3–D printing is not the only innovation that will impact industrial control systems.

Electricity delivery depends on industrial control systems.

The biggest innovation in electricity delivery is the smart grid, which is quickly replacing old electricity delivery and metering technology in cities across the Nation.

The term "smart grid" encompasses a host of inter-related technologies rapidly moving into public use to reduce or better manage electricity consumption.

Smart grid systems can aid electricity service providers, users, or third-party electricity usage management service providers to monitor and control electricity use.

The smart grid is also making it possible to more efficiently manage the flow of electricity to residential and industrial consumers.

Electric utility meters that were once read once a month are being replaced by smart meters that can be read remotely using smart grid communication systems every 15 minutes or less.

The smart grid is capable of monitoring the consumption of electricity down to the individual residential or commercial property.

DHS should remain current as innovations like 3–D printing and smart grid technologies are introduced to industrial control systems.

This Jackson Lee amendment is a good contribution to H.R. 1731.

I request support of this amendment by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, though I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment, which will modify the Information Sharing Structure and Processes section of the bill relating to the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center's, or NCCIC's, Industrial Control System.

The Cyber Emergency Response Team, ICS-CERT. This amendment directs the ICS-CERT to remain current on ICS innovation, industry adoption of new technologies, and industry best practices. This amendment directs the ICS-CERT to keep abreast of new, innovative technologies. This will enable the ICS-CERT to respond, when requested, with the latest and most current technologies and practices.

It is a good amendment. I thank the gentlewoman for bringing it. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. CASTRO OF TEXAS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 114–88.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. 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 11, line 22, insert before the semicolon at the end the following: '', and, to the extent practicable, make self-assessment tools available to such businesses to determine their levels of prevention of cybersecurity risks''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 212, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to thank my colleague and fellow Texan, Chairman MCCAUL, and Ranking Member BENNIE THOMPSON of the House Homeland Security Committee for bringing up my amendment for consideration to H.R. 1731.

This amendment supports small businesses across the Nation at no cost to taxpayers. My amendment would make self-assessment tools available to small- and medium-sized businesses so they can determine their level of cybersecurity readiness. Oftentimes, medium-sized and small businesses don't have the framework or capability in place to protect against cybersecurity threats. In 2014, for example, 31 percent of all cyber attacks were directed not at large businesses but at businesses with less than 250 employees. This is a 4 percent increase from 2013.

As the chairman knows, Texas is home to many small companies in so many critical industries: biomed and pharmaceuticals, energy, manufacturing, and many more. Some of these businesses employ as few as 5 to 10 people, and their technology is unprotected, vulnerable to cyber attacks.

Today most small businesses use the Internet, collect customers' information, and store sensitive information on business computers. Yet many of these same companies don't have the readily available information to self-assess their ability to defend their digital assets. They lack the tools necessary for determining cybersecurity readiness.

This pro-small business amendment fills that void and provides the information and tools needed to secure and empower small businesses across the country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND).

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO). Over the course of the past year, cyber breaches at Target, Sony, eBay, and Anthem have consumed headlines and brought awareness to the vulnerability of large corporations to cyber threats.

Although cyber attacks against small businesses are not well-publicized, they are a dangerous threat that we cannot afford to ignore. In fact, in 2012 alone, the National Cyber Security Alliance found that 60 percent of small businesses shut down within 6 months of a data breach. Small businesses are attractive prey for hackers because they often lack the resources necessary to identify cyber vulnerabilities and harden their cyber infrastructure.

Mr. CASTRO's amendment builds upon language I inserted into the underlying bill that is aimed at improving cybersecurity capabilities of small businesses.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to help protect small businesses from cyber threats by supporting this important amendment.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Thank you, Congressman RICHMOND, for reminding us that the big businesses that get attacked by hacks make the big headlines, but we can't forget about small businesses and medium-sized businesses who day in and day out are vulnerable to the same kind of cybersecurity threats.

So, with that, I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, though I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman's amendment. The gentleman is correct. Small- and medium-sized businesses are the lifeblood of our economy, yet they often cannot dedicate the resources to address cybersecurity issues. Making self-assessment tools available to these businesses will allow them to determine their levels of cyber risk and manage the risk through appropriate prevention.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, Mr. Chairman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. CASTRO OF TEXAS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 114–88.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. 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 52, beginning line 12, insert the following:

"SEC. 232. NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY PREPAREDNESS CONSORTIUM.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may establish a consortium to be known as the 'National Cybersecurity Preparedness Consortium' (in this section referred to as the 'Consortium').

''(b) FUNCTIONS.—The Consortium may—

''(1) provide training to State and local first responders and officials specifically for preparing and responding to cyber attacks;

''(2) develop and update a curriculum utilizing the National Protection and Programs Directorate of the Department sponsored Community Cyber Security Maturity Model (CCSMM) for State and local first responders and officials;

''(3) provide technical assistance services to build and sustain capabilities in support of cybersecurity preparedness and response;

''(4) conduct cybersecurity training and simulation exercises to defend from and respond to cyber-attacks;

''(5) coordinate with the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center to help States and communities develop cybersecurity information sharing programs; and

''(6) coordinate with the National Domestic Preparedness Consortium to incorporate cybersecurity emergency responses into existing State and local emergency management functions.

''(c) MEMBERS.—The Consortium shall consist of academic, nonprofit, and government partners that develop, update, and deliver cybersecurity training in support of homeland security. Members shall have prior experience conducting cybersecurity training and exercises for State and local entities.''.

Page 52, before line 17, insert the following:

''Sec. 232. National Cybersecurity Preparedness Consortium.''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 212, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Chairman, first, I am very honored to be joined by my fellow colleagues and Members of Congress from both parties from San Antonio, Texas—Congressmen SMITH, DOGGETT, CUELLAR, and HURD—who each represent a portion of Bexar County and have joined me on this amendment.

My amendment would give the Secretary of Homeland Security authority to establish the National Cybersecurity Preparedness Consortium, or NCPC, within the Department of Homeland Security. Doing so would formally allow this consortium, which already exists outside of the government, to assist State and local entities in developing their own viable and sustainable cybersecurity programs, and it would be at no cost to taxpayers.

The NCPC consists of five university partners. The University of Texas at San Antonio leads the effort, along with Texas A&M University in College Station, the University of Arkansas, the University of Memphis, and Norwich University in Vermont.

□ 1030

These schools proactively came together to coordinate their work, helping State and local officials prepare for cyber attacks. The consortium also develops and carries out trainings and exercises to increase cybersecurity knowledge.

Additionally, the NCPC uses competitions and workshops to encourage more people to pursue careers in cybersecurity and grow the industry's workforce.

States and communities need the ability to prevent, detect, respond to, and recover from cyber events as they would any other disaster or emergency situation, and they need to be aware of the fact that cyber events could impede emergency responders' ability to do their jobs.

This amendment helps address those State and local needs by codifying this valuable consortium.

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment, which establishes the National Cybersecurity Preparedness Consortium, consisting of university partners and other stakeholders who proactively coordinate to assist State and local officials in cybersecurity preparation and the prevention of cyber attacks.

The amendment directs the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection Directorate to update curriculum for first responders, provide technical assistance where possible, and conduct simulations and other training to help State and local officials be better prepared for cyber attacks.

The amendment directs the consortium to consist of academic, nonprofit, and government partners to deliver the best training possible, which will further advance the overall goal of H.R. 1731, to strengthen the resiliency of Federal and private networks and, thus, protect the data of the American people more effectively.

I am a strong proponent of this type of consortium. I am pleased that the gentleman from Texas brought this amendment. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD).

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his work in making this amendment happen. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to H.R. 1731.

Cybersecurity is not just a buzzword. Oftentimes, large governments and governments have plans in place to mitigate and respond to cyber threats, but many smaller State and local entities do not. This is why I cosponsored and stand in support of Representative CASTRO's amendment to H.R. 1731.

Five leading universities across the Nation have teamed up to face these cyber issues head on, including the University of Texas at San Antonio and my alma mater, Texas A&M University.

The proposed consortium would provide valuable training to local and first responders in the event of a catastrophic cyber attack. It would also provide technical assistance services to build and sustain capabilities in support of cybersecurity preparedness and response, and it would coordinate with other crucial entities, such as the Multi-State Information Sharing and Analysis Center and NCCIC.

It is clear that we must focus on cyber preparedness not only at the Federal level, but the local level as well.

Again, this is why I urge my colleagues to support this.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. HURD OF TEXAS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 114–88.

Mr. HURD of Texas. 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:

SEC. ___. PROTECTION OF FEDERAL INFORMATION SYSTEMS.

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

''SEC. 233. AVAILABLE PROTECTION OF FEDERAL INFORMATION SYSTEMS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall deploy and operate, to make available for use by any Federal agency, with or without reimbursement, capabilities to protect Federal agency information and information systems, including technologies to continuously diagnose, detect, prevent, and mitigate against cybersecurity risks (as such term is defined in the second section 226) involving Federal agency information or information systems.

''(b) ACTIVITIES.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary may—

''(1) access, and Federal agency heads may disclose to the Secretary or a private entity providing assistance to the Secretary under paragraph (2), information traveling to or from or stored on a Federal agency information system, regardless of from where the Secretary or a private entity providing assistance to the Secretary under paragraph (2) accesses such information, notwithstanding any other provision of law that would otherwise restrict or prevent Federal agency heads from disclosing such information to the Secretary or a private entity providing assistance to the Secretary under paragraph (2);

''(2) enter into contracts or other agreements, or otherwise request and obtain the assistance of, private entities to deploy and operate technologies in accordance with subsection (a); and

''(3) retain, use, and disclose information obtained through the conduct of activities authorized under this section only to protect Federal agency information and information systems from cybersecurity risks, or, with the approval of the Attorney General and if disclosure of such information is not otherwise prohibited by law, to law enforcement

only to investigate, prosecute, disrupt, or otherwise respond to—

''(A) a violation of section 1030 of title 18, United States Code;

''(B) an imminent threat of death or serious bodily harm;

''(C) a serious threat to a minor, including sexual exploitation or threats to physical safety; or

''(D) an attempt, or conspiracy, to commit an offense described in any of subparagraphs (A) through (C).

''(c) CONDITIONS.—Contracts or other agreements under subsection (b)(2) shall include appropriate provisions barring—

''(1) the disclosure of information to any entity other than the Department or the Federal agency disclosing information in accordance with subsection (b)(1) that can be used to identify specific persons and is reasonably believed to be unrelated to a cybersecurity risk; and

''(2) the use of any information to which such private entity gains access in accordance with this section for any purpose other than to protect Federal agency information and information systems against cybersecurity risks or to administer any such contract or other agreement.

''(d) LIMITATION.—No cause of action shall lie against a private entity for assistance provided to the Secretary in accordance with this section and a contract or agreement under subsection (b)(2).''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 226 (relating to cybersecurity recruitment and retention) the following new item:

''Sec. 233. Available protection of Federal information systems.''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 212, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, every day and every hour, hacktivists and state actors are attempting to breach U.S. Government systems.

This is an ongoing problem I dealt with during my time at the CIA, and, since I have left, it has only gotten worse. They are attempting to steal valuable information that could be used against us.

The EINSTEIN Program is a valuable tool that the U.S. Government can deploy to respond to and mitigate cyber threats. The EINSTEIN Program was intended to provide DHS a situational awareness snapshot of the health of the Federal Government's cyberspace.

Based upon agreements with participating Federal agencies, DHS installed systems at their Internet access points to collect network flow data.

EINSTEIN 3A is the third and newest version of the program. This groundbreaking technology uses classified and unclassified information to block cyber espionage and attacks. E3A is allowing the Department of Homeland Security to paint a wider and more intelligent picture of the overall cyber threat landscape within the Federal Government, enabling strong correlation of events and the ability to provide early warning and greater context about emerging risks.

Cutting-edge programs such as EINSTEIN can serve as a groundbreaking tool to stop criminals, hacktivists, and nation-states from harming the American public and government.

I urge my colleagues to support codifying the E3A program and vote in favor of this amendment.

Mr. MCCAUL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HURD of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MCCAUL. I support this amendment, which would authorize and codify the current EINSTEIN Program operated in the Department of Homeland Security.

The EINSTEIN Program, as deployed, makes available the capability to protect Federal agency information and information systems. The Einstein Program includes technologies to diagnose, detect, prevent, and mitigate cybersecurity risks involving Federal information systems.

I would also like to thank my colleague and fellow chairman, Mr. CHAFFETZ, of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee for working with the Committee on Homeland Security on this important issue.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would authorize the Department of Homeland Security's program to provide web-based security services to U.S. Federal civilian agencies.

The program is known as EINSTEIN. When fully implemented, it is expected to provide all participating Federal agencies with the ability to know the cyber threats they face and protect their systems from insider and outsider threats.

To fully implement EINSTEIN to protect Federal civilian networks, there are complex interagency privacy and coordination issues that still need to be settled.

This authorization should help the Department of Homeland Security's efforts at closing out those issues as it confers specific statutory authority to the Department to pursue EINSTEIN.

I support the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''aye.''

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

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part B of House Report 114–88.

Mr. MULVANEY. 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 new section:

SEC. ____. SUNSET.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall terminate on the date that is seven years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 212, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for the opportunity to present this amendment, very similar, Mr. Chairman, to the amendment that I presented yesterday that was approved by a majority of both Republicans and Democrats. It is a 7-year sunset provision to the bill.

Here again, today, we are dealing with two very real and very serious concerns, security of our people and the freedoms and liberties of our people. We are called upon to do that very often here in Congress. Sometimes, we get those balances exactly right, and sometimes, we don't.

Sometimes, we err too much on the side of safety and protection and security to the expense of our individual liberties. Other times, we err on the other side and do not provide the requisite level of safety and security that the citizens rightly demand of Congress.

All this bill does is force us to make sure that we keep an eye on this piece of legislation to make sure that we got the balance exactly right. I know that many folks will say: Well, you know, Mr. MULVANEY, we have the opportunity at any time to go back in and fix the bill.

I know that, and we have done that from time to time, but, by the same token, this is a very busy place, and a lot of bills tend to fall between the cracks.

Putting in a hardwired 7-year sunset into this piece of legislation will force us not only to keep an eye on this on an ongoing basis, but to come here 7 years from now and make sure that we have done it precisely correctly.

I think it is the exact right approach. In fact, I have often wished that we put sunset provisions, Mr. Chairman, in every single piece of legislation that we have, but we don't have that opportunity here today.

We do have the opportunity to put a sunset into this very important piece of legislation, and I hope that the House does the same thing today as it did yesterday and approve this amendment by an overwhelming margin.

Mr. MCCAUL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULVANEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MCCAUL. As an advocate for civil liberties and privacy rights, I did

not oppose the inclusion of his amendment here today on the floor, and that was for good reason.

I believe that we need an open and fair debate on this measure, this amendment. We need transparency in the process here on the floor. My committee has undertaken that since day one as we assembled this bill in a bipartisan fashion.

While, normally, I do support sunset provisions, I think, in this case, submitting a sunset provision to this vital national security program would not be in our best interest.

I have heard, time and time again, from industry and other stakeholders that a sunset would stifle the sharing of this valuable cyber threat information. It would undermine everything that we are trying to do here today as we try to incentivize participation and investment in this voluntary program.

While I do have tremendous respect for the gentleman and his point of view on this, I will vote ''no'' and oppose this amendment.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, I applaud the chairman for doing something that doesn't happen nearly enough in this Chamber. He is allowing an amendment to come to the floor that he opposes.

I think that doesn't happen nearly enough here. I think it speaks volumes to some of the recent steps we have taken to improve Member participation in the process, and I think we will be better as an institution for it.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate, as I said, the maker of this amendment.

Let me be clear, I offered the very same amendment in markup. It failed on a party-line vote, and this is democracy; but a little thing that concerns me is that, when we went to the Rules Committee, my chairman gave an indication that he really didn't have a problem with the 7-year sunset.

Mr. MCCAUL. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, my chairman.

Mr. MCCAUL. Again, I just want to clarify what I believe to be the record, and that was I was not opposed to this amendment going to the floor for a full and fair debate.

I respect the gentleman's interpretation of that. I simply was not opposed to this going to the floor, and I think it deserves a full debate, as we saw yesterday as well.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I will read for the RECORD the statement my chairman made in Rules. Mr. MCCAUL said:

There is an amendment that has a 7-year sunset provision, and I will be honest, I will not oppose that. I think 7 years is ample time to advance those relationships and while, at the same time, giving Congress the authority to reauthorize after a 7-year period.

Mr. MCCAUL. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MCCAUL. I must say that, obviously, since the time the Rules Committee discharged the amendment, there has been tremendous opposition from industry, which concerns me, about the participation in this program and the success of this program if the sunset provision is allowed to go forward, just to clarify my point of view.

□ 1045

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I accept the gentleman's reinterpretation of the statement, and we will go forward.

Let me just say that, yesterday, on a 7-year sunset on an Intelligence bill, the House resoundingly voted for this very same amendment, 313–110. It is clear that the congressional intent is, within 7 years, that it should have been ample time for this bill to be law and now set a record for us to come back as Members of Congress and do our oversight responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, I am in strong support of Mr. MULVANEY's amendment. It is common sense.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MULVANEY. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MS. HAHN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part B of House Report 114–88.

Ms. HAHN. 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 the end the following:

SEC.____. REPORT ON CYBERSECURITY VULNERABILITIES OF UNITED STATES PORTS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation of the Senate a report on cybersecurity vulnerabilities for the ten United States ports that the Secretary determines are at greatest risk of a cybersecurity incident and provide recommendations to mitigate such vulnerabilities.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 212, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman MCCAUL and Ranking Member THOMPSON for allowing me to offer this amendment.

I rise to offer a National Cybersecurity Protection Advancement Act amendment, one to increase cybersecurity at our Nation's most at-risk ports.

This amendment will direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit a report to Congress assessing risks and providing recommendations regarding cybersecurity at America's most at-risk ports, such as Los Angeles, Long Beach, Oakland, New York, Houston.

According to the American Association of Port Authorities, our ports contribute $4.6 trillion to the U.S. economy, making their security critical to our Nation.

In order to remain efficient and globally competitive, our ports have become increasingly reliant on complex computer networks for everyday management. However, The Brookings Institution has found that there is a cybersecurity gap at our Nation's ports. Currently, we do not have cybersecurity standards for our ports to give Federal agencies the authority to address cybersecurity issues.

This is completely unacceptable. The threat of cyber attack on the networks that manage the flow of U.S. commerce at our ports is real.

As the Representative of the Nation's busiest port complex and as cofounder of the Congressional Ports Caucus, I know that a significant disruption at our ports cripples our economy. An estimated $1 billion a day was lost during the lockout at the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach back in 2002. Imagine the possible damage of a more severe disruption. For example, if our ports were targeted and hacked and unable to operate, it could cost our Nation billions and billions of dollars.

While the Port of Los Angeles is a participant in the FBI's Cyberhood Watch program and has an award-winning cybersecurity operations center, we need to ensure that all of our ports have the same ability to protect themselves from cyber attacks. This is why I have offered this amendment that addresses the lack of cybersecurity standards and safeguards at our ports.

We have ignored the cybersecurity of the networks managing our ports long enough, and it is pointless and ironic for government to continue awarding funds that are spent on the installation of new technologies if the networks they are on remain vulnerable to cyber attacks. This amendment adds no new cost to this legislation, but it will offer great security to our Nation's movement of goods.

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

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment, which requires the Department of Homeland Security to identify and mitigate cybersecurity threats to our Nation's seaports. It requires the Secretary to identify the 10 ports with the highest vulnerability to cybersecurity incidents and to fully evaluate and establish procedures to mitigate relevant cyber vulnerabilities.

America's seaports are critical infrastructure, and 95 percent of America's foreign trade travels through these seaports. A cybersecurity incident which impacts a major U.S. port could have profound effects on the global economy. The Department of Homeland Security must take immediate, proactive measures to identify and mitigate cybersecurity threats in America's most vulnerable ports.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HAHN. I thank you for your support, and I applaud you and the committee for working in this bipartisan manner. I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part B of House Report 114–88.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. 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:

SEC. ___. GAO REPORT ON IMPACT PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES.

Not later than 60 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate an assessment on the impact on privacy and civil liberties limited to the work of the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 212, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank Mr. THOMPSON and Mr. MCCAUL for their leadership and Mr. RATCLIFFE and Mr. RICHMOND for their leadership and for the importance of this legislation on the floor today and—this is something that I have often said—for the importance of the Department of Homeland Security's being the front armor, if you will, for domestic security, and this is a very important component of domestic security.

The Jackson Lee-Polis amendment states that not later than 60 months after the date of this act the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate an assessment on the impact of privacy and civil liberties, limited to the work of the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center.

The public benefit of this amendment is that it will provide public assurance from a reliable and trustworthy source that their privacy and civil liberties are not being compromised. Whether it is the PATRIOT Act or the USA FREEDOM Act that is now proposed, the American people understand their security, but they understand their privacy and their civil liberties. The intent of this report is to provide Congress with information regarding the effectiveness of protecting the privacy of Americans.

We have gone through too much—we have been through too much hacking, and we have lost too much personal data from a number of retail entities and elsewhere—for the American people not to be protected. This amendment will result in the sole external report on the privacy and civil liberties' impact of the programs created under this bill.

I ask that my colleagues support the Jackson Lee-Polis amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment.

The report required by this amendment would provide a quantifiable tool for the transparency, accountability, and oversight of Americans' civil liberties, and it will address privacy concerns.

Privacy is a hallmark of H.R. 1731, and any opportunity to highlight to the American people how well DHS is protecting their civil liberties, while strengthening the cyber resilience of our Federal and non-Federal networks, is a welcome endeavor.

The report will provide data on how well the program is working, and it will potentially identify any areas of improvement, which will further strengthen the robustness of DHS' cyber information-sharing practices.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the chair for his comments.

Mr. Chairman, privacy is of great concern to the American public in a digital economy where personal information is one of the most valuable assets of successful online business. Again, I ask for support of the Jackson Lee-Polis amendment.

Mr. Chair, I offer my thanks to Chairman MCCAUL, and Ranking Member THOMPSON for their leadership and work on H.R. 1731, the National Cybersecurity Protection Advancement Act of 2015 to the floor for consideration.

The bipartisan work done by the House Committee on Homeland Security brought before the House this opportunity to defend our Nation against cyber threats.

I thank Congressman POLIS for joining me in sponsoring this amendment.

The Jackson Lee-Polis amendment to H.R. 1731 is simple and would improve the bill.

The Jackson Lee-Polis amendment states that, not later than 60 months after the date of this act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs of the Senate an assessment on the impact of privacy and civil liberties limited to the work of the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center.

The intent of the report is to provide Congress with information regarding the effectiveness of protecting the privacy of Americans.

This amendment would result in the sole external report on the privacy and civil liberties' impact of the programs created under this bill.

Privacy is of great concern to the American public in a digital economy where personal information is one of the most valuable assets of successful online businesses.

Having detailed information on consumers allows companies to better tailor services and products to meet the needs of consumers.

Instead of relying on surveys to try to determine what consumers want, companies know what they want through their online and increasingly offline activities that are recorded and analyzed.

In 2014, a report on consumers' views of their privacy published by the Pew Center found that a majority of adults surveyed felt that their privacy is being challenged along such core dimensions as the security of their personal information and their ability to retain confidentiality.

91% of adults in the survey believe that consumers have lost control over how personal information is collected and used by companies.

88% of adults believe that it would be very difficult to remove inaccurate information about them online.

80% of those who use social networking sites believe they are concerned about third parties accessing their data.

70% of social networking site users have some concerns about the government accessing some of the information they share on social networking sites without their knowledge.

For this reason, the Jackson Lee amendment providing an independent report to the public on how their privacy and civil liberties are treated under the implementation of this bill is important.

I ask that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle support this amendment.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in part B of House Report 114–88.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. 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:

SEC. ___. REPORT ON CYBERSECURITY AND CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE.

The Secretary of Homeland Security may consult with sector specific agencies, businesses, and stakeholders to produce and submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on how best to align federally-funded cybersecurity research and development activities with private sector efforts to protect privacy and civil liberties while assuring security and resilience of the Nation's critical infrastructure, including—

(1) promoting research and development to enable the secure and resilient design and construction of critical infrastructure and more secure accompanying cyber technology;

(2) enhancing modeling capabilities to determine potential impacts on critical infrastructure of incidents or threat scenarios, and cascading effects on other sectors; and

(3) facilitating initiatives to incentivize cybersecurity investments and the adoption of critical infrastructure design features that strengthen cybersesecurity and resilience.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 212, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. This is a comprehensive approach, Mr. Chairman, to the issue of cybersecurity and national cybersecurity protection.

The amendment that I am offering now states that the Secretary of Homeland Security may consult with sector-specific agencies, businesses, and stakeholders to produce and submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on how best to align federally funded cybersecurity research and development activities with private sector efforts to protect privacy and civil liberties while assuring the security and resilience of the Nation's critical infrastructure.

Again, I can recount the incidences that have brought this issue to the attention of the American people. Certainly, one of the most striking were the actions of Mr. Snowden's, so it is important that we develop research that really blocks those who would intend to do wrong, or ill, to the American people.

The amendment includes a cybersecurity research and development objective to enable the secure and resilient design and construction of critical infrastructure and more secure accompanying cyber technology. We want it to be impenetrable. We want to have a firewall that stands as a firewall. I believe that we have the capacity to have the R&D to do so.

The public benefit of this amendment is that it will make sure, as innovations occur in the private sector that can improve privacy and civil liberties protections, that they will be adopted by DHS for its programs established by this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for support of the Jackson Lee amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I support this enhancement that allows the Secretary of Homeland Security to consult with stakeholders and to submit a report on how best to align federally funded cybersecurity research and development activities with private sector efforts to protect privacy and civil liberties, while assuring the security and resilience of the Nation's critical infrastructure.

The promotion of research and development activities to design resilient critical infrastructure that includes cyber threat infrastructure and that also includes cyber threat consideration in its plan is important as we build the fences against the cascading effect of cyber attacks on critical infrastructures.

Again, I want to thank the gentlewoman for bringing this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, again, the American people deserve the kind of investigatory work that results in R&D that provides the kind of armor against the attacks that we have noted are possible and have occurred. With that, I ask for the support of the Jackson Lee amendment.

Mr. Chair, I offer my thanks to Chairman MCCAUL, and Ranking Member THOMPSON for their leadership and work on H.R. 1731, the National Cybersecurity Protection Advancement Act of 2015.

This is the final of three Jackson Lee amendments offered to this legislation.

The Jackson Lee-Polis amendment to H.R. 1731 is simple and would improve the bill.

The amendment states that the Secretary of Homeland Security may consult with sector-specific agencies, businesses, and stakeholders to produce and submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on how best to align federally funded cybersecurity research and development activities with private sector efforts to protect privacy and civil liberties, while assuring the security and resilience of the Nation's critical infrastructure.

The amendment includes a cybersecurity research and development objective to enable the secure and resilient design and construction of critical infrastructure and more secure accompanying cyber technology.

Finally, this Jackson Lee amendment would support investigation into enhanced computer-aided modeling capabilities to determine potential impacts on critical infrastructure of incidents or threat scenarios and cascading effects on other sectors and facilitating initiatives to incentivize cybersecurity investments and the adoption of critical infrastructure design features that strengthen cybersecurity and resilience.

The ability to stay current and at the leading edge of innovation in the fast-moving world of computing technology will be a challenge, but one that the Department of Homeland Security can meet.

The Jackson Lee amendment lays the foundation for an array of collaborative efforts centered on learning as much as possible about critical infrastructure operations and technologies, then using that knowledge to discover how best to defend against cyber-based threats.

I ask that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle support this amendment.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 405, noes 8, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 171]

AYES—405

Abraham	Allen	Babin
Adams	Amash	Barletta
Aderholt	Amodei	Barr
Aguilar	Ashford	Barton

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Brady (PA)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—8

Boustany
Brady (TX)
Carter (TX)
LaMalfa
Marchant
Weber (TX)
Westmoreland
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—18

Boyle, Brendan F.
Butterfield
Clyburn
Davis, Rodney
Eshoo
Graves (MO)
Hastings
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Lipinski
Meeks
Moore
Olson
Pallone
Payne
Smith (WA)
Speier
Trott

□ 1130

Messrs. BUCSHON, POSEY, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Messrs. BRIDENSTINE, COFFMAN, TIPTON, CRAWFORD, GIBBS, MILLER of Florida, and GOHMERT changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HARPER). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY) having assumed the chair, Mr. HARPER, 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. 1731) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to enhance multi-directional sharing of information related to cybersecurity risks and strengthen privacy and civil liberties protections, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 212, 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.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

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. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ISRAEL. I am, in its current form, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chair, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Israel moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1731 to the Committee on Homeland Security with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end of the bill the following:

SEC. ____. PROTECTING CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE, AMERICAN JOBS, AND HEALTH INFORMATION FROM CYBERATTACKS.

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

''SEC. 232. PROTECTING CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE, AMERICAN JOBS, AND HEALTH INFORMATION FROM CYBERATTACKS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall undertake on-going risk-informed outreach, including the provision of technical assistance, to the owners and operators of at-risk critical infrastructure to promote the sharing of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures (as such terms are defined in the second section 226 (relating to the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center). In carrying out this outreach, the Secretary shall prioritize the protection of at-risk Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) industrial control systems, which are critical to the operation of the United States economy.

''(b) PRIORITIZATION.—In carrying out outreach under subsection (a), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall prioritize the protection and welfare of the American people and economy and give special attention to protecting the following:

''(1) United States critical infrastructure, including the electrical grid, nuclear power plants, oil and gas pipelines, financial services, and transportation systems, from cyberattacks, as attacks on SCADA industrial control systems increased by 100 percent in 2014 over the previous year.

''(2) The intellectual property of United States corporations, particularly the intellectual property of at-risk small and medium-sized businesses, in order to maintain United States competitiveness and job growth.

''(3) The privacy and property rights of at-risk Americans, including Social Security numbers, dates of birth, and employment information, and health records, insofar as the health records of more than 29,000,000 Americans were compromised in data breaches between 2010 and 2013, and, in 2015, the information of 80,000,000 Americans was compromised by the attack on Anthem Health Insurance.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 231 the following new item:

''Sec. 232. Protecting critical infrastructure, American jobs, and health information from cyberattacks.''.

Mr. MCCAUL (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 Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, this is a final amendment. It will not kill the bill. It will not send the bill back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, D.C. went dark. The lights went out, the power stopped near the White House, lights out, no power at the Department of State. Federal agencies were plunged into darkness, small businesses plunged into darkness. Business stopped. The business of government stopped because there was a blackout.

Now, in this case, Mr. Speaker, this loss of energy was because of a blown transformer, and there was no indication that this was a result of a cyber attack on our energy sources or systems.

There are indications, Mr. Speaker, every day, of attempted attacks on our critical energy infrastructure, and this amendment simply strengthens the response of the Department of Homeland Security to protect our constituents, our government, our infrastructure, and our country from this attack.

Mr. Speaker, in the first 6 months of 2012, we know that there was a sustained and persistent cyber attack on critical gas pipeline control systems. Now, the good news is that we successfully defended against those attacks.

The bad news is, as we all know, the very nature of cyber war means that every time you defend against an attack, you are transmitting to your attackers what your defenses are.

The DHS reports that, of roughly 200 cases of major cyber attacks handled by DHS' cybersecurity team in 2013, 40 percent were in the energy sector. There have been attacks on supervisory control and data acquisitions, SCADA. Those attacks doubled between 2013 and 2014, so we know these attacks are being attempted. We know how serious it is.

We learned, 2 weeks ago, what happens when we plunge into the darkness. We know the economic devastation, the social devastation, the military devastation that will occur when an attack is successful, when a cyber attack against our energy systems succeeds.

We know it is coming, and we cannot wait until the day after, when we ask ourselves, in the dark: Why didn't we do more yesterday?

This is like being told that Pearl Harbor is coming, that 9/11 is coming, knowing it is coming, and deciding: Are you going to do something about it? Or are you going to continue to bury your head in the sand?

Now, this amendment is very simple, Mr. Speaker. It simply directs the Department of Homeland Security to organize a strong, concerted, focused partnership with energy companies throughout this country. Those partnerships would provide technical assistance from DHS to energy companies and information sharing. These partnerships would be focused on critical infrastructure, the electrical grid, oil and gas pipelines, and nuclear power plants.

Mr. Speaker, what happened in Washington, D.C., on April 7 of this year can happen in any congressional district in this body. Instead of a blown transformer, it will be a cyber attack against energy systems in any one of the districts represented here today, Mr. Speaker.

When that happens, our constituents will ask us, from that place in the dark: What did you do to prevent it? And what did you do to protect me from it?

This vote on this motion to recommit will be your answer.

Let's put the protection of our businesses, our government, our military, and our constituents ahead of partisanship and vote ''yes'' on this motion to recommit.

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCAUL. The gentleman from New York is correct regarding the nature of the threat. However, the activities he has discussed were authorized by Congress last Congress with a bill that I sponsored. In addition, the bill currently before the House strengthens those provisions.

This bipartisan bill passed out of committee unanimously. This motion is nothing more than an eleventh hour attempt to bring down the bill that we worked so hard on to get to this point where we are today.

Mr. Speaker, people always ask me what keeps me up at night. In addition to the kinetic threats posed by al Qaeda and ISIS, it is a cyber attack against our Nation that concerns me the most.

This legislation is necessary to protect Americans. Every day, America is under attack. Our offensive capabilities are strong, but our defensive capabilities are weak. The attacks on Target and Home Depot stole the personal information and credit cards of millions of Americans.

The cyber breach at Anthem compromised the healthcare accounts of 80 million individuals, impacting one out of every four Americans in the most private way. North Korea's destructive attack on Sony attempted to chill our freedom of speech. Russia and China continue to steal our intellectual property and conduct espionage against our Nation.

General Alexander described this as ''the greatest transfer of wealth in history.''

At the same time, Iran attacks our financial sector on a daily basis in response to the sanctions. We also face a growing threat from cyberterrorists, like the ISIS sympathizers who hacked into USCENTCOM's social media account.

Terrorists and state sponsors of terror, like Iran, want nothing more than to carry out a destructive cyber attack to bring things down in the United States, including our power grids.

This bill protects our Nation's networks, both public and private, by removing legal barriers to the sharing of threat information.

□ 1145

The bill is voluntary. It is both proprivacy and prosecurity and has widespread support from industry. It allows us to obtain the keys for information sharing, to lock the door, and to keep these nation-states and criminals out. We cannot send a signal of weakness to our adversaries.

Many, Mr. Speaker, refer to the threat of a cyber Pearl Harbor. My father, part of the Greatest Generation, was a bombardier in a B–17 during World War II. He participated in the air campaign in advance of the D-day invasion against the Nazis.

Today a new generation faces different threats to our national security, and we must protect America in this new frontier. We now live in a new threat environment where digital bombs can go undetected and cause massive devastation. This bill will defend America from these attacks.

Inaction today, Mr. Speaker, would be nothing short of reckless. It is urgent that we pass this bill today, for if Congress fails to act and the United States is attacked, then Congress will have that on its hands.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the motion to recommit and support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 180, noes 238, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 172]

AYES—180

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
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—238

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)
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
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)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—13

Boyle, Brendan F.
Davis, Rodney
Eshoo
Graves (MO)
Hastings
Kaptur
Lipinski
Moore
Olson
Pallone
Smith (WA)
Speier
Trott

□ 1153

Mr. RICHMOND changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 355, noes 63, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 173]

AYES—355

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Joyce
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (WI)

Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Torres
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—63

Amash
Bass
Becerra
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brat
Bridenstine
Capuano
Cartwright
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Conyers
Courtney
DeLauro
DesJarlais
Deutch
Doyle, Michael F.
Edwards
Ellison
Esty
Fattah
Fleming
Garrett
Gohmert
Gosar
Graves (LA)
Grayson
Grijalva
Guinta
Huelskamp
Issa
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Labrador
Larson (CT)
Lee
Lieu, Ted
Lowenthal
Massie
McGovern
Mooney (WV)
Nadler
Nolan
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sanford
Sarbanes
Serrano
Slaughter
Takano
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Welch
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Boyle, Brendan F.
Davis, Rodney
Eshoo
Graves (MO)
Hastings
Kaptur
Lipinski
Moore
Olson
Pallone
Smith (WA)
Speier
Trott

□ 1203

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 637

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered as the first sponsor of H.R. 637, a bill originally introduced by Representative Schock of Illinois, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

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

There was no objection.

MOMENT OF SILENCE TO PAY RESPECTS TO THE YOUNG WOMEN WHO DIED SUDDENLY IN SAVANNAH, GEORGIA, APRIL 22, 2015

(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 to pay my respects to the young women who died suddenly in Savannah, Georgia, yesterday. On Wednesday morning just before 6 a.m., three tractor-trailers, two pickup trucks, and two cars were involved in a chain-reaction car accident.

Abbie Deloach of Savannah, Emily Clark of Powder Springs, Morgan Bass of Leesburg, Catherine McKay Pittman of Alpharetta, and Caitlyn Baggett of Millen were killed.

I ask that a moment of silence be given to these young women and their families in the Eagle Nation.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the majority leader, Mr. MCCARTHY, for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule of the week to come.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

In addition, the House will begin the annual appropriation process. The House will consider the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs appropriations bill sponsored by Representative CHARLIE DENT. This important bill provides funding to house and train our military and ensures that we can meet the growing health care needs of our Nation's veterans.

The House will also consider the Energy and Water appropriations bill sponsored by Representative MIKE SIMPSON. This bill ensures that we safely maintain our nuclear weapons stockpile and provide for critical infrastructure projects through the Army Corps of Engineers.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the House is expected to consider the budget conference report. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information. He indicates that the appropriations process has started. First I want to say, as a Member who served on the Appropriations Committee for 23 years, I always thought we ought to start the appropriations process early, i.e., in May, but starting it, I think, is good news. We have had trouble on both sides getting all 12 appropriations bills—it used to be 13—12 appropriations bills done. So I congratulate the committee for initiating its work in a timely fashion.

Hopefully, Mr. Leader, that will lead to, hopefully, passing 12 bills in the regular order, which, as I pointed out last week with respect to some other legislation, will require the kind of bipartisanship that we saw displayed ultimately on the DHS bill, but certainly on the SGR bill, and then this week we had two bills pass with a bipartisan—both sides—majority voting for it. Hopefully, we will be able to do that on the appropriations bill.

I ask my friend on the MILCON, Military Construction bill, VA funding bill and on the Energy and Water bill, does the gentleman expect to follow what the gentleman and his party have indicated would be the process for appropriation bills under an open rule?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The answer to your question is ''yes.'' The gentleman does know, having been a part for many years of the appropriation process, that this is actually the earliest in the history of Congress we have ever started appropriations. It is our goal—I know it is your goal as well—to get all bills done through the House in regular order. It is something that we strive towards, and I thank the gentleman for his help.

Mr. HOYER. I congratulate the gentleman and his party on bringing these bills to the floor early.

He also says we are going to be considering a conference report. I don't obviously know what that conference report is. The budget itself, though—which of course sets the parameters for the appropriations bills in terms of caps on spending—was, as the gentleman knows, not a bipartisan bill. There were party differences on that bill. I would hope that in the conference report we can reach an agreement.

My own view is, Mr. Majority Leader, that if we stay at sequester levels we will not be able to pass bills and the President will not sign them. The reason being that our side, and I think the President, perceives, and many in your party perceive at least as it relates to some aspects of the sequester, that the sequester numbers are not workable.

As you know, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has called the sequester numbers, which are reflected in the budget that passed the House, ill-conceived, unworkable, and unrealistic. In that context it will be difficult for us to get, no matter how early we start, these bills completed. I would hope that we could come together at some point in time as was done in Ryan-Murray. I know there are Members on your side, including I think the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who believe that if we don't come together on an agreed figure that will allow the Appropriations Committee to meet its responsibilities, then we will have great difficulty getting appropriations bills done.

I don't know whether the gentleman has any thoughts on that, but if he does, I would be glad to yield to him on that.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate his comments, and we will continue to work together to get our appropriations process finished.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. I don't know whether the gentleman had an opportunity to read an article—it may have been an op-ed, I have got the clip—but I am not sure where it appeared in the paper. But the former Speaker, Newt Gingrich, wrote an article that essentially stood for the proposition that Republicans and Democrats about a decade or a little over a decade ago were able to come together and to take advantage of the research opportunities that Speaker Gingrich, former Speaker Gingrich, said were apparent and possible in today's day. I share that view.

Many people, including your predecessor, Mr. Cantor, were concerned and have recently said that we need to increase substantially the investments and the resources that we have at NIH. Unfortunately, as the gentleman may know, in the allocations to subcommittees that were adopted yesterday in the Appropriations Committee, as I understand it, there was $3 billion cut from the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, which covers NIH, which will make it very difficult to do what Speaker Gingrich, former Speaker Gingrich, suggested we do in The New York Times today.

□ 1215

The gentleman, if he hasn't read the article, doesn't need to comment on it, but I want to call to his attention that we are very concerned, but people on your side and your former Speaker are very concerned that we are not investing sufficient sums to take advantage of the opportunities, and it is costing us.

He particularly mentioned Alzheimer's and the extraordinary costs related to Alzheimer's disease and that, if we can either delay the onset of Alzheimer's or prevent Alzheimer's, that we will, in effect, save tens of billions of dollars.

I bring that up simply in the context of we really do need to get the resources into the Appropriations Committee that Mr. ROGERS, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, a senior Republican in this House, says are necessary to meet our responsibility.

I would hope that the majority leader would be looking at that and would, hopefully, work towards that end.

Let me ask you two more questions, Mr. Leader. The highway bill, as the gentleman knows, expires in terms of its authorization for funding on the 31st of May. It is not on the schedule, obviously, this month, but can the gentleman tell me—we are very concerned, and, as you know, every Governor, every county executive, every mayor—you have talked to them; I have talked to them—are very concerned about the resources that they are going to have available to do bridges and highways maintenance, infrastructure investment.

Can the gentleman tell me when we might, in the 2 weeks that we will have in May, be able to consider the highway bill?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman is correct about the highway funding. We look forward to making sure we get that done on time in a bipartisan manner. We will be continuing to work with you as we move forward.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the fact that we can work on a bipartisan manner. I look forward to doing that. I know that Mr. DEFAZIO looks forward to doing that; I know Mr. SHUSTER looks forward to doing it—both very, very positive Members of this body.

I will tell the gentleman, I am somewhat concerned, however, about rumors that I have heard that we are looking at, perhaps, a short-term patch. The problem, as the gentleman so well knows, with a short-term patch is it does not allow for the kind of planning that is necessary in terms of significant infrastructure projects, which require some significant lead time.

Does the gentleman know whether or not we might be considering at least a 5-year or at least a longer term, maybe even as long as a 7-year authorization? Or are you contemplating that we, in May, would do another short-term patch?

As you know, we Democrats opposed May 31. We wanted a longer extension. The House and the Senate agreed on a short-term patch—or short-term May 31 deadline.

Does the gentleman have any expectations that we have the possibility of doing a 5-year or longer, so that the States and communities can plan on a long-term basis, as opposed to a very short-term basis?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

No decisions have been made at this point. This could be a prime example, just like our work on SGR.

As a personal note, I would like to solve these problems in the long term. There is no reason to come back to it.

If we have to get in a situation that is short-term, hopefully, that that would be short to fix a long-term, much like the issue that we had with SGR. I am hopeful that we can get that done in a very long-term manner.

Mr. HOYER. Well, I thank the gentleman for that comment. I think it is a very positive comment.

I will tell the gentleman, next week, perhaps you and I can talk about this towards that end because I think, if we talk about creation of jobs, we talk about giving confidence and stability to the economy, I think that is one way we could do it, and, hopefully, we can work together.

The last issue I would bring up, Mr. Leader, as you know, I worked with your predecessor, Mr. Cantor, very successfully on the reauthorization of Export-Import Bank. That issue is coming up, and it will be expiring at the end of June, on June 30. We need to reauthorize that.

I am someone who believes that that is critical in terms of our exports. I know there is some disagreement on that issue, maybe between the two of us and between our caucuses; but, as you know, there are 60 Members in your caucus who have written a letter to the Speaker indicating their support and urging that that be brought to the floor.

Very frankly, with 185-plus Members, I think we will be unanimous on it, as we were last time. That makes somewhere in the neighborhood of 240 to 250 votes on this floor for the reauthorization of Export-Import Bank.

Does the gentleman see any prospect of that bill coming to the floor any time in the near future? As I say, as you know, the authorization expires on June 30.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman is correct, the authority for the Export-Import Bank does expire at the end of June.

I know the respect the gentleman has, as I do, for regular order and working through committees. The committee of jurisdiction has had a few hearings, and I know they have some hearings scheduled in the future continuing.

Nothing is scheduled at this point, but, if anything comes forward, I will notify.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

I will just say this: we know that the chairman of the authorizing committee is opposed to Export-Import Bank. He was opposed to TRIA as well. He is opposed to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. As the gentleman knows, those, nevertheless, enjoy broad-based support in this House to a greater or lesser degree.

TRIA, we passed, notwithstanding the chairman's opposition to TRIA, on a bipartisan basis with overwhelming big numbers. I think that was the right thing to do.

I would urge the majority leader to urge the chairman, who I think does not enjoy the support of the majority of this House, on his position. I know you may share that position, but I really do believe the House has a position that we ought to pass the Export-Import Bank, and we need to do it sooner rather than later, to make sure that we continue the confidence that purchasers of U.S. goods, whether they be airplanes or widgets, will continue to keep doing so with the thought that we have in place what almost every country in the world has in place, a facilitating of that export ability of our country.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I do want to correct one part of history here. You referred to our chairman. Our chairman did move a TRIA bill through his committee. We did move it off this floor. The chairman you speak of, Chairman HENSARLING, managed the bill, got it through the House. We got it over to the Senate, and unfortunately, the Senate didn't take it up in the last hours, and then we got it done and signed into law this year.

I believe our chairman works very hard on these issues and did an excellent job in the TRIA.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

I have no disrespect for Mr. HENSARLING. I think he is a very able Member of this body, and I have great respect for him. I disagree with him both on the Export-Import Bank, and I think I correctly characterize his view on whether we ought to do TRIA, but I do respect the fact, yes, he did bring it to the floor, and when he brought it to the floor, it passed overwhelmingly.

I won't pursue that further, but I don't expect Mr. HENSARLING—because I think he honestly believes that we ought not to have an Export-Import Bank involvement, but having said that, I think that is not the position of the majority of this House.

When we last voted on it, it wasn't the position of the majority of your party or of mine. Now, that may have changed; I agree with that, but I think I am pretty confident in saying the majority of this House believes, in order to make sure that we stay competitive with worldwide competitors, that the Export-Import Bank is a critical component of that competitive ability. I simply hope that we will be considering it.

If it fails, it fails, but I think the American public, on this and so many other issues, deserves a vote on this floor. As the Speaker, and I have repeated this time and again, said at the beginning in the last election that his objective was to let the House work its will on this matter, as well as some others that I will discuss in the future, I would hope we could do that.

Unless the gentleman wants any more time, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 2015, TO MONDAY, APRIL 27, 2015

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 8 p.m. on Monday, April 27, 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Michigan). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 29, 2015

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Tuesday, April 28, 2015, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. on Wednesday, April 29, 2015.

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

There was no objection.

35TH ANNIVERSARY OF IRAN MISSION RESCUE

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, since 1979, the Islamic Republic of Iran has been responsible for the deaths of many, many Americans.

This Saturday, April 25, 2015, we will observe the 35th anniversary on the day on which eight of those Americans gave their last full measure of devotion during a failure to rescue 52 fellow Americans being held hostage by radical extremists in Tehran.

There is no greater love than to lay down one's life for their friends.

Since America never forgets, I come to the floor today to read their names and to remind us to keep their families in our prayers: Marine Sergeant John Harvey; Marine Corporal George Holmes, Jr.; Marine Staff Sergeant Dewey Johnson; Air Force Major Richard Bakke; Air Force Tech Sergeant Joel Mayo; Air Force Captain Lynn McIntosh; and Air Force Captain Charles McMillan.

HONORING ISRAEL'S INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise to recognize Israel, our partner in peace and prosperity, for its 67 years of independence.

On April 14, 1948, just hours before the British mandate was due to end, Israel's founding fathers and mothers, led by David Ben-Gurion, declared the birth of the State of Israel in Tel Aviv.

On that day, 67 years ago, the population of Israel was 806,000. Today, 67 years later, after many difficulties and hardships, a strong, resolute Israel has a population of over 8 million.

Many of the Jews who lived in Israel in 1948 were survivors of the Second World War and the Holocaust, which pushed international opinion for the need for a homeland for the Jewish people where they could be free from persecution and free to build a better life.

Since that fateful day in Tel Aviv, Israel and its people have worked tirelessly to build a thriving democracy that is economically prosperous and at peace with neighboring nations.

The first nation to recognize Israel's independence, I am proud to say, was the United States, when Democratic President Harry Truman welcomed Israel into the community of nations just hours after its declaration. The bonds between our two great nations, bound together by common interests and shared values, have only grown with time.

Mr. Speaker, I hope, on this joyous day, that we reflect on the need to redouble our efforts to bring peace to the region and continue to support our friend and ally in its quest for peace.

FARC DEMANDS IMMUNITY

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Marxist Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, or FARC, in a direct violation of a ceasefire, attacked a resting army unit in Cauca, killing 11 Colombian soldiers and injuring 20. I mourn with the Colombian people for this senseless loss of life.

Just this past weekend, reports from Colombia claim that a naval convoy delivering medical and humanitarian care to remote communities in Colombia's Amazon region twice came under attack by FARC forces. Attacking medical personnel is considered a war crime by international law.

Colombian President Santos continues to demonstrate a dangerous naivete in his negotiations with the terrorist organization. The FARC demands immunity and political legitimacy, but it is not an honest partner in the peace process.

Immunity for the FARC would constitute an affront to the memory of thousands murdered by that terrorist organization, innocent victims whose spirits demand justice.

Mr. Speaker, peace is always achieved through strength, never through weakness and appeasement.

□ 1230

A NEW TRADE MODEL FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, Congress spent this past week trying to fast-track Trade Promotion Authority and the new Trans-Pacific Partnership proposal for trade agreements with several nations in the Pacific; but why rush such a significant piece of legislation that cedes Congress' constitutional authority to the executive branch?

Meanwhile, Prime Minister of Japan Shinzo Abe and President Obama are scheduled to meet on April 28 to further fast-track this agreement.

Rushing this process is an easy tactic to try to silence a reasonable opposition, but, based on our country's history of making trade deals that drive up our trade deficit and outsource millions of U.S. jobs, the American people should be alarmed. I and many others are sounding that alarm.

Japan is one of the most significant partners in this agreement, and it is the world's second largest currency manipulator and is one of the leading protectionist markets in the Pacific. They have much to gain from a weak trade agreement.

Japan is the world's third largest automobile market, but 96 percent of that market belongs only to Japanese automobiles. Since 2000, we have been able to sell 183,000 cars there, but guess how many they sold here—16.3 million. That is 89,000 to 1.

There is something wrong with trying to work a deal that rewards a country whose markets are closed. We need a new trade model that creates jobs in America again and that does not reward currency manipulators and protectionist markets.

TRIBUTE TO DONALD S. POWERS

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

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a significant Hoosier, Mr. Donald S. Powers, who passed away on April 21, 2015.

I would like to express my gratitude for his community service and economic development efforts in my hometown of Munster, Indiana. Most importantly to me, he was a friend and a mentor who was always ready to provide some guidance. More than that, those who claim northwest Indiana as their home can also rightfully claim the same kind of relationship with Don Powers.

Mr. Powers proudly fought for our Nation during World War II as a Navy fighter pilot and then again in the Korean war. He was a graduate of Indiana's beloved Purdue University where he spent several years as president of the board of trustees.

Mr. Powers went on to develop much of Munster's residential neighborhoods; and, in 1973, Mr. Powers took part in the creation of Community Hospital, which was voted as one of America's 50 best hospitals 7 years in a row. In 1989, he developed the Center for the Visual and Performing Arts, home to the Northwest Indiana Symphony Orchestra and South Shore Arts.

His efforts in developing Munster led to nationwide accolades for the community, even having the town make Forbes Magazine's 25 top suburbs for retirement. Mr. Powers was highly regarded in the community and throughout Indiana for his philanthropic and business endeavors.

Indiana and, indeed, the Nation, Mr. Speaker, lost one of its best leaders this week, but his legacy will certainly endure in the many lives he positively affected.

ENLIST ACT

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

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, I, once again, introduced the ENLIST Act.

The ENLIST Act would give young adults who came here through no fault of their own, who have graduated from our high schools, who can pass a background check, who can speak English, and whom the military is asking for to protect and defend the Nation that they know and love the opportunity to actually sign up for the military, to wear the cloth of our Nation, and put their lives on the line.

At the end of an honorable term, they would be eligible for permanent residence in the United States of America.

This is an act of patriotism. This is an opportunity to create a greater national defense and an opportunity for those kids who know of no other country to call home to actually pledge allegiance and be patriots of this great Nation.

FAST TRACK AND MARRIAGE EQUALITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, in just a few months in Washington, I have learned that there is always something going on, and this week is no exception to that rule. In the coming days, two very important actions may change life for many of my constituents and Americans across the country.

Last week, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. RYAN, introduced the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015, legislation that would allow the President to negotiate and to sign trade agreements with limited congressional oversight. The Committee on Ways and Means has reported that legislation out, and I imagine we will be considering it on the floor in short order.

Next week, the U.S. Supreme Court will hear arguments in Obergefell v. Hodges, which is a case that has the potential to decide once and for all whether every American, regardless of sexual orientation, should have the right to marry and should have access to all of the legal rights and benefits we afford married couples.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I plan to address both of these important issues on the floor of the people's House this afternoon. I want to start by talking about the legislation that was reported out by the Ways and Means Committee this week.

If Congress authorizes TPA's fast-track authority, this President and every President elected after him will have the unprecedented authority to negotiate and sign sweeping trade agreements with little opportunity for Congress to intercede on behalf of the many Americans those deals inevitably impact.

In the past, those agreements haven't turned out great for American workers here at home, which is all the more important reason that Congress should be able to retain the ability to fight for what is in the best interests of our constituents. After 6 years of secretive negotiations for the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement, we haven't been given much motivation to release any of this oversight.

Offering fast-track authority for the TPP means that we press fast-forward on policies that put American families' health at risk on policies that are challenging our chemical safeguards, on policies allowing unregulated and potentially contaminated food products into the United States.

We lose our chance to question policies that would allow foreign corporations to skirt our courts and demand taxpayer compensation when they feel they have been violated by U.S. laws.

Our constituents are relying on us to stand up for their interests on TPP and on every future trade agreement to come down the line. We cannot pass the buck on this, and I know that our first speaker today agrees with me.

I want to talk a little bit about the State of New Jersey because the State of New Jersey has seen what can happen when trade deals go bad: factories close, employees are laid off, and cities that have previously made things that have been bought by consumers around the world are suddenly faced with stunted economies and surges in unemployment.

My capital district—''Trenton makes, the World Takes''—is an illustration of what was a great economy in that locale. That is why it is so important that this body ensures we only sign these agreements when we are sure they will help, not hurt, working families.

I yield now to another Member who is deeply familiar with the issues in New Jersey, my friend and my fellow freshman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS).

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of what is being called fast-track authority.

The legislation would allow a deal, a deal that, regardless of its impact on American jobs, would go into effect with just a simple up-or-down vote. We have no other avenue for input, and I think we are seriously misguided. The best indication of that is history, where we have been.

I started my career as an electrician, working up and down the Delaware River, in different plants that manufactured products for not only the United States, but around the world. Now, I go through what is now my congressional district, and I can see the empty boxes which used to be manufacturing, which used to put men and women to work.

Since NAFTA, I have been involved in trying to educate the people of not only my area, but, certainly, of the rest of the country, that this is seriously misguided and that the rhetoric that we heard at the time ended up being the exact opposite.

In my district alone, there have been 19,500 jobs lost and 59 employers who are no longer there. Those empty buildings that we used to call home, that used to pay for college educations, those are dreams erased. I was sent to Congress to create a climate for jobs here in America, and that is my focus. That is why I am so passionate about this issue.

When we look around the country, we are just now coming out of the worst economic times since I have been alive—the worst times. Now, what we are seeing and what we are being asked to do is to grant authority to take those jobs—the ones that will take care of our families—and ship them overseas.

They did it before, and it is going to happen again. Our job is to help create jobs here in America for all of the people, not just for the few who make and own the companies.

I urge my colleagues in the strongest way I can to say ''no'' to fast track and to say ''yes'' to American jobs.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, our constituents are really relying upon us here to stand up for their interests on TPP because every future trade agreement that comes down the line has an impact on our quality of life and on our opportunities.

I know that the speaker that we are getting ready to hear from knows very well how this trade agreement and how these negotiations are going to impact the communities and the economy of our United States of America. It is my honor to yield to someone who has been fighting furiously for her constituents, who has been adamant about giving a voice to the voiceless, and who has been educating our Caucus on a routine basis.

I yield now to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Let me say thank you to my colleague from New Jersey. I appreciate her kind words, but it is also true that she has been a strong, strong supporter of what this trade agreement might do to working families in the United States because where her heart and soul and where her values are, are going to strengthen the middle class in this country, not take the jobs away, not lower their wages, but make sure they can take care of themselves and their families.

I was so pleased to see another colleague from New Jersey here as well, and I am proud to join this effort.

□ 1245

On Monday, the beginning of this week, I went to Ansonia, Connecticut, which is in my district. I went to a place called the Ansonia Copper and Brass Company. There I was with the gentleman, John Barto, who was formerly the vice president of Ansonia Copper and Brass. John used to work there alongside of hundreds of others. He made specialty metal products, products that were used by U.S. industry and our military. Not so long ago the company employed thousands. Today this site lies vacant. All of those jobs have gone. What closed this plant? Unfair competition from overseas, exacerbated by bad trade deals.

Just don't listen to me on this. These are the words of a gentleman that I stood with in a hollowed-out building where the rain was coming through the roof on Monday because it is vacant and it is becoming just derelict. They are now taking the steel out of there to see what they can do to sell it in order to see what kind of revenue can be raised.

This is what he says: ''These trade agreements are always promised to bring money and jobs and prosperity to our country, but they've done the exact opposite. We were a supplier to the United States Navy for over 70 years for a very critical part. Now that part is no longer made in this country, and that's terrible.''

Further: ''I think we already know that this is going to be like NAFTA (the North American Free Trade Agreement). There's something undeniably suspicious about an agreement when you're not able to see it''—to read it, to understand what is in it.

Finally, I will just say that his words and he did strike a chord when he talked about:

> We've long understood that currency manipulation is the driving force behind jobs existing in this country. It hasn't changed. That's an issue. We talk about NAFTA, we talk about CAFTA, most recently the Korea free trade agreement, and they are going to change things, bring jobs, help manufacturing. It has done nothing short of the exact opposite. I am living, breathing proof . . . This was a vibrant company. There were 300 people-plus working here . . . Now there are zero jobs, zero revenues . . . Hundreds upon hundreds of employees, thousands worked here over time . . . generations of families were supported by this company, and it's with great sadness that we find ourselves here today. The fact is the enemy is ourselves . . . We have got to get our Senators and all of our elected representatives to understand what we're up against is currency manipulation. I don't for a second believe that we need to take this deal, negotiate it in the back room. Our elected officials cannot see it. That squashes democracy. It reeks of impropriety. What is going on here where we cannot see this agreement?

These are not my words. I didn't work at Ansonia Copper and Brass. But today, John Barto, a former vice president, is trying to find another job for himself and for his family. That is the story that this free trade agreement is all about.

What has gone on here and what is happening in our manufacturing sector is that problems are leaving people struggling to find middle class jobs. American manufacturing jobs are being lost; foreign products are being subsidized, and those are coming in, and it is about these bad trade agreements.

The United States is poised to sign the biggest trade agreement of them all, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, and it is a very dangerous prospect for our economy, for our working families. It forces Americans to compete with low-paid workers in developing countries like Vietnam, where the minimum wage is 56 cents an hour. It hazards the health of our families by opening up our borders still wider to dangerous, unregulated food, toxic seafood from Malaysia and from Vietnam. It empowers foreign companies to challenge all kinds of U.S. laws, without ever stepping foot inside an American courtroom. It promotes corporate special interests. It relegates labor rights and environmental protections to the sidelines. It does nothing to confront the currency cheats whose abuses have already cost Connecticut over 32,000 jobs.

Now the administration wants us to give it a rubberstamp to say: You go ahead and complete the negotiations that they have been engaged in for the last 5 years without any congressional input so that they can complete the deal without us knowing what is in this Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement.

What is fast track? What does it mean? No public scrutiny; limited debate in the House of Representatives; and no ability by Members of Congress, who have the constitutional authority to review free trade agreements, it gives us no opportunity to amend the process. If we wanted to change it, we can't change it once you have given fast track.

We have been here before. The administration sought fast-track authority last year. It failed. They produced another bill that came out of a committee in the United States Senate; and in the House it is exactly the same, almost exactly the same as it was last year. Our view is it is dead on arrival this time as well.

On that issue of currency which Mr. Barto spoke so poignantly about, which, currency manipulation, when a country devalues its currency, it makes their goods cheaper than our goods. The administration has refused

to put a currency chapter in the free trade agreement, and they have said that. They wrote a letter to the United States Senators. That is the biggest link in losing jobs and depressing wages.

I will finish up on this. What is the economic challenge that we face today? People in our country are in jobs that just don't pay them enough money to pay their bills. Middle class families are struggling. Wages are stagnant today. Why would we want to support a free trade agreement that will only exacerbate this problem? It will not create jobs and, further, it will depress wages.

We counter, say ''no'' to fast track and that we are not going to stand by. We are going to exercise our constitutional authority as Members of the House of Representatives. Read this piece of legislation, and it has to reflect not our ideas, but what our constituents believe is the right thing to do on their behalf.

I can't thank you enough for organizing this effort today. You can be sure that every single day we are going to be up on our feet and finding the votes to say ''no'' to fast track and ''yes'' to the American people and to working families in this country. I thank the gentlelady.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I thank the gentlelady for having taken this issue and just gone forward with it and having been such an educator of us, of the ones that are new and the ones that have been here and that have taken the time to really speak to the constituents about the impact of this trade agreement and the potential that it has a negative impact on our economy, our safety, our security, our worker protections. I thank you very much.

I think it is quite illuminating for people to understand that no one is opposed to trade. We are just opposed to unequal trade. No one is opposed to exporting or importing. We are opposed to not knowing what is in this trade agreement. We are opposed to not having a say in this trade agreement, and we are opposed to anything that creates greater unequal opportunities for the workers of this country to have decent jobs and good wages that are being paid. So I thank you very much.

The notion of giving this President, whom we love, and any President that we are going to love in the future the authority to do that without our involvement is not what was expected by creating these three coequal branches of government.

As I said to you in the beginning, there are two very important issues that our constituents are concerned about, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to speak out today because they are occupying the minds of many of our colleagues over the next few weeks. It is not only this major issue that will be on the minds of American people, but next week, just next week, the U.S. Supreme Court will take up a case that has the potential to fulfill the principles of equality and justice that this country stands for. When the court hears arguments in this case, they will have the opportunity to ensure that every American, regardless of whom they love, has access to the legal rights and benefits we give on the Federal and State level to married couples.

More than 60 percent of Americans already agree that same-sex couples deserve the same recognition that we give heterosexual couples; and just as public opposition has crumbled, so have many of the arguments we have made against giving these couples the same protections we give their heterosexual peers. I am proud to be a member of the LGBT Caucus and to join my colleagues today on the floor this evening as we urge the court to rule in support of equal rights and in favor of marriage equality.

It is my pleasure now to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), a leader in the fight for marriage equality and equality in general for all people. I now ask Mr. TAKANO from the great State of California to share his remarks with us.

Mr. TAKANO. Well, I thank the gentlelady from New Jersey for yielding to me during this Special Order, and I want to give time for us to get set up with our graphics.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is on the cusp of correcting a longstanding injustice, an injustice that has been embedded into our national psyche and, frankly, our laws for more than 200 years. It is an injustice that says LGBT Americans shouldn't receive the same rights as everyone else. It is an injustice that the law in many States still says it doesn't matter how committed LGBT relationships are or how much in love they are. It is an injustice in the law that says LGBT Americans cannot and should not be able to get married.

The law could not be more wrong, Mr. Speaker. Our Constitution says that no person shall be denied equal protection of the laws, and that should include LGBT Americans. To say that it doesn't matter how committed same-sex relationships are is an insult to the thousands of same-sex relationships that have been going strong for 30, 40, even 50 years. Gender and sexual orientation should not matter when it comes to the right to marry. What should matter is what is in one's heart.

Now the Supreme Court can correct this injustice next week, as it is set to hear oral arguments in a case that could make marriage equality the law of the land. Now, I have never been one to count my chickens before they hatch, but I believe that the Supreme Court will rule on the right side of history.

Our Nation has been moving toward marriage equality at a breakneck speed. Ten years ago, only one State had marriage equality; and as you can see here, things have changed, as 36 States and the District of Columbia now have marriage equality.

As we prepare for the Court's ruling, let us not forget that there are more battles to be fought. As it stands in 28 States, someone can be fired because of their sexual orientation or gender identity. This puts individuals who live in certain States in a difficult position. I just want to take a moment to point out, this here is a map of where those 28 States are in our country with employment discrimination in the United States.

I want to tell you the story of Lonnie Billard of South Carolina, a high school teacher for more than a decade. Lonnie couldn't wait to marry his long-time partner when marriage equality came to South Carolina in late 2014. Like so many Americans do, he posted the news of his marriage on Facebook.

□ 1300

Several days later, he received a call from his assistant principal, and he was fired from his job.

Marriage equality is coming, Mr. Speaker, but what does it say about our Nation when people cannot share the happiest day of their life for fear of losing their job?

For Americans who live in States with marriage equality and legalized discrimination, we are telling them that they can have the same rights as everyone else, but it is best that they don't tell anyone about it.

What we have is an incomplete patchwork map of rights for LGBT Americans. If you look at the marriage equality map, there are 36 States with marriage equality. But if you look at the employment discrimination map, LGBT Americans can be fired in 28 States simply for being who they are.

That means that in 14 States—like Indiana, Alabama, and Pennsylvania—an LGBT American can get married to their partner, but then get fired because of it.

That is not what our Nation is about. Every American is granted a certain set of rights, and they should be able to exercise them as freely and openly as they wish.

Our Nation is becoming a more perfect Union. But until we recognize that LGBT Americans are entitled to all of the same rights and protections as anyone else, full legal equality for LGBT Americans will be incomplete.

There will be a day when both of these maps are combined and show that LGBT Americans are receiving full and equal protection under the law. Until then, we fail to live up to our own Constitution. But even when we reach full legal equality, it may take years until we receive equality in the hearts of all Americans.

I know I will continue the fight for equality in the hearts of all Americans, and I know the gentlewoman from New Jersey will fight as well.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Thank you very much to the gentleman from California.

I have to tell you that I am very happy to be able to work with you on this issue. As a State legislator, this

was important to us in the State of New Jersey. And as we grappled with all kinds of configurations of equality in relationships, we recognized that everything but absolute marriage equality was giving individuals stumbling blocks over very important things like simply being able to visit your loved one in the hospital and making medical decisions for them, or being able to enjoy the financial rights that a heterosexual couple can enjoy.

Any area in which there is inequality is a threatened area to every one of us who at one point has been discriminated against or has been identified as part of a protected class.

So I thank you for the work that you are doing here, and I am your partner in this effort.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our leader in our Caucus on this and so many other issues, a person who stands up each and every day for the rights of the citizens of this great country.

Mr. HOYER. I thank Congresswoman COLEMAN for yielding time, and I thank her for organizing this Special Order and for her leadership on this issue. She is a new Member, but not a new person to public service, not a new person to leadership, not a new person to fighting for the rights of every American, and I thank her very much for her leadership, her commitment, and her courage.

I also want to thank, Mr. Speaker, the LGBT Equality Caucus for its powerful advocacy on this issue.

The Supreme Court next week is hearing more than just an argument about same sex marriage. It is considering a question fundamental to what it means to be an American.

Our Nation, as we say so proudly, was founded on the premise that all people are created equal—not the same, but equal—irrespective of the differences. Our Declaration of Independence, as all of us quote so often, says:

''We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men''—of course, if Jefferson were writing today, it would be either all people or all humankind—''are created equal, that they are endowed by''—not a Congress, not by a Constitution, not by a will of the majority—''their Creator''—by God—''with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.''

That, of course, has not always been America's performance, notwithstanding it has been its promise.

Next week, the highest Court in our land will be asked to consider whether these words apply to same-sex couples who love one another. Many courts have already said that it does.

Marriage equality provides same-sex households vital legal protections and economic security that we would ask for ourselves. Marriage equality would mean that approximately 250,000 children in America who are being raised in same-sex households will see their parents receive equal treatment.

One of those families is led by—or perhaps his partner would say he leads it—SEAN PATRICK MALONEY, with three beautiful, loving and loved children. I have seen them all together. They are a happy, healthy family.

Study after study has shown that children of same-sex households are doing as well as their peers from opposite sex households academically, psychologically, and socially.

Marriage equality also means spousal benefits for those who share their lives with and care for their same-sex partners. Marriage equality will mean that same-sex couples, Mr. Speaker, can make medical and end-of-life decisions for their loved one.

These are tangible benefits. These, I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, are the pursuit of happiness. They are tangible benefits and ought to be treated equally under the law in every State of our Union—not in 28, not in 48, but in all 50 and the District of Columbia.

Thanks to the extraordinary courage of millions who have come out to their friends and families, which took a lot of courage, and spoken with their neighbors and coworkers, a majority of Americans now agree that every loving couple ought to be treated equally and have their right to marry recognized.

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, I have three daughters. I have three grandchildren. One of my grandchildren is an adult. All four of those women would say to me: Dad, why is it any of our business who somebody else loves, who somebody else wants to commit to? Why is that our business? Why does it make a difference to us?

What makes a difference to us is how they treat us, whether they obey the law, whether, as Dr. Martin Luther King would say, the content of their character is such that we ought to respect them, not because of the difference of the color of their skin, their gender, their nationality, their religion, or their choice of whom they want to love.

Born equal, endowed by God with certain unalienable rights, and among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Is there a happier time in one's life than when one pledges themselves to another? We all gather, we all celebrate, we all wish them well.

LGBT Americans now have the right to marry and have their families treated equally in 37 States and the District of Columbia. In the remaining States, however, LGBT residents are watching the Supreme Court with great anticipation.

Hopefully, the Court will do as Earl Warren's Court did in Brown v. Board of Education, saying that separate is not equal. Treating people here differently than people here—who love one another—is not equal.

Tens of millions of Americans stand with our friends in the LGBT community in support of marriage equality and believe, as I do, in a ruling in support of the lower courts that have again and again sided with same-sex couples and have said that the law requires, the Constitution requires, that we do in fact live out our promise of treatment on an equal basis.

We need to bring those words of the Declaration of Independence closer to their full realization, Mr. Speaker. Hopefully, the Court will do that.

Mr. Speaker, I am from the State of Maryland. I was proud to join in sending an amicus brief to the Court in March, arguing that the State bans are unconstitutional.

In my State of Maryland, our legislature carried out what MRS. COLEMAN and I have said: equality means equality. We passed marriage equality.

Mr. Speaker, some folks didn't agree with that and petitioned it to a referendum. I am very proud of the citizens of Maryland. They were the first State to say in a referendum at the polls, We believe equality means equality, and passed this resolution and confirmed that law.

I thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey, a leader in that State, a leader in our Nation, for leading this Special Order hour.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we will be able to return to this floor over the summer to praise a ruling by the Court that I anticipate will be historic and accurate and one that our Nation can be proud of for generations, indeed, centuries to come.

Our Nation made a promise in our Declaration of Independence. Our Nation has not always met that promise. Indeed, we have struggled to realize the reality of that promise.

In my lifetime, Martin Luther King, Jr., brought that compellingly to America's attention. In his lifetime, the President whom the majority leader in this House just last week heralded as one of the great figures, great giants in American history, Abraham Lincoln, called the attention of his generation to the gulf between the promise and the practice in America.

It resulted in a war in which we lost more lives in America than any other war in which we have been involved: the Civil War. It is sad that we had to fight. It is sad that we lost lives. But we have redeemed, to some degree, the promise of treating people based upon the content of their character.

□ 1315

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, and I appreciate the passions with which you have taken on this issue of right and wrong and equality, as you have taken on other issues. Thank you for you leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I know that these may seem to have been very diverse issues to bring before the floor at the same time, but they are connected in so many different ways, particularly because our constituents care deeply about both of these issues.

If we allow the fast-track authority to move forward, we risk signing up for a trade deal that risks our environment, the health of American families,

while excusing the reprehensible conduct of many of the governments who would become our new partners, all while putting in the same compromise for future agreements.

Meanwhile, if the Supreme Court upholds the tenets of justice and equality that our Nation has always valued, LGBT couples across the country will gain the access to the same rights and protections that heterosexual couples expect and enjoy, and the children of those couples will have the confidence and the security of their family's relationship. I look forward to continuing my work with that.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 19 minutes remaining.

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

HONOR THEIR MEMORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, on April 24, the arc of the moral universe will intersect with the 100th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. Many will bear witness to that intersection, but sadly, official recognition of the genocide by the United States Government will be conspicuously absent.

Let us review the facts. In 1915, more than 1.5 million Armenians were systematically annihilated by Ottoman-era Turkish authorities. Men, women, and children were massacred, deported, and condemned to death marches into the Syrian Desert, where they died of thirst and starvation—no final rights, no burial, an assault on the dignity of a dignified and proud people.

This indisputable tragedy of history has been acknowledged by innumerable scholars and historians, including the International Association of Genocide Scholars, the Elie Wiesel Foundation for Humanity, and no less than 53 Nobel laureates. The European Parliament and Pope Francis recently joined the chorus that honestly labels this horrific chapter of Turkey's history a genocide.

Hopelessly infected by the disease of denial, modern-day Turkish authorities have now made it clear they were never going to acknowledge the 100th anniversary of the genocide with anything approaching candor, honesty, or the most minimal degree of self-reflection.

It heaps insult upon injury that they have chosen the genocide anniversary of April 24 to commemorate something wholly different, the 100th anniversary of the landing of British imperial forces at Gallipoli, a landing that actually occurred the next day, on April 25, 1915.

Turkey's treatment of the Armenian genocide is no surprise. It is a conditioned reflex that has been codified into the laws of the state. In Turkey, anyone who uses the word ''genocide'' to describe the massacre of the Armenians is subject to criminal punishment under article 301 of the Turkish penal code.

Obviously, we should have dramatically higher expectations for our own country. That is the reason that, as a Member of Congress who has long supported a resolution to recognize the Armenian genocide, I have dreaded the prospect that the 100th anniversary would come and go without official recognition from either the United States Congress or the President of the United States.

I share the deep disappointment and sense of betrayal felt by the Armenian people and all who support their cause. It is lamentable that, on Capitol Hill, advocacy for recognition is being undermined every day by Turkey's intense lobbying campaign to block passage of the Armenian genocide resolution.

In the face of this, it is easy to be cynical and angry, but we should remind ourselves and be inspired that, on April 24, hundreds of thousands of Americans will defy the lack of official recognition with their own personal and heartfelt acknowledgment of the Armenian genocide.

In Turkey, there are brave citizens who, at great personal risk, condemn state authorities for their tragic silence. Ultimately, the voices of individual citizens have a special power to move the heart, in this instance, to bless the unmarked graves of 1.5 million Armenians whose own voices and spirits were trampled into the ground 100 years ago.

This year, I will resist the temptation to mark the anniversary of the Armenian genocide with anger and frustration at the lack of official recognition from those who should know better; rather, I will draw strength from the conviction that the arc of the moral universe will ultimately bend toward justice, toward the eternal memory of those who perished in this undeniable tragedy of history.

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

STOP THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN. I thank the gentleman for this Special Order on an important subject, the Export-Import Bank. I was just going to start with retelling a story I told at an event not too long ago that I think is important.

The scenario that is going to play out, I think, all across the country later this afternoon, there is going to be a guy who works second shift at the local manufacturing facility. He is going to go out, get in his truck to drive to work.

Now, remember, he is working second shift, which means he has got to miss some of his kids' Little League games, miss some of his children's afterschool activities.

He goes out to get in his truck to go to work, and he looks a couple of houses down, and he sees a guy sitting on the front porch, drinking a cup of coffee, reading the newspaper. He knows the guy can work, but won't work, and is getting his tax dollars.

He gets in his truck to drive to work, and he happens to turn the radio on. It happens to be the news hour. A reporter comes on and talks about the Federal Government's got an $18 trillion national debt.

They have got this program that gives money to favored and connected corporations. One of these companies went bankrupt and cost the taxpayers a ton of money.

He hears all that, and he remembers what he saw on the front porch of his neighbor's house. Guess what, this guy is ticked off, and he has every right to be.

At the same time he is driving to work, there is a lady driving home from work. She teaches second grade at the local elementary school, and she has busted her tail all day long helping her students.

She views her job as a teacher as a mission field, trying to help her students get the skill set they need to start on their path to achieving the American Dream. She has worked hard all day long.

She is driving home, happens to have her radio on, happens to be tuned in to the same station where the same reporter comes on and talks about the Federal Government with an $18 trillion national debt, this program that gives money to favored corporations, connected corporations. This one company went bankrupt, cost the taxpayers millions of dollars.

She hears all that as she pulls into her driveway on the same street, sees the same guy sitting on his front porch, drinking coffee, reading the paper. She knows he can work but won't work, and he is getting her tax dollars. Guess what, she is just as mad as the second-shift worker, and she has every right to be.

Now, our job, as Members of Congress, is to remember people like the second-grade teacher and the second-shift worker and fight for things they care about. Here is one: they care about this concept that goes on in this town, where connected companies get special deals with their tax money, and they want that to stop.

We now have a chance to do that, to start the process of stopping the corporate welfare, and that is what Mr. BUCK's Special Order hour is all about, stopping the Export-Import Bank from continuing the corporate connectedness, the corporate cronyism, and the corporate welfare.

Our job is real simple. All we have to do is nothing, something Congress is usually pretty good at doing. All we have to do is not reauthorize this Bank, which loans out billions of taxpayer dollars, puts billions of taxpayer dollars at risk, and helps connected corporate entities who got every lobbyist in this town hired to fight for their cause, at the expense of second-grade teachers and second-shift workers.

Let's not reauthorize this thing. Let's show those people we are actually fighting for them. Then once we do that, then we can actually also get into the social safety net, reform that, require work for able-bodied adults, treat taxpayers with respect, help people trapped in our social safety net system get to a better life.

We can reform it all, but let's start with those connected companies with the high-paid lobbyists getting the special deals.

One other thing I will add before turning it back over to the gentleman from Colorado, who is doing such a great job on this issue, and my good friend from Virginia, who is going to speak as well on this issue and doing a great job, this thing is not only bad because it loans out money, puts taxpayer money at risk, it is corrupt.

Just last week, Mr. Gutierrez, a long-term employee at the Ex-Im Bank, was indicted on bribery and fraud charges, bribery and fraud charges that go clear back to 2006.

For 7 years, he was scamming people, taking taxpayer money, helping himself, taking bribes from companies benefiting from the Export-Import Bank.

Last week, at the first hearing we have had on this issue this Congress, we had the inspector general at the Export-Import Bank say this—and I will close here. He said there may be more indictments in the Gutierrez case. More importantly, he said there may be indictments in the 31—that is right—31 open fraud investigations that the Ex-Im Bank and the Department of Justice are currently investigating.

Now, if that is not enough reason to get rid of this thing, I don't know what is. It puts taxpayer money at risk—corruption, fraud, 31 open fraud investigation cases. Everyone knows it is bad.

All Congress has to do to end it is not a darn thing. For goodness sake, maybe even Congress can accomplish that.

Mr. BUCK. I thank the gentleman from Ohio, and I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BRAT).

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to follow my fellow Congressman from the great State of Ohio and follow our leader, KEN BUCK.

I am an economist who has been working on international trade policy and economics for more than two decades. I support free trade and equal treatment under the law. I oppose special privileges.

Everyone likes free money, and that gets to the crux of this issue, and I want to go real slowly over this issue because everyone knows there is no such thing as free money or a free lunch. Every economics student learns that in their first course in economics.

Let's just be real clear on that one point and take our time. If you get free money, right, if a corporation gets free money or you get free money, that is good for you, and you are going to hear a lot of people up here saying: Hey, this hurts business, this hurts my company because I am getting free money.

The flip side of that free money is someone is paying the tab for that. Guess who that is, that is you. That is the public. That is the taxpayer. You are footing the bill for this free money that falls out of heaven up here, working through special interests and corporate cronies.

□ 1330

The Export-Import Bank provides cheap, below-market credit to certain exporters. ''Below market,'' that means the market system is not working, and something has jumped in to distort free markets. Below market is just a fancy way of saying ''disguised subsidies.''

Subsidized exporters and their foreign customers like the goodies. For example, Boeing and its airline customers in the United Arab Emirates, India, South Korea, Chile, China, Ethiopia, and Turkey, among others, appreciate U.S. taxpayers helping to subsidize their planes, or any other good you want to name.

So at first, the Export-Import Bank just looks like a bank that is helping our firms export. But then go and look at the size and the bottom line of the foreign firms who are offering these products more cheaply to their customers, the folks we export to. That is the issue.

Banks in this country also like this program since they get lighter regulation on U.S. Government-backed loans and related products. That is a good thing. But, again, the backstop is you, the taxpayer. If this system ever fails—and we have just seen failure of a massive order with the financial crisis of 2008. And who paid the bill at the end of that failure? The taxpayer. You are the backstop for any failure.

Whenever you hear someone say, Hey, I am getting low interest rates—what a great deal. The low interest rates are being paid for by you; and the risk, which is just as important and is easy to hide, is also being borne by you, the taxpayer.

So the Export-Import Bank does not advance the public interest. Export-Import imposes real costs on you, the American consumer, taxpayers, and other businesses through risk, market distortions, and misallocation of resources.

Let me bring a little economics into this. Export subsidies don't—do not—increase net exports, and there is plenty of economic literature to support this claim. Sure, subsidized exports increase. Of course they do. But unsubsidized exports—the folks without the deal—drop, and imports increase in response. So someone is getting a benefit, but there is always someone else that is not receiving the benefit, that is being harmed by this free money out of heaven.

As the Government Accountability Office noted in a study on Ex-Im's jobs claims: ''Additional exports may result in jobs shifting from one firm to another, without an increase in total employment.''

Let me read that again. The study claims: ''Additional exports may result in jobs''—that is what we care about up here—''jobs shifting from one firm''—who loses them—''to another''—who has the free money—but ''without an increase in total employment.''

I think that is what Americans care about. I think you care about increasing total employment, and this program does not accomplish that goal.

What is true for employment is also true for production in general and for net exports, which are all part of our GDP.

These economic outcomes are driven by major macroeconomic factors. These are the things we should care about. These are the things that really do improve our economy: worker productivity, United States capital stock, our business climate, and how much we save or borrow. Those are the fundamentals that we need to improve if we want to do better in the rest of the world. And we should also include the United States education system in the mix as well. The Export-Import Bank doesn't change any of these fundamental market drivers. It just benefits some at the expense of the rest of us.

America is supposed to embody free enterprise and equal opportunity for all people—equal opportunity. ''Equal'' means equal, no special deals for anyone. Getting ahead shouldn't require having friends in Washington, D.C.

Besides, how can we address the entitlement crisis and the legitimate welfare issues we have on the domestic front, as the gentleman from Ohio, JIM JORDAN, just noted, and other domestic reforms if we can't even tackle a narrow corporate welfare program?

I will just close by drawing another comparison with the great financial crisis we had in '07–'08. Fannie and Freddie had a network across 50 States. It was almost a shadow Congress of power that even Members of Congress didn't want to go up against because they were so powerful.

And what happened as Fannie and Freddie helped to generate mortgages to people who could not pay their mortgages; right? Subsidized rates—is it sounding familiar? Subsidized rates to folks who didn't have incomes, liar loans, and utter financial collapse starting in the housing sector, spreading over to the financial sector, all too good to be true, all free money falling from heaven, just like I am describing here with the Export-Import Bank.

And at the end of the day, who paid the bill? You did, the American taxpayer.

So the Export-Import Bank is building the same infrastructure throughout the country. They are going State by State by State, Member by Member by Member, saying: Hey, you have companies who really need this special deal. They like the deal.

We have shown, I have shown: it is good for them, but it is not good for you.

These special interest subsidies need to end, starting with the end of the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. BUCK. I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for the opportunity to rise and speak on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I have some serious concerns about the future of the Export-Import Bank, particularly with this administration.

In the past, the Bank has been used to push extreme environmental policies from the President to guide how it awards their loans. We all know that the President has declared a war on coal; and through his administration, he is doing everything he can to prosecute that war on coal. We have seen the EPA and other departments in this administration, through regulation—not through Congress, but through regulation—attempt to shut down the coal industry and bankrupt the coal industry. The President, himself, said his goal was to bankrupt the coal industry. This, of course, along with the Export-Import Bank, is hurting coal companies and costing American jobs as they try to compete in the global market.

I know that American coal has been hurt because the Export-Import Bank has awarded loans in countries that do not have to adhere to President Obama's leftwing environmental regulations. They don't have an EPA in many of these countries, yet we are financing deals there. Our current President has proven time and again he will use any means necessary to circumvent Congress and the Constitution to promote an agenda the American people just don't want.

So let me give you some specifics on the Export-Import Bank and some of their investments:

For example, in 2013, the Export-Import Bank approved a loan in the amount of $694 million in financing for U.S. equipment to develop an open-pit iron ore mine in Australia. The mine is owned by the wealthiest woman in the country of Australia. Do you really think she needs U.S. tax dollar support for this project?

According to public officials, unions, and the Iron Mining Association, these subsidies threaten to displace nearly $600 million worth of U.S. iron ore exports and cause a reduction of approximately $1.2 billion in U.S. domestic sales.

The Wall Street Journal recently highlighted a $641 million deal the Export-Import Bank made with a Turkish company to build a new fuel-producing plant. According to the CEO of Valero, a company that exports American diesel and gasoline to foreign countries, ''The new Turkish refinery will be a direct competitor of U.S. refineries in the global market.'' ''It takes away potential export markets.''

Valero, I might mention, has operations in my district, in my State, and in many other States throughout the country.

Lastly, according to The Heritage Foundation, the Export-Import Bank made a $500 million deal with a copper mine in Mongolia that competes with excavations in Arizona, Utah, New Mexico, Nevada, and Montana.

The American people elect Congress to write the laws and make the laws, not the President. The President is the executive branch. He needs to figure this out. The executive branch enforces laws. They don't make the laws. That is what we do here in the legislative branch. The American people gave Republicans majorities in both Chambers to put a stop to the President's radical agenda.

One other concern I would like to point out is I don't believe the government should be in the business of picking the winners and the losers. Private investors, you, when you choose to shop, individuals, can pick who you want to support.

We have a vibrant and highly functioning private banking system. We should let them determine which loans are made to which companies. When the Federal Government inserts itself into the process, you end up with a system where Washington special interests drive decisionmaking, not free market principles. The Export-Import Bank has become the competitor to this private capital and investment.

And I am a conservative. I believe I support Federal policies that encourage free enterprise and entrepreneurship, not to enter the arena as a competitor to the private sector. The Federal Government should not be in the business of picking winners and losers. Let's let the marketplace decide who wins and loses. This is the way free markets are supposed to work.

What has made America great are the traditional values, hard work, and free markets. The ability to create jobs in this country, that is what has made America great.

We support businesses. Those businesses that create jobs, they have raised more people out of poverty—the businesses and the jobs they create have raised more people out of poverty than any other government program can or ever will.

So I wanted to bring these concerns to the attention of the American people and this body. This is a serious issue that may or may not come before Congress. If we don't act at all, the Bank expires; and it is clear from what I have detailed here, there are serious concerns with moving forward with the Export-Import Bank.

Again, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this issue.

Mr. BUCK. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia.

Bribery, corruption, and fraud, throughout my tenure as a State and Federal prosecutor, I saw all of these evils and more. I am disappointed to say that the words I once used to describe white-collar criminals can now be used to define a federally funded entity.

The Export-Import Bank, or, as some know it, the Ex-Im Bank, has taken advantage of our free market system. An institution that once stood for economic growth, prosperity, and global expansion now stands as a symbol of greed, a pillar of crony capitalism.

It does not take a trained eye to see that the Ex-Im Bank is exactly what is wrong with Washington today. This 80-year-old institution we once trusted to expand our ''Made in America'' brand to every corner of the globe has failed to live up to its charter and has, instead, morphed into something else.

The Bank does not maintain or create jobs. It does not support small businesses as much as its supporters would like you to think. It does not level the playing field for U.S. exporters. It is not even a good deal for taxpayers. The Ex-Im Bank has become more like a train with no conductor at the helm, running faster and faster, heading straight off the tracks. As so often happens when accountability is slim and punishment is nonexistent, the Ex-Im Bank has become a breeding ground for corruption, cronyism, and fraud.

If you think I am wrong, even President Obama agreed with me back in 2008. Before he ascended to the White House, Mr. Obama said that the Ex-Im Bank was ''little more than corporate welfare.'' The President is also on record saying:

> There should be a level playing field for U.S. exporters, allowing them to compete based on the quality and price of their goods and services, rather than on the quality of any officially supported financing.

You know, Mr. President, the great thing about the Internet is those words never go away, no matter how much you change your tune.

At best, the Bank is handpicking winners and losers. At worst, Ex-Im Bank is corruptly accepting bribes, crookedly steering funds to favored foreign companies, and chilling the market for our homegrown companies.

Take, for instance, Delta Air Lines. Delta is suing Ex-Im Bank because it feels that it is being cheated out of many of its former routes. The airline is on record saying that foreign competitors aided by American taxpayer-funded loans from the Ex-Im Bank can now charge less per flight because they have purchased Boeing aircraft at cheaper prices than our own American companies can.

□ 1345

The American taxpayer is subsidizing foreign airlines that compete with other American airlines.

Speaking of Boeing and the Ex-Im Bank's corrupt practices, following Delta's suit, Congress mandated that the Bank perform economic impact reviews on all large deals. Take one guess who helped Ex-Im craft these rules. Boeing. This company received 65.4 percent of the bank's taxpayer-backed financing to help sell their jets to foreign companies, putting domestic airlines like Delta in a bind. How can Ex-Im justify its claims of leveling the playing field and supporting small businesses with these practices?

It only takes a quick glance at Ex-Im's leadership to see how we got to this point. The Daily Caller found that fully half of Ex-Im's own advisory committee members led businesses that directly benefited from Ex-Im financing during their term. Five more members had Ex-Im funding reach their organizations before joining the advisory committee. And most disturbing of all, if we can have something more disturbing, is that the current advisory committee chair is former Democratic Governor Christine Gregoire of Washington State—Washington State, which receives 43.6 percent of the bank's total funding. I invite you once again to take one guess at what company is headquartered in Washington State. Yes, you guessed it: Boeing.

Mr. Speaker, if this is not bad enough, between October 2007 and March 2014, there were 124 investigations linked to corruption surrounding the Ex-Im Bank. This includes some 792 separate claims involving more than $500 million. The Ex-Im inspector general also revealed last week that 31 other Ex-Im Bank employees are currently being investigated for fraud. That brings us to nearly 40 Ex-Im employees who have already been investigated or are currently being investigated for fraud.

During an Oversight and Government Reform Committee hearing during the week of April 15, the Export-Import Bank's inspector general revealed that four senior-level Ex-Im employees were relieved of their duties last summer. These employees were allegedly steering taxpayer-funded loans to favored companies in exchange for cash payments and other kickbacks. A former Congressman is sitting now in Federal prison until 2023 on bribery charges linked to Bank practices. Another former Ex-Im employee was indicted in the same scheme for soliciting and accepting $173,500 in bribes. The list goes on and on. How can we justify allowing a Federal agency to continue to operate in flagrant disregard of the law?

Mr. Speaker, the most recent of these cases features a former Ex-Im loan officer, Johnny Gutierrez. You may remember Mr. Gutierrez as one of the four Ex-Im employees I mentioned before. He has the dubious honor of being the first of these four to be formally charged with bribery by the Department of Justice. He allegedly accepted cash bribes 19 times between 2006 and 2013 to help direct taxpayer-backed loans to a Florida-based construction equipment exporter, Impex Association. Mr. Gutierrez was apparently very good at his job. He secured between $1 million and $5 million to finance Impex Association projects in both Mexico and the Dominican Republic in June 2007. Similar guarantees were also promised to Jamaica and the Turks and Caicos. It is clear this is, unfortunately, not an isolated incident.

It only gets worse, Mr. Speaker. In 2009, former Democratic Congressman William J. Jefferson from Louisiana was convicted of accepting bribes from U.S. telecom company IGATE and a Nigerian company in exchange for selling access to Ex-Im Bank employees. Jefferson was even videotaped receiving $100,000 at the Ritz-Carlton hotel right across the river in Arlington. When Federal investigators raided Jefferson's house, they discovered over $90,000 in cash stashed away in his freezer. This does not even take into account the former Ex-Im employee, Maureen Scurry, who was indicted for accepting $173,500 worth of bribes to help the Nigerian company.

I don't know about you, but when an internal poll shows that only 42.1 percent of your employees think the organization's leaders maintain a high standard of honesty and integrity, and only 50.2 percent of employees believe they can disclose violations of the law without fearing for their jobs, there is something terribly wrong.

It is time for a change here in Washington. The Ex-Im Bank is the perfect example of what happens when a single agency is allowed to pick winners and losers. For too long, Ex-Im employees have been accepting falsified documents, failing to record applicants' eligibility, and forging mandatory checks on applicants' financial integrity. There is a systemic sickness poisoning this agency with greed and corruption. It must be stopped, and it must be stopped now.

This battle may be hard. But it is one I feel deep down that we must fight. We cannot allow this corrupt agency to continue picking winners and losers, laughing in the face of our laws and degrading our free market principles. The Ex-Im Bank is a portrait of exactly what is wrong with Washington today, and it is finally time for a change. That is why I ask you to join me on June 30 in allowing this pillar of crony capitalism to expire once and for all.

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

RECOGNIZING THE BELL STREET MIDDLE SCHOOL SCIENCE OLYMPIAD TEAM UPON WINNING ITS 13TH CONSECUTIVE SCIENCE OLYMPIAD STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an exceptional group of students, teachers, and parents of the Bell Street Middle School Science Olympiad Team, which just won their 13th consecutive Science Olympiad State championship. Let me repeat that: the 13th straight Science Olympiad State championship, a remarkable group of parents, teachers, and students.

The Science Olympiad program is one of the premier science competition programs in the Nation, which for the past 31 years has been dedicated to interscholastic academic competition that provides a series of individual and team events requiring the knowledge of scientific facts, concepts, processes, skills, and science applications. They provide constantly changing challenges to nearly 7,000 teams across all 50 States that allow for students to be exposed to a variety of career choices while meeting practicing scientists and life-changing mentors.

The Bell Street Middle School in Clinton, South Carolina, began competing in this competition in 1986. The Science Olympiad team here was founded by three exceptional teachers: Dr. Rosemary Wicker, Dr. David O'Shields, and Michael Mack. Mr. Mack and Dr. David O'Shields still work in the school district today, and Dr. O'Shields is the superintendent of Laurens County School District 56. He continues to be a part of the team and coaches the Bell Street Middle School Science Olympiad.

Many of the Bell Street Science Olympiad alumni have gone on to be extremely successful in the fields of science and technology. One example is Elizabeth Humbert, who went on to obtain a master's degree in geology at the University of Tennessee and later went on to help manage mastodon excavation at the Paleontological Research Institution in Ithaca, New York. She also participated in the Hyde Park Mastodon Project, which was the discovery of the most complete mastodon to date. She has spent countless hours working in outreach to students through helping to build the Museum of the Earth and through an outreach position at Cornell University for NASA, through which she helped build the STEM internships across the State of New York for underrepresented students.

Today Elizabeth is living on the island of Sumatra in Indonesia, developing a class for upper elementary school students on their regional ecology and geology. When asked about her love for science, Elizabeth states: My building block, my love for learning, my discovery that I could do what I found interesting, dates specifically back to Bell Street Middle School and to our Challenge classes, to enjoying the freedom and the open-ended research it offered and to Science Olympiad and the connections it created.

Of her experience participating in Science Olympiad, she states it provided her with ''the feeling that being different might not be a burden, but a great blessing and an exciting path to follow. Science for me has always been that exciting path and perhaps an unusual one in 1994. I have been so glad to see more women in the field in these last 20 years. I know Science Olympiad fosters that in all students and creates visions of possibilities that really exist,'' she said.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that her statement sums up how valuable this organization has been and continues to be to our Nation's youth.

This year's students are continuing this history of success and innovation with their first-place finishes in 11 of the State competition's 20 events. One event in particular required students to create a wheeled vehicle that could travel a specific distance in the shortest amount of time. This year the length of the track was longer than in previous years, and there was a coffee can placed in the middle of the track. I have got a graphic here to kind of show you what that is. Students lost points if the car went over the finish line or didn't stop close enough to it.

In order to be successful in this event, Dillon Snead created a formula based on what he is learning in his geometry class. He created a triangle with a square ruler which he accurated with his car and then used a formula to calculate the distance from the starting point—starting point being here—to the ending point. This allowed him to create an arch with a point 1/12th of the total distance.

Using this formula, Dillon and his partner, Alyssa Shiflet, were able to create a car that stopped 2 centimeters away from the finish line, winning the team first place. This victory helped the team achieve the overall first place award at the State competition.

You can look at this Web site and actually watch a video. They had to take a motorized vehicle that they created, calculate the distance, the energy, and the radius to go around an obstacle in the middle of the path, and they stopped it at the other end within 1 centimeter of the finish line. This is an eighth-grade student that did this, helping his class win the first place. I think Dillon Snead's mathematic abilities are tremendous. I would like to congratulate him.

Mr. Speaker, I want to finally take this opportunity to congratulate all the coaches and members of this year's Science Olympiad team from School District 56's Bell Street Middle School on their 13th consecutive State championship. I will try to read their names without stumbling. If I do, students, I apologize:

Sydney Argoe, Victor Barcenas, Jordan Barker, Sean Bell, Jonathan Braswell, Sienna Brent, Jakiya Campbell, Erin Caughman, Justin Easter, Mason Gibbs, Cole Gresham, Karl Gustafson, Anjela Gutierrez, Grace Johnson, Matthew Lane, Dequan Lindsay, Patrick Nelson, Toni Parenti, Jakob Pountain, Tytajha Robinson, Alyssa Shiflet, Dillon Snead, Destiny Spoone, Bailey Stephens, Maren Vondergeest, Nathan Vondergeest, Gary Walsh, Caitlyn Watson, David Wilkie, and Kari Young.

These are all the students on that team, Mr. Speaker, and while I don't have all the names of their parents and the teachers, I want to congratulate them as well and thank them for their efforts in helping create our future scientists and innovators, and for challenging these middle school students to be the very best they can be. You see, these things don't happen overnight. These Science Olympiad teams train weekend after weekend, spending Saturdays and sometimes Sunday afternoons with the teachers and the parents involved, figuring all these mathematic formulas out and figuring out this science.

I also want to wish the best of luck to all of you as you make your way to Lincoln, Nebraska, for the national competition, which is in May.

I would like to end by saying: May God continue to bless these students, their teachers, and their parents; may God put a hedge of protection over them as they travel; may God continue to bless Bell Street Middle School; and may God continue to bless the United States of America.

□ 1400

HONORING JOHN T. DUNCAN, SR.

I would also like to take this opportunity to finish my comments here today talking about one of my heroes. My dad passed away Tuesday, a week ago, from complications with Alzheimer's. It is a terrible disease. The Alzheimer's Association and others are working hard to come up with a cure for that.

My dad was an amazing man. He was a 1961 graduate of Clemson University, the first in his family to finish college. He went on to send my brother and me to Clemson as well. My brother has one son that has graduated from Clemson, one that is attending, and I have one that is attending. That is because of my father.

We have a saying at Clemson that our ''blood runneth orange.'' When they prepared my dad's body, I believe they found his blood to truly runneth orange because of his love for our alma mater, and that is Clemson University.

My dad studied industrial management, textiles emphasis. He went on to be a plant manager and supervisor and, ultimately, vice president at Arkwright Mills in textiles.

He used to carry a marble in his pocket. I think that was the philosophy that helped him succeed not only in life as a general manager or a plant manager or supervisor in the textile industry, not as a member of the community, not as a father, but just as a human being. That is a marble that had a saying on it that was given to us by Jesus Christ, and that is:

Do unto others as you would have others do unto you.

Let us treat others the way that we would want to be treated. I think my dad used that philosophy as he walked the plant floor in the textile mills that he oversaw. I think he treated the people that were pushing the brooms or working on the looms or the spinning frames or actually weaving and spinning or actually the supervisors, I think he treated them all the same.

I think my dad treated them the way that he would want to be treated if he was pushing that broom or if he was working on that spinning frame or if he was actually a weaver and supervisor.

Treat others the way you want to be treated. I think if we are able to do that in life, I think we will go far. I think it is a great motto. It is inspiration to me, so I will try to treat others as well.

My dad was one of my heroes. I lost him on April 14 of this year, Tuesday, a week ago. I am going to miss him. He was proud of what I did, proud of what I have been able to accomplish, proud of me serving this great country that he loved so much, the United States of America.

If he was at home, he would be sitting in front of the TV, watching C–SPAN, watching me give this speech; and he would be proud.

Thank you. God bless you. May God bless America.

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

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the Armenian genocide, the first genocide of the 20th century.

Now, I know a number of other Members were planning to join me—there has been some confusion as to the schedule—but I hope that Members interested in this issue would come to the floor and join me during the next 30 minutes.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Long Beach, California, Mr. ALAN LOWENTHAL, for being at the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, of which I am the ranking member, so that I can be here on the floor at this important time.

Mr. Speaker, today, it is the afternoon of April 23 here in our Nation's Capital; but in Istanbul, it is night. It is about to be midnight, bringing in the 24th of April. As we are here, at this very hour, 100 years ago, agents of the Ottoman Government, the government ruling the Ottoman Empire, went out into the night to arrest the leadership of the Armenian community there in Istanbul, then the capital of the Ottoman Empire.

Soon the rest of the plan went into effect. Having arrested and killed the leadership of the Armenian community, agents of the Ottoman Empire felt free to go into the ancient Armenian lands of Eastern Anatolia and begin a process of ethnic cleansing, to begin a process of mass murder, to begin a process of sending people into the desert to die or simply annihilating them on the spot, to begin a well-thought-out plan of genocide, the first genocide of the 20th century.

Now, I am asked: Why is it so important that we remember this genocide? Well, first, genocide denial is the last step of the genocide itself. When I say genocide denial, you might think that, in recounting history of 100 years ago, that I was simply here to commemorate and to mourn.

Unfortunately, the government of modern Turkey has begun and continued a multimillion dollar plan of threats, of lobbying, of secret money, all designed to deny the Armenian genocide. That genocide denial is the last stage of the genocide that began 100 years ago this hour.

First, in a genocide, a people is destroyed, and then we see the destruction of the memory of their annihilation; but worse than genocide denial being the last step of a genocide, it is the first step of the next genocide.

When Adolf Hitler was talking to his henchmen and they wondered whether they could get away with the total destruction of the Jewish people, he was able to turn to them, as he did, and said:

> Who remembers the annihilation of the Armenians?

This genocide denial creates the expectation among other evil men that they can get away with genocide. Why do we here, in the United States, kowtow to Turkey's demand that we fail to recognize the Armenian genocide?

Last week, the European Union overwhelming passed a recognition recognizing not only the murders and atrocities that took place in Eastern Anatolia, but also using, as was appropriate, the word ''genocide.''

A few days before, Pope Francis used the word ''genocide'' for the first time in the history of the Vatican to commemorate this 100th anniversary of massacres. Over 40 State legislatures in our own country and 20 foreign governments have recognized that the acts of the Ottoman Empire against the Armenians in the early 20th century constituted a genocide.

It is time for this Congress to do what then-Senator Barack Obama did and acknowledge that what happened 100 years ago today, what began 100 years ago today, was, indeed, a genocide.

I see that we are joined by the chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I yield now to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California, and I also rise today on the 100th anniversary of the Armenian genocide.

Mr. Speaker, that period of time represented a generation of Armenians, a generation lost to assassination, to depravation, to assault, to starvation, 1.5 million souls, a half a million others left homeless, decades of Armenian culture and history and religion erased from the landscape of Anatolia; and, on this significant anniversary, 100 years, we cannot remain silent.

Pope Francis said it clearly when he called on the world leaders to ''oppose such crimes with a firm sense of duty, without ceding to ambiguity or compromise.''

Our National Archives is filled with thousands of pages documenting the premeditated extermination of the Armenian people. Our own Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, Henry Morgenthau, recalled in his memoirs that that Ottoman Empire ''never had the slightest idea of reestablishing the Armenians in a new country,'' knowing that ''the great majority of those would . . . either die of thirst and starvation, or be murdered by the wild . . . desert tribes.''

Growing up in Anaheim, I knew an elderly Armenian who had survived the genocide only because of a compassionate Turkish family that hid him from sight, and he was the only one in his village—the only Armenian in his village—that survived.

The U.S. has long been a global leader in promoting human rights around the world. The issue of the Armenian genocide is taught in our textbooks. The French, Swiss, Swedish, German Governments, the Russian Government, they recognized the Armenian genocide, as does the EU. As a global leader in human rights, it is important for the U.S. to stand on principle and recognize the annihilation of the Armenians as genocide.

While the Armenian genocide was the first of the 20th century, the blind eye cast to the slaughter of Armenians at the time was a point used by Hitler when he said to his officer corps: ''Who . . . speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians?''

My friends, history is a continuum. Yesterday impacts today, which impacts tomorrow. It is much harder to get tomorrow right if we get yesterday wrong. The world's strength to oppose killing today is made greater by accountability for actions present but also past. It is weakened by denial of accountability of past acts. Not recognizing the Armenian genocide, as such, weakens us.

I wanted to say a bit about the Near East Relief, which was the name of the American charity specifically organized in response to the Armenian genocide. I quoted our Ambassador at the time, Henry Morgenthau, and he very much urged support for this effort.

Through public rallies and church collections and with the assistance of charitable organizations and foundations, that committee raised millions in his campaign to save the starving Armenians as the campaign went across the country with that theme.

Between 1915 and 1930, when it ended operations, Near East Relief administered an amazing $117 million in assistance. It delivered food, clothing, and materials for shelter by the shipload from America. It set up refugee camps in clinics and hospitals, orphanages, and centers for vocational training.

Near East Relief is credited for having cared for 130,000 Armenian orphans scattered across a region that stretched from Tbilisi to Yerevan to Istanbul, Beirut, Damascus, and Jerusalem. Where they could find those orphans, they cared for those orphans.

Near East Relief was an act which quite literally kept a people, a nation, alive. Unfortunately, since 1950, hundreds of Armenian religious, historic, and cultural sites have been confiscated. They have been destroyed. They have been vandalized.

Turkish leaders must act now to prevent losing any more. The United States must keep pressing Turkish leaders until they commit to protecting these sites and to return all confiscated church properties to their rightful owners.

In addition, we must work to protect those Armenians who are living under the threat of violence today.

□ 1415

Armenians in Syria are increasingly targeted for violence by Islamist terrorists due to their religious beliefs, and, in Nagorno-Karabakh, Armenians have suffered under the greatest escalation of violence along the line of conflict in 20 years.

As we remember the victims of the first genocide of the 20th century, let us also commit to working for the safety and freedom of their descendents. Such efforts would be a fitting and needed tribute to the innocent victims of the Armenian genocide.

Mr. SHERMAN. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I want to associate myself with his comments and particularly thank him for focusing our attention on the struggles of the people of Artsakh.

Mr. Speaker, one should remember that, with the support of the Government of Turkey, the Government of Azerbaijan has threatened to shoot down civilian airplanes headed to the Stepanakert Airport. Those are the kinds of threats and intimidation that the people of Armenia and of Nagorno-Karabakh face today.

I yield to the gentleman also from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) if he requests.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Let me thank my colleagues from California for taking the time and effort to come here and to put these very important expressions of outrage into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, yes, we are outraged that people today would even consider not acknowledging the fact that there

was a genocide that took place 100 years ago.

I am a friend of Turkey's. I believe that the Turkish people and the people of the United States need to be close. We were in the cold war, and I am grateful to their contributions to our security over the years; but this doesn't mean that we should not be totally honest with each other and with them as friends in that all of us have made mistakes. Certainly, the United States has committed errors in its past that we should agree to acknowledge.

In this demonstration today, we are putting ourselves in solidarity with the families of those who were victimized 100 years ago by the Armenian genocide. We also express ourselves to our friends in Turkey that this is the time to just acknowledge that, in the past, mistakes were made and that, indeed, it is time to move on and to make sure that people today in Turkey are treated with greater respect for their rights and in continued cooperation with the United States and with other free people in the world.

I thank my friend Mr. BRAD SHERMAN, who has been a leader on this issue, for acknowledging and being here today to make sure that this gets into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on this very important day.

Mr. SHERMAN. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I am here on the House floor where we, today, should be voting on a resolution to recognize the Armenian genocide. Several of us, I believe including the gentleman from California, introduced the Armenian Genocide Truth and Justice Resolution, but that resolution is not on the floor today because of the pressures, arguments, and an incredibly expensive lobbying campaign by the Turkish Government.

It was 100 years ago today, as I pointed out in the beginning, that 650 writers, lawyers, poets, doctors, priests, and politicians were rounded up, deported, and murdered by the Ottoman Government. No one should give any credence to the argument that somehow these were a few individuals who were acting alone, that this was not a coordinated governmental campaign. There were 1 million to 1.5 million people who died, and it was because of a premeditated and carefully planned effort by the Ottoman Government.

Now, we are told that Turkey is an ally of the United States and that, therefore, we dare not recognize the genocide here on the House floor.

First, I believe that there is nothing that we could do that is more important for the people of Turkey than to recognize the genocide and to urge them to do so as well. How will Turkey be a great country in the future if it is so focused on lying about its past? What relationship would we have with the government in Berlin if it were engaged in a Holocaust denial? Who in the world would trust American leadership if the government here in Washington were lying or denying slavery? Every nation has a past. Every nation ought to honestly come to grips with that past.

Then we are told that we cannot recognize the genocide because of threats from the Turkish Government.

Never have I been more ashamed of this Congress than in its kowtowing to threats that turn out to be not only outrageous but illusory. Turkey threatened harsh retribution for those countries that recognized the genocide and then took only token steps against Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, Argentina, and 10 other countries. Some 40 American State legislatures have recognized the Armenian genocide and have not lost a single dollar of exports to Turkey. The greatest attempt by the Turkish Government to muzzle a national legislature was their effort, roughly a decade ago, to prevent France from recognizing the genocide. They threatened an economic boycott. In the 6 years that followed France's courageous recognition of the genocide, exports from France to Turkey increased fourfold.

The only thing worse than kowtowing to ridiculous and outrageous threats is kowtowing to ridiculous and outrageous threats that turn out to be illusory paper tigers.

Finally, I have to comment on just how outrageous it is for Turkey to be threatening the United States, because look at what we have done for Turkey.

In the years since World War II, we have saved them from communism and the Soviet Union. We disbursed over $23 billion in aid. We prevented the creation of a fully sovereign and independent Kurdish state. We helped build the pipeline that brings them oil today, and we have been the loudest voice in urging that Turkey be admitted to the European Union. After we have done all of that, they say it is not enough and that we have to be accomplices with them in denying and in hiding the first genocide of the 20th century.

This is outrageous. It is time for this Congress to show that America is worthy of world leadership, not only because of our values of freedom and democracy, but because we have the courage to acknowledge the facts that actually occurred, and we are not tempted to gain some sort of illusory alliance advantage by denying the greatest crime that a nation can commit.

I think, as we see the last persons who survived the genocide—or the nieces and nephews of those who died—come to the end of their days, that America should recognize this great genocide.

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

DEMOCRACY IS IN GREAT DANGER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, let us note in this great hall of freedom that this is the culmination of over 200 years of sacrifice and hard work and commitment by generations of Americans who started back in the 1700s to build a country that was based on freedom, liberty, and a democratic ideal of which all people's rights are respected and laws are made by the consent of the governed and that, indeed, we could have established a government at the Federal level which had its areas of authority but where other authority was vested in the States and in the people, themselves. This great, wondrous experiment of democracy is in great danger today from a number of areas.

Overseas, of course, we see radical Islam on the rise, and they would like to terrorize the population of Western civilization, especially those of us in America. We also have people who fear forces within our own society. Ironically, one of the things most our people fear is that our own government is out of control and that we have a government today that in no way matches the model that our Founding Fathers had in mind for the United States of America and for the people of this country at this time.

They looked forward to a shining city on a hill, and what we have instead is an evermore control-centered government that is not democratically oriented but is, instead, run for special interests, run by crony capitalists, run by bureaucrats in the Nation's Capital themselves, run by rogue elements within our own government, run by a too decentralized system that has emerged over these last several decades.

The United States was created by individuals who proclaimed a commitment to liberty and to the pursuit of happiness and life. Even as the Declaration of Independence declared our independence from Great Britain, we declared we were, instead, not just a country that was free of Great Britain but that we were going to be a special country in which people's rights were respected.

Even as we did declare our independence in that same document, what did we do?

We listed the horror stories that were going on of the great oppression that our Founding Fathers were experiencing by the British, who were trying to suppress their desire for liberty and independence—many of those items that were declared in our own Declaration of Independence that were reason enough for us to declare independence and to declare ourselves revolutionaries and patriots. Instead, we see many of those same items now being part and parcel of our own government. Our own bureaucracy claims the right to do some of the things that our Founding Fathers felt should have been left to the people and should not be permitted by any government.

Today, I would like to mention two significant issues that are at play in

Washington, D.C., that will play a prominent role in the degree of freedom that is enjoyed by our people. The second issue that I will mention gets a lot more publicity than the first, but the first issue that I would like to talk about today, which is a dramatic diminishing of the freedom and liberty of our people, is a bill that is designed to dramatically change our patent system. All of a sudden, there are yawns. ''Oh, the patent system. Who can understand that?'' No. It is very easy to understand.

□ 1430

Our Founding Fathers wrote into the Constitution that Americans would have the right to own and control the product of their own creative genius for a period of time, that way we would encourage people to innovate, to come up with new ideas. And, in fact, that patent concept was so revolutionary that it was what catapulted America into a major power in the world.

It was a power in which the security and the prosperity of the average person and the rights of the average person were respected. Much of this can be traced back, yes, to the Constitution, to rights, and especially the patent rights because people had a right to own for a period of time the product of their own creative genius.

We developed the technology that uplifted America's middle class. We have a working group in this country who have always had a higher standard of living than other countries in the world. Now, why is that? People all over the world and in the United States work very hard. There are hard-working people all over the world, but it was here where hard-working people were able to prosper; people were able to live in dignity, to have families, to look forward to owning things of their own that they could then possess and enrich their own lives. There was nothing wrong with that, and, in fact, it was our technology that permitted that to happen.

Well, that technology was based on a legal foundation, as I say, in our own Constitution. Benjamin Franklin saw to it, that wise man, and our other Founding Fathers who listened to him and were captured by the idea. Thomas Jefferson, another man who believed in technology, Benjamin Franklin, these were people who knew that with freedom and technology there is no limit to what America can accomplish, and they set out to build the most creative, the freest, the most prosperous land of all, and they succeeded.

But today they are taking elements away from our freedom every day. This attack on the patent system, while it is stealth and not many people are seeing it, is a huge attack on the well-being, the prosperity, the security of the American people.

Now, what we have got—and who is trying to bring about these changes in our patent law that will hurt the little guys, hurt the individual inventors, make sure that the American people don't see this as an individual right but look at it as something that corporations do? No, no. What we have are huge multinational corporations that are trying to do their best to undermine the patent rights that we have enjoyed as Americans for over 200 years.

Yes, it is a sinister attack on the rights of the American people, and we are talking about crony capitalism at its worst in that these are huge corporations having their say in the Nation's Capital and in Congress because they have influence here.

Now, I am not saying that people are being bought off in their votes. I am not saying that at all. But as this system works, every Member of Congress and every person here, just like most Americans, is busy with their lives and busy with specific responsibilities; and what we have are these huge multinational corporations that have basically given campaign donations, not to buy a vote, but to buy someone's attention.

So only about 10 percent of the people here know anything about these patent proposals that are now working their way to the floor of the House. These 10 percent, unfortunately, they know. Over the years, they have been given donations by major multinational corporations who explained their point of view. It is just that the other side has never gotten explained, and nobody knows about the other side.

So, thus, what we have is coming to the floor a bill, H.R. 9, that will greatly diminish the patent rights of average Americans, of the little guy in a way that it will help these great multinational corporations steal the technology that they did not create. This is the big guys versus the little guys; and I will tell you that the little guys don't always win, and the big guys don't always win. But if the little guys become active and they make sure that their Representative in Washington knows what is going on and knows that they stand for a strong patent protection of the American citizens, of patent rights for the American people, the little guys will win; otherwise, the crony capitalists, these major, huge multinational corporations who don't care about the American people. They care about their profit at the end of the year, which may or may not go into America's warehouse or America's banks. It may go overseas, because these are multinational corporations who know no allegiance to the United States.

So what we have got is a bill coming before the House, H.R. 9. Every one of the provisions in this bill has been designed to weaken the ability of American inventors to be able to defend their patent rights in court against major corporations that are trying to steal from them.

Now, how did it get this way? How did we get to this point where a bill may come to the floor—and it passed last year. We stopped it in the Senate. But how is that possible? Well, it is possible not because these multinational corporations said: Oh, we want to weaken the patent protection of America's inventors. No. They said: We have got a problem with trolls.

Trolls, yes. ''Trolls,'' what a sinister-sounding word.

By the way, when I came here 20 years ago, they weren't talking about trolls. They were talking about submarine patents. There is always some sinister-sounding threat that is being used in order to try to diminish the actual patent protection of our average inventor. Today it is ''trolls.''

Now, by the way, what does a troll mean? A troll, according to these corporations, is someone who did not invent something but has purchased the patent rights from the inventor mainly because that inventor maybe doesn't have the money to actually go and to enforce his or her own patent rights upon some huge corporation. So you have some people who come along who have got resources and say, ''I will be your partner;'' or, ''Hey, I will just buy these rights from you.''

This has played an important part in our whole process. You take that away—which is what these big corporations want to say: Unless you invented it, you can't make a profit from it. No, no, no. This is a property right, and if they take that away, individual inventors will never be able to raise the money for their own research, individual inventors won't be able to sell their product. Thus, the number of people who can buy it from them will be so greatly diminished that the value of their patents will be dramatically cut by this bill.

But of course these huge corporations don't care. They just want to use other people's ideas and creations for their own profit. They don't care what happens to these little guys; although we know that it is the small inventor that comes up with the genius that changes the lives of people. But of course these huge multinational corporations are only interested in a profit at the end of the fiscal year.

Well, this is a huge threat, and people are being told that the trolls—these are people who didn't invent, and thus, again, they are going to benefit anyway by bringing the lawsuit. Well, what they describe and try to claim are that the lawsuits brought on are mainly frivolous lawsuits. Well, let me just note, we have a problem with frivolous lawsuits throughout our system.

Throughout our government, we have frivolous lawsuits in every area of our economy. Yes, there are frivolous lawsuits, but this is the equivalent of saying, because some lawyers have frivolous lawsuits, we are going to totally decimate the rights of the American people to sue anyone who has caused them damage. No, no. We don't want to eliminate the rights of the American people because someone has frivolous lawsuits.

Let me note that the frivolous lawsuit end of this equation has already

been corrected in the courts, but they continue to press for H.R. 9 because their real goal is to diminish the rights of American inventors to sue huge multinational corporations who are stealing their technology.

Let's just note the trolls. The trolls, where did this come from? To show how cynical this debate is, the word ''troll'' has actually been created as a PR device to trick the American people into believing that the changes they are bringing about are going to hurt some scurrilous person, a troll, when in fact every provision we are talking about hurts the honest little guy who is struggling to develop new technology or the fact that, if he develops something important but doesn't have the ability to enforce it, he can at least enforce it by selling it to someone who will give him a price for his property. By the way, it is only for about 15 years or so that someone is going to own that, but he has a right to do that. But we are going to eliminate that right for the little guy so that he and nobody else can sue a multinational corporation that is stealing from him.

Well, how did that word ''troll'' come about? I talked to a business executive who was in the room with various business executives from major corporations trying to decide: How will we deceive the American people? What we can do is build up a straw man and make it sound like, oh, this is a horrible person, this straw man; thus, we are going to pass laws against that straw man when, in reality, they are trying to get the little inventor over here.

So what were the names? They went around: What really scurrilous name can we think of? My friend told me: Well, I actually put into the hopper that we should call them patent pirates. Well, that wasn't scurrilous enough. That wasn't sinister enough because one of them came up with trolls, patent trolls. Well, okay, patent trolls. That is just how cynical this is, that we have businessmen who are sitting in a room trying to decide what word can be used to fool the American people into acquiescence into letting their inventors have their patent rights decimated.

One big problem is it is not just the small inventors that are hurt by this change of patent law. Our universities, which now have many patents, our laboratories, which come up with so many new innovations, they are hit dramatically by this. This would probably decrease the value of our patents and people who have whole collections of patents as part of their economic package; it decreases their value perhaps by 50 percent.

The major universities stepped forward and stopped it in the Senate, this bill, last time. Well, H.R. 9 is coming up again. We need to stop it here, and we need to stop it in the Senate. Whether you are someone who depends on a job that is a technology-related job, whether you work at a university or a technology laboratory, we need to make sure that the freedom of technology development is maintained in our country. This is necessary for my colleagues and the American people to become active. The little guys can win as long as we are active. We can beat the crony capitalists who try to diminish our freedom.

The second bill I would like to mention today is H.R. 1940. H.R. 1940 was submitted by me yesterday. Basically, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues and the American people to the importance of H.R. 1940. What it does is sets a policy concerning the Federal Government that if a State government has legalized the medical use of marijuana last year—now, we are going to include whatever marijuana laws are on the books of various States—that the State law should be what is respected and not the Federal Government coming in to States and local communities where people have decided that they don't believe that the police and Federal action and court action should be used against people who use marijuana.

Last year I had a bill that became part of our appropriations process and for DOJ and basically said, for medical marijuana, if a State has a law that legalizes medical marijuana, the Federal Government cannot come in and supersede that State law. In H.R. 1940 I extend that. It will be the same as it was before, only this will also include States that have basically made marijuana for personal use legal.

What this bill says is let's respect the 10th Amendment to the Constitution. Let's respect states' rights. Let's respect local communities' rights to control what is going on in their communities. Let us not have an aggressive Federal law enforcement bureaucracy making decisions for us and superseding what local people want to do with criminal justice in their own neighborhoods.

□ 1445

H.R. 1940 has been submitted. I would hope my colleagues read this and take this into consideration, perhaps coming on board to support this effort.

Last year, we passed a bill just for medical marijuana and put it in as an amendment that said that the Federal Government can't use any of those resources to supersede State law. We got that in last year. And there were 50 Republicans that signed onto the argument that the States have a right to make their determination on these types of things.

Our Founding Fathers didn't mean the Federal Government to have criminal justice control over this country. That was supposed to be left at the local level and at the State level. Our Founding Fathers did not want there to be a Federal police force.

But yet what we have done is create a militaristic Federal police force that comes into people's neighborhood and now is insisting that even if a State and local community doesn't want something illegal, we are going to enforce a Federal law on them that is a criminal justice law that the local people don't even want.

That is not what our Founding Fathers had in mind. Our Founding Fathers wanted local people to control their communities and wanted criminal justice to be a State issue. They didn't want to have the Federal Government to have such control over our lives.

And to show you how heinous this is, we passed that law here in this Congress—it won by a solid majority—that we would not supersede State law when it came to medical marijuana. Yet we have prosecutors in the United States who are still moving forward, filing charges, bringing people to court, even though the States in which they are in have agreed to legalize the medical use of marijuana. These rogue prosecutors are thumbing their noses at the law.

This is what happens when government gets out of line, gets away from the Constitution. The Constitution want us to control our lives at the local level and the State level. They want the Federal Government to handle things that are international and across State borders and are important for trade, et cetera, and our national security. They did not have in mind that we would have Federal prosecutors coming in and stepping on local authority and stepping on local prosecutors and insisting on people being prosecuted, even when the United States Congress is telling them not to do it.

To say that this is arrogance and a threat to our freedom is an understatement. We need to pay attention to this because we have built up in the name of protecting people from themselves a law enforcement drug policy that is a dramatic threat to the freedom and well-being of the American people.

We don't need a militarized police force. Policemen used to be known as peace officers. When I was a kid, they were peace officers. ''I am a peace officer.'' That means they were there to protect us from each other.

Now, we have over the years evolved into the police being called law enforcers. Well, think about what that does. You change the relationship between the law, between the police, and between the citizenry. We have created animosity, we have created fear, we have created violence where there wasn't violence.

When someone breaks into a home because they have a baggy of marijuana, that is unconscionable. Breaking into their home with guns drawn—and this happened. And, of course, we have an Attorney General who is insisting not only are we going to supersede states' rights, but we are going to have asset forfeiture. So if someone is providing medical marijuana for one of our veterans or for some people who are suffering, we are not going to give the parents the choice, or someone

whose older father or mother is in agony, the chance to try medical marijuana. No, no. What we are going to do if somebody does that is seize their property. We are going to seize the property of the person that sold them the marijuana to alleviate their suffering.

This is contrary to everything our Founding Fathers had in mind. This is contrary to the ideal of American freedom and respect for individual rights.

I was one of Ronald Reagan's speech writers, as everyone knows, and I have been a Republican all my life, and here I am with my fellow Republicans, and we talk about getting the government off our backs. We talk about states' rights. We talk about individual responsibility all the time. And we talked lately about the doctor-patient relationship as being so important to us.

And then we turn around and a majority of my colleagues on the Republican side vote to have the Federal Government come in and step all over state's rights, step all over the rights of the individual to control his life and consume for himself, make his own determinations.

Individual freedom, limited government—these are things that we supposedly believe in, but when it comes to the drug issue, no, no; we think the Federal Government has to come in and make that determination for people in their own lives.

This is a threat to our freedom. My legislation will take a long step forward to making this a public issue. We should be debating this.

I have been sponsoring legislation. My first legislation that was successful was last term in Congress, the one that these arrogant prosecutors are ignoring now that has actually been put into law that they can't use their own resources, meaning their pay, their time, and their office in order to prosecute medical marijuana, but yet several of them are doing exactly that. That shows you how the law and how our constitutional rights are being threatened.

I didn't know what reaction my friends who are more conservative would have. I did not know that. I didn't know that maybe some of them would just say: Well, that is a lot of baloney, and just go on using the cliches about the states' rights and individual freedom and not really confront my argument. That is what I thought most of them would do.

But I asked a conservative friend of mine just to see what he would say. He is a retired naval officer—a pilot—and he is a typical conservative voter in my district, or in our area in southern California.

I asked him: What is your reaction to the fact that the guy you supported these years is now the point person in legalizing medical marijuana? And this officer said to me: You know, you don't know me very well, do you?

I said: Well, I know you supported me. You are a retired military officer, and you are now engaged in the aviation business. And he said: Yes, but what you don't know is I have three sons. The day after 9/11, they all enlisted.

I said: Yeah. And he said: Let me tell you what happened. Two of my sons came home whole. One son came home having seizure after seizure after seizure every day.

Think of that. Your child, your hero marches off to war, and there he is, and you can't control the situation. He is having seizures.

They took him to the veterans hospital, and the veterans hospital couldn't do anything to help him. And then one veterans doctor pulled him aside and said: Come and see me off campus. I have got to tell you something. He said: Here is a prescription for medical marijuana. That is what your son needs. I am not permitted to tell you that at the VA hospital.

They did it. And this supporter of mine said: My son hasn't had a seizure since. I saw him just a while ago, and he said: It has been 4 years, and my son is still not having seizures. How do I feel about you being the point man on legalizing medical marijuana? I want to give you a big hug.

Well, guess what? There are people whose parents are dying or their family, their children, are going through seizures. My child recently had a problem with leukemia. Why would I think that, if she was having a seizure and that would help stop it, that the Federal Government should step in and prevent that?

That is what we are doing. The American people need to wake up. My bill will take us a step in the right direction.

I am asking my colleagues to support H.R. 1940. Do it because we believe in freedom. Do it because we believe in the well-being of the American people, and we believe in the system that our Founding Fathers decided of ultimate individual responsibility and freedom. That is what we are deciding, as well as the issue of whether or not some poor suffering soul shall be prevented from getting something that might alleviate their suffering.

That is not the job of the Federal Government. We need to stand tall on this. My colleagues need to be honest and open with their own constituents, and they will find that they are more supportive than they think.

With that said, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LIPINSKI (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 27, 2015, at 8 p.m.

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. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 172. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 501 East Court Street in Jackson, Mississippi, as the ''R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse'' (Rept. 114–89). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1690. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 700 Grant Street in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, as the ''Joseph F. Weis Jr. United States Courthouse'' (Rept. 114–90). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. CALVERT:

H.R. 1981. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide that an employee's 'regular rate' for purposes of calculating overtime compensation will not be affected by certain additional payments; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. HARPER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. TIPTON, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. JORDAN, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. DUFFY, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. MESSER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. LANCE, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. HIMES, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 1982. A bill to amend the Securities Investor Protection Act of 1970 to confirm that a customer's net equity claim is based on the customer's last statement and that certain recoveries are prohibited, to change how trustees are appointed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 1983. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to ensure that the receipts and disbursements of the Social Security trust funds are not included in a unified Federal budget and to provide that Social Security contributions are used to protect Social Security solvency by mandating that Trust Fund monies cannot be diverted to create private accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. PINGREE, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 1984. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the cap on compensation subject to the payroll tax, to reallocate payroll tax revenue to the Social Security Trust Funds, to apply the CPI-E to Social Security cost-of-living increases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. NEWHOUSE (for himself, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. STEWART):

H.R. 1985. A bill to prohibit treatment of gray wolves in Washington, Oregon, and Utah as endangered species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROUZER (for himself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. JONES, Mr. WALKER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. MEADOWS):

H.R. 1986. A bill to repeal the Environmental Protection Agency's most recent rule for new residential wood heaters; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 1987. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal years 2016 and 2017, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. FUDGE (for herself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 1988. A bill to provide for the waiver of the Medicaid IMD limitation in order to permit Medicaid coverage for substance use disorder treatment services furnished to certain individuals in a community-based institution for mental diseases; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DENHAM (for himself, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. DOLD, Mr. NUNES, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BARTON, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. WALZ, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 1989. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the enlistment in the Armed Forces of certain aliens who are unlawfully present in the United States and were younger than 15 years of age when they initially entered the United States, but who are otherwise qualified for enlistment, and to provide a mechanism by which such aliens, by reason of their honorable service in the Armed Forces, may be lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 1990. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to prohibit certain discharges of dredged material into the Great Lakes System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah (for himself and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1991. A bill to extend the authority of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COOK (for himself, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California):

H.R. 1992. A bill to reduce temporarily the royalty required to be paid for sodium produced on Federal lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 1993. A bill to permit the chief executive of a State to create an exemption from certain requirements of Federal environmental laws for producers of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida (for himself, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1994. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or misconduct, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. BABIN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. FINCHER):

H.R. 1995. A bill to prohibit the Department of Housing and Urban Development from implementing certain regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1996. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to prohibit the assignment of social security account numbers to certain individuals seeking employment in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEWART (for himself, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. TIPTON, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HARDY, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. CRAMER):

H.R. 1997. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to provide certain Western States assistance in the development of statewide conservation and management plans for the protection and recovery of sage-grouse species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself, Mr. POE of Texas, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. MENG, Ms. BASS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 1998. A bill to continue operation of the Human Exploitation Rescue Operative (HERO) Child Rescue Corps, a Cyber Crimes Center, a Child Exploitation Investigations Unit, a Computer Forensics Unit, and a Cyber Crimes Unit to support the mission of the Homeland Security Investigations directorate of United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement to combat the exploitation of children; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 1999. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to deny the right to grant retransmission consent to a television broadcast station if an AM or FM radio broadcast station licensed to the same licensee transmits a sound recording without providing compensation for programming and to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from imposing radio tuner mandates for mobile devices; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. VEASEY (for himself, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. TONKO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 2000. A bill to provide for a competitive grant program for apprenticeship and internship programs through the Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida (for himself and Mr. CONAWAY):

H.R. 2001. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the conditions under which certain persons may be treated as adjudicated mentally incompetent for certain purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. ESTY (for herself, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 2002. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend expensing of environmental remediation costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Mr. RIBBLE, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. VELA, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. ASHFORD, Ms. GRAHAM, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. KIND, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

H.R. 2003. A bill to amend the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012, including making changes to the Do Not Pay initiative, for improved detection, prevention, and recovery of improper payments to deceased individuals, 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 Mr. BYRNE:

H.R. 2004. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for more effective online education verification metrics; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida (for herself and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 2005. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require drug manufacturers to provide drug rebates for drugs dispensed to low-income individuals under the Medicare prescription drug benefit program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 2006. A bill to amend SAFETEA-LU to ensure that projects that assist the establishment of aerotropolis transportation systems are eligible for certain grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 2007. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a grant program to assist the development of aerotropolis transportation systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS):

H.R. 2008. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for clarification regarding the children to whom entitlement to educational assistance may be transferred under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 2009. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land inholdings owned by the United States to the Tucson Unified School District and to the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HULTGREN (for himself, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 2010. A bill to require the periodic review and automatic termination of Federal regulations; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. RIGELL, and Mr. NUGENT):

H.R. 2011. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove the authority of the Secretaries of the military departments to revoke combat valor awards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 2012. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to authorize competitive grants to support programs that address needs of fishing communities; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 2013. A bill to strengthen and extend the authorization of appropriations for the Carol M. White Physical Education Program and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 2014. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to carry out programs and activities that connect Americans, especially children, youth, and families, with the outdoors; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. VISCLOSKY, and Mrs. LAWRENCE):

H.R. 2015. A bill to establish educational seminars at United States ports of entry to improve the ability of U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel to classify and appraise articles that are imported into the United States in accordance with the customs laws of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. MEEKS):

H.R. 2016. A bill to end the use of body-gripping traps in the National Wildlife Refuge System; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS (for herself and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California):

H.R. 2017. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to improve and clarify certain disclosure requirements for restaurants and similar retail food establishments, and to amend the authority to bring proceedings under section 403A; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2018. A bill to ensure that the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority complies with auditing standards; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 2019. A bill to prevent the reclassification of certain ammunition as armor piercing ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. VARGAS, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H.R. 2020. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to include foreign terrorist organizations as enemies of the United States for purposes of treason, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 2021. A bill to prohibit the expenditure of Federal funds to Amtrak; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. POLIS, and Ms. BASS):

H.R. 2022. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to create a demonstration project to fund additional secondary school counselors in troubled title I schools to reduce the dropout rate; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 2023. A bill to reduce the annual rate of pay of Members of Congress if a Government shutdown occurs during a year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, 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. SERRANO (for himself, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GRAYSON, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 2024. A bill to require mobile service providers and smartphone manufacturers to give consumers the ability to remotely delete data from smartphones and render smartphones inoperable; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. POCAN, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KIND, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. ESTY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 2025. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for equal treatment of individuals in same-sex marriages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself and Ms. TSONGAS):

H.R. 2026. A bill to enhance the sexual assault prevention and response program of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 2027. A bill to support stabilization and lasting peace in northeast Nigeria and areas affected by Boko Haram through development of a regional strategy to support multilateral efforts to successfully protect civilians and eliminate the threat posed by Boko Haram, to support efforts to rescue female students abducted in Nigeria on April 14, 2014, as well as other kidnapping victims of Boko Haram, and to provide funds for humanitarian relief, development programs, transitional justice, and victim support, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. ASHFORD, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LANCE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NEAL, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. STEWART, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. ZINKE):

H.J. Res. 47. A joint resolution supporting the establishment of a Presidential Youth Council; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. HAHN (for herself, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. COOPER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. POLIS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. FARR):

H. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the people of United States have the Constitutional right to record law enforcement authorities, and they have the full protection of the law to the possession of the recording devices, and full protection of the law regarding data saved on the recording devices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DOLD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. ENGEL):

H. Res. 220. A resolution condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. VELA, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. BASS, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. PETERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LEE, Mr. FARR, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BERA, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WALZ, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mrs. TORRES, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H. Res. 221. A resolution expressing support for designation of April 2015 as ''National Stress Awareness Month''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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. CALVERT:

H.R. 1981.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority of congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 1982.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 (''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States''), 3 (''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes''), and 18 (''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof'').

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 1983.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 1984.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. NEWHOUSE:

H.R. 1985.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, commonly referred to as the ''Commerce Clause'' of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 1986.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution. The Congress shall have power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 1987.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 1988.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 and Clause 18.

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 1989.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional Authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 1990.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 1991.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

''The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.''

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 1992.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 1993.

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 several States, and with Indian Tribes.

The Tenth Amendment—The powers not Delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 1994.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 1995.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 affords Congress the power to legislate on this matter. The executive branch, through the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), has misinterpreted its authority under the Fair Housing Act of 1968, as demonstrated in its Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Rule. Two cases before the United States Supreme Court—Magner v. Gallagher and Mount Holly v. Mount Holly Gardens Citizens in Action—were settled less than a month before the Court entertained oral arguments. The plaintiffs were concerned that their challenges would not be affirmed by the Court. The Court is currently considering a case, Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs v. The Inclusive Communities Project, which may set a precedent for the issue of ''disparate impact.'' Regardless, Congress has the legislative authority to address the Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing rule head on and prevent that rule, or any substantially similar successor rule.

Section 3 of the bill promotes a core component of our republic known as federalism. It requires the executive branch, through HUD, to consult with State and local officials to further the purposes and policies of the Fair Housing Act.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1996.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, to ''provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. STEWART:

H.R. 1997.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 allows Congress ''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 Sates or in any Department or Officer thereof''

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ:

H.R. 1998.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 1999.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8—''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. VEASEY:

H.R. 2000.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 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 Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 2001.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of The Constitution of the United States

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 2002.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 2003.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H.R. 2004.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 2005.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 2006.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 2007.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 2008.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 2009.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HULTGREN:

H.R. 2010.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8, Clause 3—Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and the Indian tribes.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 2011.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution, which allows Congress ''to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces'', and ''to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof''.

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 2012.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 2013.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 2014.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 2015.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power *** To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 2016.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2017.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to regulate Commerce as enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 as applied to providing for the general welfare of the United States through the administration of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2018.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 2019.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 2020.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 2021.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7—''No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.''

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California:

H.R. 2022.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

article I, section 8, clause 4 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 2023.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under:

U.S. Const. art. 1, §1; and

U.S. Const. art. 1, §6

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 2024.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation is introduced pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, which states that ''The Congress shall have power . . . To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.'' In addition, this legislation is introduced pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution, which states that Congress shall have the power ''to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof''

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 2025.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 2026.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Military Regulation: Article I, Section 8, Clauses 14 and 18

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

and To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 2027.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.J. Res. 47.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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 SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 20: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 91: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. LONG, and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 94: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 118: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 119: Mr. SANFORD.

H.R. 121: Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 123: Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 125: Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 201: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 237: Ms. GABBARD and Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 238: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 251: Mr. CONYERS and Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 263: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 266: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 268: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 282: Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 372: Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 448: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 449: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 472: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 473: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 500: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 539: Mr. HANNA and Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 578: Mr. BOST.
H.R. 592: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 594: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 611: Mr. GIBBS and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 619: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 642: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 653: Mr. LEWIS and Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 654: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 662: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 664: Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WALZ, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 670: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 680: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 702: Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 706: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 711: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 721: Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 745: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 842: Ms. Adams, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 855: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 879: Mr. HECK of Nevada and Mr. RATCLIFFE.
H.R. 880: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. TROTT, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 893: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FARR, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BUCSHON, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. RUSH, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. DOLD, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. DENHAM.
H.R. 907: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CHABOT, and Ms. GABBARD.
H.R. 942: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 969: Mr. BOUSTANY, Ms. Maxine Waters of California, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 980: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. ABRAHAM.
H.R. 997: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 999: Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 1002: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 1016: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 1059: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 1096: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1142: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 1170: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1174: Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1194: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 1206: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 1233: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 1258: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1266: Mr. STIVERS, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. TROTT.
H.R. 1269: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 1274: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 1283: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1287: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 1300: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Ms. MCSALLY.
H.R. 1308: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 1309: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. DOLD, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. BABIN, and Ms. Graham.
H.R. 1319: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 1331: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 1336: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 1342: Mr. LATTA, Mr. WALZ, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. SIRES, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESTY, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 1349: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1369: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 1384: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 1387: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 1399: Mr. HIGGINS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. RUSH, and Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 1404: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1427: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 1431: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia and Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 1432: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia and Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 1434: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H.R. 1441: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 1462: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. Rogers of Kentucky, and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 1464: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 1475: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 1478: Mr. FINCHER.
H.R. 1493: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1496: Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 1519: Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 1523: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. ZINKE, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 1541: Mr. Ben Ray LujÁn of New Mexico, Mr. VELA, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1557: Mr. CHAFFETZ, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 1559: Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 1567: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 1571: Mr. WALDEN, Mr. TONKO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. DENT, Mr. POCAN, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. REED, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1572: Mr. LANCE, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 1598: Mr. DOLD and Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 1599: Mr. FLEISCHMANN and Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 1600: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 1604: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Mr. KNIGHT.
H.R. 1607: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1608: Mr. PETERS, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. YOHO, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. POCAN, and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 1610: Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 1618: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 1635: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1654: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1689: Mr. TROTT.
H.R. 1701: Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 1718: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1732: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. MICA, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1734: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 1782: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 1801: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 1814: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1833: Mr. VELA, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1834: Mr. ROSS and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 1842: Mr. HONDA, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. NUNES, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 1845: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1854: Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 1857: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 1858: Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 1886: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 1898: Mr. HOYER.
H.R. 1900: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 1901: Mr. BARTON.
H.R. 1902: Ms. LEE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1904: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1905: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1908: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1923: Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 1924: Ms. VELAQUEZ, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 1926: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 1928: Mr. WALKER.
H.R. 1936: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 1937: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 1967: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1968: Mr. PALAZZO and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 1969: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.J. Res. 42: Mr. WENSTRUP and Mr. DESANTIS.
H.J. Res. 43: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mrs. WALORSKI.
H. Con. Res. 17: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. MEADOWS.
H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. POCAN.
H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H. Res. 26: Mr. ROYCE.
H. Res. 28: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H. Res. 50: Mr. SIRES and Mr. SHERMAN.
H. Res. 54: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. BERA, and Mr. LEWIS.
H. Res. 56: Mr. ADERHOLT.
H. Res. 82: Mr. BARLETTA.
H. Res. 95: Mr. HONDA and Mr. PETERS.
H. Res. 128: Mr. JONES and Mr. ROUZER.
H. Res. 130: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. DELANEY.
H. Res. 147: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida and Ms. BASS.
H. Res. 154: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H. Res. 176: Mrs. BUSTOS and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H. Res. 181: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. DESANTIS.
H. Res. 188: Mr. DESANTIS.
H. Res. 207: Mr. COOPER and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H. Res. 211: Ms. SPEIER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. CONYERS.
H. Res. 216: Mr. RANGEL.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 2015 No. 60

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Our visiting Chaplain this day is the Reverend Ralph E. Williamson, senior pastor of First African Methodist Episcopal Church in Las Vegas, NV. He will lead us in prayer.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Most gracious Master and our God, who has safely brought us to another day, grant these elected men and women in the United States Senate wisdom and Your divine guidance as they seek to take care of the business of this Nation. May Your invisible presence watch over and refresh their minds, encourage their thoughts, and invigorate their spirits to find the peaceful solutions and excellence for which they were elected. Allow every moment to serve as an opportunity to resolve their differences and move our great Nation forward.

We pray in the Name of God, the Creator and Sustainer of us all. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

LYNCH NOMINATION AND HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today we will be considering the President's nominee for Attorney General, Loretta Lynch. Last month I said the Senate would consider this nominee as soon as we passed an all-important antislavery bill, and today we will consider the nominee. We could not have been more pleased to see the legislation, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act pass by an overwhelming majority of 99 to 0, yesterday.

Senator CORNYN and the entire Republican conference made this antislavery bill a priority because the suffering of these victims is simply unconscionable. As the new majority, we decided these victims had waited long enough. We wanted to make it an early legislative priority. It was time to act and finally to give the victims of modern slavery the help and hope they have long waited for.

Now, we can finally say that help is on the way. Victims, advocates, and all the Members of this body who negotiated in good faith, and Senator CORNYN in particular, who never gave up, should take heart in yesterday's outcome. I would urge the House and the President to enact this bill quickly.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, last night we saw the latest example of committees getting back to work in a new Congress—getting back to work for the American people. The Finance Committee passed an important bipartisan bill, trade promotion authority, with broad support from both parties, 20 to 6—20 to 6. The chairman and ranking member of that committee, Senator HATCH and Senator WYDEN, worked hard to achieve the result we saw last night.

Along with Chairman RYAN in the House, they put together an agreement that reflects the kind of honest compromise they can take pride in. It protects and enhances the role of Congress in the trade negotiating process, while ensuring that Presidents of either party—and I would remind our colleagues that this is a 6-year trade promotion authority bill. It will give to the next President the opportunity to negotiate additional trade agreements and send them to Congress for approval.

These agreements can boost our economy and support more high-quality American jobs. Now, this bipartisan bill will move to the Senate floor. It is my hope to pass it during the current work period.

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on the topic of committees getting back to work in the new Congress, we witnessed more evidence of that last week when the Senate Foreign Relations Committee unanimously approved the bipartisan Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. It is a bipartisan bill with many Republican and Democratic cosponsors. It will ensure the American people are given a voice on one of the most important issues of our time.

Chairman CORKER worked closely with Members of both parties both to craft a compromise bill and to advance it. Many have admired not just his hard work on this issue but his determination as well. After all, who would have imagined that the White House, after trying to kill this bipartisan bill for months, would find itself forced to pull a near-total about-face. It is no wonder, though, because the core principle that has always underlined the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act—that Congress and the American people deserve a say in any nuclear deal that the President tries to cut with Iran—is more than just common sense. It is really a no-brainer.

After all, preventing the world's foremost state sponsor of terrorism from gaining access to nuclear weapons should be the goal of every Senator and every American, regardless of party. It

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

is not a partisan issue. It is one of the greatest challenges to regional stability, and the stakes are very high.

Iran's support of Hezbollah, the Assad regime, Shia militias in Iraq, and the Houthi insurgents in Yemen, coupled with its determination to expand not just its nuclear capabilities but also its ballistic missile and conventional military capabilities, represents an aggressive effort to expand the Iranian sphere of influence throughout the greater Middle East.

Iran's belligerent quest for nuclear weapons capabilities, its fierce determination to undermine America's standing in the region, and its violent pursuit of regional hegemony represent a grave, grave threat—not just to nearby nations in the Middle East, not just to our own country, but for that matter to the entire world. So the stakes are indeed high. As we know, President Obama has been engaged in negotiations with the Iranians for some time now. Initially, we were led to believe that the point of these negotiations was to prevent—prevent—Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons.

But the administration's focus appears to have shifted from reaching an agreement that would end Iran's nuclear program to reaching an agreement for agreement's sake. That is the only way to interpret the interim agreement we saw recently. It would effectively bestow an international blessing for Iran to become a nuclear threshold state forever—forever on the edge of obtaining a nuclear weapon.

The direction these negotiations have taken should be very worrying for Americans of every political stripe. What that simply underlines is the need for a measure such as the bipartisan Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act.

Here is what it would do. First, it would require that any final agreement reached with Iran be submitted to Congress for review. Second, it would require that Congress be given time to hold hearings and, ultimately, take a vote to approve or disapprove any Iran agreement before congressional sanctions are lifted.

Third, if a final deal ultimately does go forward, it would require the President to certify back to Congress every 90 days that Iran remains in compliance with the agreement. And if the President is unable to do so, it would empower Congress to rapidly reimpose sanctions. In short, passing this bipartisan bill would give Congress and the American people important tools to assess any agreement reached by the administration before congressional sanctions can be lifted.

Remember, it was due in no small measure to the congressional sanctions offered by Senator MARK KIRK, which passed this Chamber 100 to 0, 4 years ago, that Iran was forced to the negotiating table in the first place. The Obama administration fiercely opposed those bipartisan sanctions back then, just as it opposed the bipartisan bill before us soon until very recently. But those sanctions have been so effective that even the administration has had to embrace them. Congress was right then, and Congress is right now.

We should not be negotiating away the leverage previous sanctions have given our country for a bad deal especially agreed to for agreement's sake. Look, no piece of legislation is perfect. Senators who would like to see this bill strengthened, as I would, will have that chance during a robust amendment process that we will soon have right here on this floor. This bill will be open for amendment. Those who seek to improve it will have an opportunity to do that. But what we do know is that this bipartisan bill is underlined by a very solid principle and a lot of hard work. It represents a real opportunity to give the American people more of a say on this important issue. We look forward to a vigorous debate on it next week.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELLER). The Democratic leader is recognized.

WELCOMING THE GUEST CHAPLAIN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this morning I would like to extend a warm welcome to the Reverend Dr. Ralph Williamson, of Las Vegas, NV, who opened the Senate today with such a beautiful prayer. For a dozen years, Dr. Williamson has served as senior pastor at the First African Methodist Episcopal Church in North Las Vegas.

During that time, Reverend Williamson has helped shepherd the First African American Episcopal Church through an expansion that includes a beautiful new sanctuary. It is brand new. He is a devoted pastor, and he is beloved by a growing congregation, which includes Senator CORY BOOKER's mother.

CORY's mom and aunt live in Las Vegas. It was there that his good dad died. I had the opportunity to meet his father before he passed away. They are so proud of their son, CORY—as well they should be—as they are proud of having worshiped in this church.

The Apostle Paul wrote: ''As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good to all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith.''

Reverend Williamson has heeded this admonition, doing good for the members of his flock and the people of all southern Nevada. Through Reverend Williamson's leadership, the First African American Episcopal Church has become a source of faith and vital support for the community. Reverend Williamson's tireless efforts have produced programs for youth, seniors, and the underprivileged. He has pioneered food banks, summer lunch programs, tutoring programs, and health ministries. Just about everything that deals with helping people, he has done it.

I appreciate his joining us today. I did not have the chance to tell him. We met earlier today. We had a ''Welcome to Washington'' with 60 or 70 people today. He gave the presentation to them and offered a prayer for those assembled. It was very warm and nice. But what I did not get a chance to tell him is that I believe the first leader of the flock, of this church in southern Nevada, was a man by the name of Albert Dunn. He was responsible for starting this first congregation. He was my friend, Reverend Dunn. He was a very, very devoutly religious man. To show you how far he went to help people in the community, this was a conversation with his wife one day. She said: ''You know, I wish you had talked to Reverend Dunn, because, oftentimes, we would get up in the morning and he had given away all the food to people who needed it.''

So I have a warm remembrance of this church and Reverend Dunn.

Dr. Williamson, thank you very much for your leadership. I appreciate it very much.

IRAN LEGISLATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I look forward to returning to the debate on the situation dealing with Iran. It is a very difficult issue. It is so important for the country and the world.

I hope there can be some further negotiations when they finish these negotiations in June, at least something that will be received with popularity in the Senate. Democrats and Republicans will say: That is great. We are finally able to get something done. Iran now can no longer use nuclear weapons because we have stopped them from doing so. I hope we arrive at that point, but we are not there yet. I wish so fervently that the negotiators can arrive at some agreement in the next couple of months.

We are going to move to this bill as soon as we can. I hope we can do it sooner rather than later.

The debate on these amendments that the Republican leader talked about are very significant. As the Republican leader said, there should be amendments offered. If people think they can improve the bill, there can be amendments offered. If people think there is stuff in the bill they simply don't like and they don't like all of this process, let them offer an amendment. We need robust debate. We have to make sure that attention is focused on this issue and nothing else.

I look forward to seeing what I can work out with my friend, the senior Senator from Kentucky, the majority leader of the Senate, to see when we can move to this bill.

LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal had a great editorial

today. To show you how senseless it was, I will read the headline: ''The GOP uses its advice and consent power to beat HARRY REID.''

Think about that, a major newspaper in this country has the audacity to say: ''The GOP [Republicans] uses its advice and consent power to beat HARRY REID.''

Reading the editorial, what they are talking about is that the Republicans were very smart in delaying Loretta Lynch to be confirmed. The reason she was delayed is because a very vital issue came up with the trafficking bill. It dealt with women's reproductive rights, and it took a long time to work that out. In fact, it took a long enough time to work it out until the Republicans capitulated to what we wanted.

We protected the women's right to choose. The Hyde language no longer allows, as was in the underlying legislation, the Hyde language to apply to nontaxpayer money. So for them to say they beat HARRY REID, they didn't beat HARRY REID. What they did was beat up on themselves.

To think that they beat HARRY REID, I repeat, all they did was beat up on themselves.

Later today, the Senate will do something it should have done months ago, confirm Loretta Lynch as the 83rd Attorney General of the United States.

She is as qualified a candidate as I have ever seen in this Senate, which is more than three decades—so qualified, in fact, today will mark the third time she has been confirmed by the Senate.

Twice before, Loretta Lynch was unanimously confirmed as the U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of New York. By all accounts, Loretta Lynch's confirmation this time around should have sailed through the Senate. For a while, it seemed it would. We had Senators, Republican Senators, saying what a wonderful woman she is. She is great. They were very vocal in their support. The senior Senator from Utah, the senior Senator from South Carolina, the junior Senator from Arizona—but it soon became apparent the Republican leadership pressed these people a little bit, and suddenly they weren't as interested in moving the Lynch confirmation along, even though that is what they said they should do. Her nomination has dragged on for months.

In fact, I repeat, she has waited longer to be confirmed than the first 54 Attorneys General combined, longer than Attorneys General nominated by every President from George Washington to Woodrow Wilson.

What should have been a quick confirmation would be anything but that. Instead, Ms. Lynch became the first Attorney General nominee in history to be filibustered.

The editorial from the newspaper is very insulting. They said: ''Mr. REID accused Republicans of racism and sexism.''

I dare—I dare anyone to find a single word that I said dealing with race or sex. I didn't do that, but maybe that is something the Republicans hoped I would do, but I didn't do that.

There was even a hunger strike. Now, listen to this, the depth of this editorial from the Wall Street Journal:

> Al Sharpton's activist group vowed a hunger strike until Ms. Lynch received a vote. (Al, please go through with it.)

I guess I was naive in thinking my Republican colleagues would treat Loretta Lynch with the dignity she and her office deserved. Perhaps my mistake was forgetting that for Republicans, this isn't about Loretta Lynch, it is about President Obama because Republicans will do everything, anything they can to make President Obama's life more difficult. They said they would do that when he was elected, and they have stuck with it.

President Obama's Cabinet officials have been treated worse than any President in history. Today's vote on Loretta Lynch marks the seventh cloture vote the Republicans have forced on a Cabinet official during the Obama administration.

Forcing cloture, that is terminating the filibuster, was something that was rare in the entire history of this country. It used to be Cabinet officials were filibustered only in the most extreme circumstances, but once Ms. Lynch is confirmed, five sitting members of the President's Cabinet will have been filibustered by Senate Republicans.

To put that in contrast, it rarely happened before, rarely. Unlike today's Senate Republicans, Democrats showed restraint in our disagreements with the President's appointments. We showed great deference to his choices for the President, and by that I am talking about the last President, George W. Bush.

Some may say that is water under the bridge. There will be those Republicans who, after confirming Loretta Lynch today, will say all's well that ends well. They are wrong.

While I am pleased she will be confirmed as Attorney General, her nomination process is proof of all that is wrong with Republican Senate leadership. Senate Republicans made Loretta Lynch's nomination linger more than 10 times longer than the average Attorney General—and you have heard what I said before about that—just to spite Barack Obama.

The viciousness with which the majority leader's party has treated the President is unconscionable and is bad for our country. Republicans have become so blinded by their nastiness that they have even made filibusters of Cabinet officials the norm around here. The first time we had a Defense Secretary filibustered, they did it. The first time for an Attorney General, they did it.

How sad that in the future we can expect delayed and filibustered nominations such as Loretta Lynch to no longer be the exception but the rule. This is so unfortunate that this is how Republicans portend to govern.

Mr. President, what is the order of the day?

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF LORETTA E. LYNCH TO BE ATTORNEY GENERAL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Loretta E. Lynch, of New York, to be Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 hours of debate equally divided in the usual form.

Mr. REID. 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. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I didn't realize the time in the quorum call would be equally divided, so I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally charged to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. 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. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, we will be voting soon on confirmation of Ms. Lynch to be the Attorney General of the United States of America. That office is a part of the President's Cabinet, but it also is the office of the chief law officer for America. The Attorney General is the top official in our government who is required to adhere to the law, even to the point of telling the President 'no' if he gets it in his head, as Presidents sometimes do, to do something that violates the law—just as corporate lawyers sometimes do for the CEO of corporations. 'Mr. President, you can't do this. This is wrong. Don't do this.'

Some Attorneys General have been known to resign before they would carry out policies that violate the law.

We are deeply concerned in this country about the President's Executive amnesty—the unlawfulness of it, the breadth of it, and the arrogance of it to the point that it is a direct assault on congressional power and legitimacy, a direct attack on laws passed by the People's representatives; we have a big problem. Ms. Lynch has said flat-out that she supports those policies and is committed to defending them in court against any complaint about them.

I think Congress has a real role here. We do not have to confirm someone to the highest law enforcement position in America if that person is publicly committed to denigrating Congress, violating the laws of Congress, or violating even the wishes of Congress and the American people. We do not have to confirm anybody. It is a power Congress is given. The President is asserting powers he has never been given anywhere in the Constitution or by the American people, but if we don't confirm Ms. Lynch, we will be doing what we have a right to do, and what I think we should do.

I am pleased that Mr. Andrew McCarthy, who prosecuted some of the top terrorist cases in America as a former U.S. attorney or as an assistant U.S. attorney, is very critical and is very strongly of the belief that Ms. Lynch should not be confirmed. He says this:

> A vote against Ms. Lynch's confirmation is not an assessment that she has performed incompetently or unethically in her prior government positions. It is a vote against the President's blatantly unconstitutional policy and against Ms. Lynch's support of that policy. Senators are bound by oath to uphold the Constitution; Ms. Lynch's prior, laudable record as a federal prosecutor cannot overcome her commitment to violating the Constitution.

We have a right to assert that. We are paid to make decisions about that. I think that Mr. McCarthy is correct. Congress was given certain powers as a coequal branch of government, not only to protect the Congress as an institution but to restrain other government branches from overreaching. One of those powers is the Senate's power to confirm or not confirm, and this check on Executive powers can be used as Congress sees fit. But it should not be abused, just as the President should not use his nominees to abuse the Constitution or to advance an unlawful agenda. The Attorney General is the top law enforcement officer in the country. This is not traditionally a political position. It is a law position. Anyone who occupies the office must serve the American people under the laws and the Constitution of the United States. They are not above the law.

The Supreme Court has clearly held that the President is subjected to the laws. It has always been the case and always has been a part of the law of the land. The Senate must never confirm an individual to an office such as this who will support and advance a scheme that violates our Constitution and eviscerates established law and Congressional authority. No person who would do that should be confirmed. We do not need to be apologetic about it.

Ms. Lynch has announced that she supports and, if confirmed, would advance the President's unlawful Executive amnesty scheme—a scheme that would provide work permits, trillions in Social Security and Medicare benefits, tax credits of up to $35,000 a year—according to the Congressional Research Service—and even the possibility of chain migration and citizenship to those who have entered our country illegally or overstayed their lawful period of admission. The President has done this even though Congress has repeatedly rejected legislation he supports that would allow this scheme to be implemented. He asked for it, Congress considered it, and Congress said 'no.'

President Obama's unlawful and unconstitutional Executive action nullifies current immigration law to a degree most people have not fully grasped. The Immigration and Nationality Act is the law of the land, and his actions replace it with the very measures Congress refused to adopt. Even King George III didn't have the power to legislate without Parliament.

During her confirmation hearing in the Judiciary Committee, I asked Ms. Lynch plainly whether she supported the President's unilateral decision to make his own immigration laws.

Here is the relevant portion of the transcript:

> Mr. SESSIONS: I have to have a clear answer to this question—Ms. Lynch, do you believe the executive action announced by President Obama on November 20 is legal and Constitutional? Yes or no?
>
> Ms. Lynch: As I've read the opinion,—

That is, the opinion of the Department of Justice, which would be under her supervision—

> I do believe it is, Senator.

Of course, the lawful duty of the Attorney General is to enforce the law that exists, not one that she or the President wish existed. One of the most stunning elements of the President's scheme is the grant of work permits to up to 5 million illegal immigrants—taking jobs directly from citizens and legal immigrants in our country at a time of high unemployment and low wages.

Peter Kirsanow, Commissioner on the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, has written at length about how this undermines the rights of U.S. workers, especially African-American workers, and other minorities suffering from high unemployment. He says: Those citizens who are suffering from high unemployment and low wages have their rights undermined when the President ignores plain law that protects them from an excessive surge of illegal workers.

So at her confirmation hearing, I asked Ms. Lynch about what she might do to protect the rights of U.S. workers. By the way, Attorney General Holder, our current Attorney General, astoundingly, in comments he made some months ago, declared that there is a civil right to citizenship in America for people who enter the country unlawfully. How can this possibly be, that the Attorney General can get so removed from his responsibility to enforce the law that he says that if someone comes into the country unlawfully, they have a civil right to citizenship?

That was part of the reason I asked her this question:

> Mr. SESSIONS: Who has more right to a job in this country? A lawful immigrant who's here or a citizen—or a person who entered the country unlawfully?
>
> Ms. Lynch: I believe that the right and the obligation to work is one that's shared by everyone in this country regardless of how they came here. And certainly, if someone is here, regardless of status, I would prefer that they would be participating in the workplace than not participating in the workplace.

So this individual would be the chief law enforcement of our country, and I believe that is a fundamentally flawed statement and comment. It is unprecedented for someone who is seeking the highest law enforcement office in America to declare that someone in the country illegally has a right to a job when the law says if you are here illegally, you cannot work.

This Nation is—as George Washington University law Professor Jonathan Turley, who has testified a number of times here, often called by a number of our Democratic colleagues, put it—at ''a constitutional tipping point.'' Professor Turley, who is a nationally recognized constitutional scholar and self-described supporter of President Obama, testified before the House of Representatives in February 2014, nine months before the President announced his unprecedented executive action, and said:

> The current passivity of Congress represents a crisis of faith for members willing to see a president assume legislative powers in exchange for insular policy gains. The short-term, insular victories achieved by this President will come at a prohibitive cost if the current imbalance is not corrected. Constitutional authority is easy to lose in the transient shift of politics. It is far more difficult to regain. If a passion for the Constitution does not motivate members, perhaps a sense of self-preservation will be enough to unify members. President Obama will not be our last president. However, these acquired powers will be passed to his successors. When that occurs, members may loathe the day that they remained silent as the power of government shifted so radically to the Chief Executive. The powerful personality that engendered this loyalty will be gone, but the powers will remain. We are now at the constitutional tipping point of our system. If balance is to be reestablished, it must begin before this President leaves office and that will likely require every possible means to reassert legislative authority.

One of those means is the advice and consent power to approve or disapprove nominees for high office. It was created for just such a time as this. It is a legitimate constitutional power of Congress. It is not only appropriate but necessary that the Senate refuse to confirm a President's nominee when

that President has overreached and assumed the legislative powers of Congress. It is particularly necessary when the President's nominee is being appointed specifically for the improper purpose of advancing the President's unconstitutional overreach—all through powers of the office to which they have been nominated.

Mr. President, we have a number of problems with regard to executive branch overreach and executive branch failure to be responsive to Congress. When Members of Congress ask legitimate questions, we often don't get answers from the people who are paid by the taxpayers and who are authorized by us. I believe that is another matter we need to consider before we confirm people. The Department of Justice has been recalcitrant too often in producing information it should produce.

I wish to go a little bit further because some of this goes to the core of the issues before us. Is this just a policy dispute between Congress and the President? No, it goes much deeper than that. The actions of the President are stunning—beginning with his so-called Morton memos. He had an underling carry out orders to achieve what he wanted done, which is often how he has proceeded with these unlawful activities. I will point out some of them.

Beginning with the Morton memos in 2011—under the guise of prosecutorial discretion based on limited resources—the Administration began to flaunt clearly written provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, such as section 235, which requires the Secretary of Homeland Security to place illegal aliens into removal proceedings to be deported once they are found. Section 235 requires DHS to do that, they do not have any discretion there.

In direct contradiction of clearly written law, the Morton memos generally directed U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel to refuse to initiate removal proceedings against certain aliens, and to administratively close or terminate such proceedings if they had been initiated. Thus began the opening salvo in the Administration's assault on our immigration laws. This is huge. Officers respond to the President's leadership.

The following year, June 2012, the Administration created, through Executive fiat, a program that Congress consistently refused to enact into law—the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals or DACA. This program not only shielded certain illegal aliens from the threat of removal, but it also provided them with work authorization, the ability to travel outside of the United States without fear of being refused reentry through grants of advanced parole. It gave them a Social Security number and a photo ID.

By the way, colleagues, this resulted in the Immigration and Customs Enforcement officers being so concerned at this radical reversal of the laws of the United States that they filed a lawsuit against their supervisors asserting that they were being required to violate the law of the United States rather than being allowed to carry out their sworn duty, which was to enforce the laws of the United States.

The judge was sympathetic to the matter, but for technical and legal reasons, concluded that the case would not go forward, but I believe it is still on appeal now.

This is remarkable. There are law officers—many of them have been in law enforcement for 10, 20, 30 years—who sued their supervisors because they were being ordered to violate the law instead of enforce the law. We ought to listen to them. They have repeatedly told us that what is happening is outrageous and they pleaded with Congress to stop it.

But then in November of last year, after Congress refused to pass the Administration's preferred legislation providing amnesty to illegal aliens, the Administration created, through Executive fiat, a number of other programs that further eroded enforcement of our immigration laws. Notably, the two most visible programs are the Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents, the so-called DAPA Program, and an expanded version of DACA, both of which were blessed by the Department of Justice, the Office of Legal Counsel, and the Attorney General—wrong, unlawful actions blessed by the chief law enforcement officer in the country.

Less visible are policies that prevent the enforcement of immigration laws against certain criminal aliens, such as the November 20, 2014 memorandum from Jeh Johnson, the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, entitled ''Policies for the Apprehension, Detention, and Removal of Undocumented Immigrants.'' That memo excludes from enforcement priority categories whole categories of criminal offenses defined in sections 2(a)(2) and 237(a)(2) of the INA.

We have observed a decimation of law enforcement in this country involving immigration as a direct result of the President's determination to create an immigration system that he believes is right, but the People, through their elected Congress, have refused to make law. This is a direct threat to who we are.

Professor Turley is so insightful about this issue. This is not some rightwing extremist. In testimony before the House committee, he said:

> I believe the President has exceeded his brief. The President is required to faithfully execute the laws.

He goes on to say:

> This goes to the very heart of what is the Madisonian system. If a president can unilaterally change the meaning of laws in substantial ways or refuse to enforce them, it takes offline that very thing that stabilizes our system. I believe the members will loathe the day that they allow that to happen. There will be more presidents who will claim the same authority.
>
> When I teach constitutional law, I often ask my students, what is the limiting principle of your argument? When that question is presented to this White House, too often it's answered in the first person, that the President is the limiting principle or at least the limiting person. We can't rely on that type of assurance in our system.

Madison knew no one can be given total power without limits.

Professor Turley goes on to say:

> The problem of what the President is doing is that he is not simply posing a danger to the constitutional system; he is becoming the very danger the Constitution was designed to avoid: that is, the concentration of power in any single branch. This Newtonian orbit that the three branches exist in is a delicate one, but it is designed to prevent this type of concentration.

When asked explicitly if he believed the President violated the Constitution, he said, as I quoted before, ''The center of gravity is shifting, and that makes it unstable. And within that system you have the rise of an uber presidency. There could be no greater danger for individual liberty, and I really think that the framers would be horrified by that shift because everything they've dedicated themselves to was creating this orbital balance, and we've lost it. . . . ''

He goes on to say to Congress as a challenge to us:

> I believe that [Congress] is facing a critical crossroads in terms of continued relevance in this process. What this body cannot become is a debating society where it can issue rules and laws that are either complied with or not complied with by the president. I think that's where we are . . . [A] president cannot ignore an express statement on policy grounds . . . [In] terms of the institutional issue . . . look around you. Is this truly the body that existed when it was formed?

So he was sitting there in the House of Representatives and he was talking to Members of Congress and said:

> . . . look around you. Is this truly the body that existed when it was formed? Does it have the same gravitational pull and authority that was given to it by its framers? You're the keepers of this authority. You took an oath to uphold it. And the framers assumed that you would have the institutional wherewithal and, frankly, ambition to defend the turf that is the legislative branch.

I think we need to—without apology—defend the law, and I think this is in the Congress' interest. Congress should not confirm someone to lead the U.S. Department of Justice who will advance this unconstitutional policy. Congress has a limited number of powers to defend the rule of law and itself as an institution and to stop the executive branch from overreaching. It is unthinkable that we would ignore one of those powers in the face of such a direct threat to our constitutional order—an escalating pattern of overreach by the President.

Every day that we allow the President to erode the powers of the Congress, we are allowing the President to erode the sacred constitutional rights of the citizens we serve. We have a duty to this institution and to the American people not to confirm someone who is not committed to those principles but rather who will continue to violate them.

I will oppose this nomination and urge my colleagues to do so. I think we should see a bipartisan vote rejecting this nomination, and in doing so, Congress will send a clear message that we expect the President to abide by the law passed by Congress, not to violate it.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. For almost 2 months, I have been returning to the Senate floor to urge the majority leader to schedule the confirmation vote for our next Attorney General. Yesterday afternoon, we were finally able to get an agreement that was long overdue. But even now, this morning, we are not voting to confirm Loretta Lynch to be the next Attorney General of the United States; we are going to vote on whether to invoke cloture in regard to this top law enforcement position.

For those not familiar with the rules of the Senate, cloture is a rule that allows the Senate to end a filibuster.

The fact that Senate Republicans are requiring a cloture vote on her nomination acknowledges what we have known all along: Republicans have been engaged in an unprecedented filibuster of this nomination.

When we do vote to confirm Loretta Lynch this afternoon, she will be the first African-American woman to serve as Attorney General. She is a historic nominee, but it is Senate Republicans who are making history—and I would say for the wrong reasons. We have had 82 Attorneys General in our Nation's history. Until now, not one of those 82 has had to overcome a cloture vote. But this one, Loretta Lynch, as I said, the first African-American woman to serve as Attorney General, became the first and only to have to overcome a cloture vote.

I would have opposed any filibuster on any President. I have been here with President Ford, President Carter, President Reagan, President Bush, President Clinton, another President Bush, and President Obama. Neither Republicans nor Democrats have seen this.

President Obama first announced Ms. Lynch's nomination more than 5 months ago. At the time, Senate Democrats acceded to the request of Senate Republicans not to move her nomination during the lame duck period. Republicans promised that she would be treated fairly.

In fact, last fall, the now-majority leader promised that ''Ms. Lynch will receive fair consideration by the Senate. And her nomination should be considered in the new Congress through regular order.'' But she hasn't been treated fairly. There hasn't been regular order.

The nomination of Ms. Lynch has been pending in the Senate awaiting confirmation for 56 days. I went back over the last seven Attorneys General. I added up the number of days they waited for confirmation on the floor. She has waited longer than all seven of them put together twice over, so twice as long as the seven preceding Republican and Democratic Attorneys General combined: Richard Thornburgh, 1 day; William Barr, 5 days; Janet Reno, 1 day; John Ashcroft, 2 days, Alberto Gonzales, 8 days; Michael Mukasey, 2 days; and Eric Holder, 5 days. I have said it repeatedly, but it bears repeating again: this historic delay is an embarrassment for the United States Senate.

As the U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of New York, Ms. Lynch brought terrorists and cyber criminals to justice. She obtained convictions against corrupt public officials from both political parties. She fought tirelessly against violent crime and financial fraud. Ms. Lynch has protected the rights of victims. She has a proven record prosecuting human traffickers and protecting children.

I am glad that yesterday the Senate was finally able to overcome an impasse on trafficking legislation which, unfortunately, those on the other side of the aisle caused by injecting partisan politics into the debate. That Republican leaders tied a vote on the confirmation of Ms. Lynch to human trafficking legislation never made sense at all, especially given her strong record of prosecuting human traffickers.

In a recent article, the Guardian rightly pointed out that the Republican leaderships' use of her nomination as a negotiating chip was ''painfully wrongheaded—tantamount to holding the sheriff back until crime goes away.'' I could not agree more. I ask unanimous consent that the Guardian article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

We all know that Loretta Lynch is eminently qualified to be our next Attorney General. She should not have been delayed for so many months by the Senate majority. And we should not be forced to vote to cut off debate on this nomination, especially when no other Attorney General nominee has ever needed such a vote. This is the complete opposite of the fair treatment that Senate Republicans promised last November. After this extended delay on the Lynch nomination, I can only hope Senate Republicans will show her more respect as Attorney General of the United States than she has received as a nominee. She deserves our respect and gratitude for being willing to continue to serve our Nation. She has earned this respect.

Ms. Lynch's story is one of perseverance, grace, and grit and I believe this process will only make her stronger. She was born and raised in North Carolina. She is the daughter of a fourth-generation Baptist preacher and a school librarian. Her proud mother and father instilled in her the American values of fairness and equality, even though as a child those around them were not living up to these values.

I must say that meeting Reverend Lynch at these hearings and then meeting him at the time of the markup—I was so impressed with the strength that man showed and his sense of faith in goodness. This is a pastor and a preacher we can all look up to. In fact, Ms. Lynch recalls riding on Reverend Lynch's shoulders to their church, where students organized peaceful protests against racial segregation. The freedom songs and the church music that went hand in hand with those protests undoubtedly made up the sound track of her childhood. As Attorney General, I am sure she will draw upon those childhood experiences and the struggles of her parents, her grandparents, and her great-grandparents when addressing the current protests over too many young lives lost on our streets.

As I said, the Judiciary Committee was honored to have her father, the Reverend Lorenzo Lynch, with us on both days of her hearing in January, as well as at the committee markup when her nomination was favorably reported with bipartisan support. He is here to watch these proceedings today. It is clear this undoubtedly proud father instilled in his daughter the great resilience she has shown over the past 6 months.

As a Senator, as have other Senators, I have gotten to meet wonderful people from all walks of life, up to and including Presidents, but I have said many times before and I will say again that meeting Reverend Lynch was really a very special moment in this Senator's life.

Throughout Loretta Lynch's life, those who encountered her intelligence and her tenacity have not all been prepared to accept her and her impressive accomplishments. But at every point, the content of her character has shone through and led her to even greater heights.

In elementary school, administrators did not believe that Loretta Lynch could score as high as she did on a standardized test. They demanded that she retake the test. How could this young African-American girl score so high? She took the test again and her second score was even higher.

In high school, she rose to the very top of her class but had to share the title of valedictorian with two other students, one of whom was White, because school administrators feared an African-American valedictorian was too controversial. But that didn't hold her back, either. She kept going forward. She went on to graduate with honors from Harvard College, and then she went on and earned her law degree from Harvard Law School.

This has been the story of Loretta Lynch's life. While some are not ready to embrace her distinction, she marches forward with grace to prove she is even stronger and more qualified than her detractors can imagine. She has dedicated the majority of her remarkable career to public service, and

we are fortunate as a nation that she wants to continue to serve.

Ms. Lynch's record of accomplishments makes me confident she will be able to lead the Justice Department through the complex challenges it faces today.

One issue the outgoing Attorney General prioritized was the protection of Americans' right to vote. After the Supreme Court's disastrous ruling in Shelby County v. Holder, Republican governors and State legislatures exploited the decision and implemented sweeping voter suppression laws that disproportionately affect African Americans and other minorities. Ms. Lynch will have to continue the commitment to fighting voting rights for all Americans.

At a time of severe budget cuts for too many vital programs that help victims and support public safety, something must be done about the massive financial burden that is the Bureau of Prisons. One-third of DOJ's budget goes to BOP. This imbalance has largely been driven by our reliance on drug mandatory minimum sentences, which do not make us safer but are costing us plenty. These sentences explain why the United States has the largest prison population in the world. We must work together on more thoughtful solutions to address our mass incarceration problem.

Few issues affect communities and families as intimately as addiction. Vermont, like many parts of the country, has seen a recent surge in the abuse of heroin and other opioids. The Department must work with States to find solutions to support communities struggling with heroin and other opioids, and help them break the cycle of addiction.

The Attorney General will also be called upon to build on the sometimes strained relationship between law enforcement and communities of color, which has been exacerbated by the recent tragic events in Ferguson, New York, and South Carolina. Restoring that trust will be as great a responsibility as she will have while in office.

Nor are these issues of trust limited to local law enforcement. Just the other day, a Washington Post article detailed the fact that the Justice Department and the FBI acknowledged numerous instances of flawed testimony by FBI examiners over a two-decade period in connection with hair analysis evidence. This included dozens of cases involving defendants who were sentenced to death row. This troubling revelation means that the FBI must conduct a comprehensive analysis to prevent future breakdowns such as this.

The Justice Department must also keep up with the rapid development of technology. We must stay ahead of the curve to prevent and fight threats to cybersecurity and data privacy. The growing threat of cyber crime is very real but so is the specter of unchecked government intrusion into our private lives—particularly dragnet surveillance programs directed at American citizens. The intelligence community faces a critical deadline this June when three sections of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act are set to expire. We must protect our national security and our civil liberties. We must work together to reform our Nation's surveillance laws so we can achieve both goals and restore the public's trust.

When President Obama announced his intention to nominate Ms. Lynch last November, I had the privilege of attending the White House ceremony. At that event, Ms. Lynch noted with admiration that ''the Department of Justice is the only cabinet department named for an ideal.'' Just think of that. The Department of Justice is named for an ideal—the ideal of justice. And having served as a State prosecutor, although not with the complexity she has encountered, I always felt that was an ideal to uphold, and she has. I believe that when Loretta Lynch is sworn in as our next Attorney General, she will work tirelessly to make that ideal a reality for all Americans.

As I said, I am sorry that for the first time, after 82 Attorneys General, we have to have a cloture vote. I have great respect for my friends in the Republican leadership, but I must say they sent an awful signal to America in saying that for the first time in 82 Attorneys General, we require a cloture vote for this highly qualified woman.

I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Guardian, Apr. 21, 2015]

LORETTA LYNCH 'LED THE NATION' ON HUMAN TRAFFICKING DESPITE REPUBLICAN STANDOFF

(By Tom McCarthy)

Republican leaders say they'll hold up Lynch's confirmation until trafficking bill passes—and yet Lynch has been one of America's boldest pursuers of sex traffickers, Guardian review reveals.

After almost six months, the Republican blockade on the confirmation of Loretta Lynch as the next US attorney general—once a grand fight over immigration, then banking prosecutions, then abortion—appears headed for a final legislative showdown over protecting victims of sex trafficking.

But the biggest Congressional headache of the year—a single cabinet nomination effectively hijacking the legislative calendar—has culminated in ''a very sad irony'': Lynch has been one of the country's premier guardians of victims of sex trafficking, and a tireless scourge of sex traffickers, a review of her record and conversations with current and former colleagues reveal.

Lynch—according to prosecutors, officials and victims' advocates familiar with her tenure as US attorney for the eastern district of New York—has a prodigious history of throwing sex traffickers in prison, breaking up prostitution rings, rescuing underage victims forced to work as prostitutes and reuniting mothers held captive by the rings with their long-lost children.

Heading into what could be the final day of protracted negotiations over her job as the nation's highest law enforcement officer, Lynch's supporters spoke at length with the Guardian about what they say is one of the most powerful legacies of her tenure.

Republicans have not challenged Lynch's record as a prosecutor of sex trafficking—or any other part of her record. But Senate majority leader Mitch McConnell has clung to an announcement that he would hold up her nomination until the Senate completed work on the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, which would create a compensation fund for victims. Republican and Democratic senators are squabbling over abortion language in the bill.

''I had hoped to turn to her next week, but if we can't finish the trafficking bill, she will be put off again,'' McConnell said. More than a month later, that hold is still in place, although Republicans aides on Friday signaled potential new movement on the nomination, after President Obama called the delay ''embarrassing''.

To those with close knowledge of Lynch's record on human trafficking, the hold-up has not been embarrassing, so much as painfully wrong-headed—tantamount to holding the sheriff back until crime goes away.

Carol Robles-Román, who in 12 years as deputy mayor of New York City worked closely with Lynch's office to stop young girls from falling victim to sex traffickers, said Lynch had made ''protecting the most vulnerable members of our society a hallmark of her tenure''.

''The irony that it's a trafficking bill that's holding everything up is just . . . it's a very sad irony,'' said Robles-Román, who now runs the nonprofit Legal Momentum. ''The fact of the matter is, with this record, she has been one of the top leaders in the country around the fight against human trafficking.

''This is such a difficult area for prosecutors to wrap their hands around. And her office, the eastern district, has really distinguished itself in the cases that they have brought, and the fearlessness that they have shown in prosecuting these cases.''

'HEINOUS' CASES WITH REAL RESOLUTIONS

Lori Cohen, director of the anti-trafficking initiative at New York-based Sanctuary for Families, has worked closely with Lynch's office, including to reunite victims of sex trafficking with their children, who in multiple cases have been held in Mexico by members of the trafficking organization.

''The eastern district prosecutors have been exceptional in terms of their willingness to listen to the clients,'' Cohen said. ''And I think that, frankly, that came from the top, that came from the attorney general nominee. I think she has always had a very high degree of professionalism, but also a very strong sense of compassion for victims. And a strong sense of justice, that people who are exploiting these vulnerable immigrant women and children in the commercial sex industry need to be held accountable.''

In the typical sex trafficking case prosecuted under Lynch, a community services organization might tip off law enforcement to the presence of a prostitution ring based in Brooklyn or Queens, New York. Investigators would discover many girls and young women living under the control of men who forced them to work in brothels or who drove them around the city, sometimes to as many as 20 assignments a day.

Anne Milgram, a former prosecutor on human trafficking cases in the eastern district, who went on to serve as attorney general of New Jersey and is now a senior fellow at the New York University school of law, said one after another of the trafficking cases were prosecuted because Lynch made them a ''personal priority''.

''Under her leadership, the eastern district has really led the nation in this area,''

Milgram said. ''I really couldn't say enough good things about both the office and Loretta Lynch's record on human trafficking. If you look nationally to find a US attorney who was as thoughtful and progressive in prosecuting human trafficking cases, I don't think you could find one.''

Lynch's office has specialized in breaking up rings that share a remarkable similarity. Members of family-based crime syndicates in Mexico, in a repeated pattern, would seek out young girls in poor, rural areas and make them promises of love and a better life in the United States. Sometimes a marriage would follow. And then the girls would be introduced to a new life, in which they were coerced to work as prostitutes. Obedience was enforced with rape, beatings, imprisonment, and, in some cases, by threatening the lives of children born of the corrupt ''love'' affairs.

''Any trafficking victim is going to be suffering in a tremendous physical and emotional harm, and pretty extensive sexual abuse,'' Cohen said. ''But these particular Mexican trafficking cases are so difficult for our victims because usually the trafficker is an intimate partner. So it could be a man who held himself out to be a boyfriend, or a fiancé, and in at least one case it's been a husband. Who courted a client, who won her trust, and her love, and in a number of cases had children with her.''

''You just pull the facts of one of these cases, and they're heinous,'' Robles-Román said. ''They almost don't sound real.''

THE MOST ACTIVE RECORD IN THE COUNTRY

Lynch's office has specialized in breaking up these rings. The eastern district of New York has delivered more than 55 indictments in human trafficking cases and rescued more than 110 victims, including at least 20 minors, in the past 10 years.

Under Lynch, the eastern district is currently prosecuting at least five cases relating to the prostitution of US minors or sex trafficking—more active prosecutions than any other US attorney's office in the country, according to knowledgeable observers.

In 2012, Lynch's office reunited a child and mother who had been separated for more than 10 years when the woman was taken from Mexico to New York and forced to work as a prostitute. It was one of 18 such mother-and-child reunions completed by the eastern district.

Cohen worked with a client who was reunited with her child after a conviction by Lynch's office.

''It was really very moving,'' Cohen said. ''My client had been separated from her child for a number of years and was really frantic about her child's safety. Frankly it's terrifying for a victim to come forward and report the abuse, when she is afraid that if word of her cooperation gets back to her traffickers, there's very little protection available for her child back in Mexico.

''These clients, when they have children, they are mothers first. And they'll do anything to protect their children. In fact some of them continue to be trafficked because they were afraid that if they stopped or refused, that their children would be harmed.''

In December 2012, Lynch announced the extradition and arraignment of four suspects from Mexico in two separate sex trafficking cases. In 2013, Lynch sent a New York bar owner and two co-defendants to prison for dozens of years each for running a sex-trafficking ring between Central America, Mexico and two bars on Long Island. In 2014, three brothers convicted of sex trafficking were sentenced to double-digit prison terms for enticing victims as young as 14 to be transported illegally into the United States and forced to work as prostitutes in New York City and elsewhere.

''It's horrible to think that children in the United States are being exploited sexually,'' said Robles-Román. ''They are. [But Lynch's] office has shown that they have the courage, the know-how, and the expertise to prosecute these people—some of them involving international criminal enterprises.

''From my perspective, somebody who has that vision, and that eye, to protect our most vulnerable, can protect us all. It is a fearlessness that we need in our attorney general.''

As of Monday, after what minority leader Harry Reid called ''164 very long days'', there was still no Senate deal over the abortion language in the trafficking legislation, although signs emerged that a deal may be close.

If Republicans stick to their promise, it will then be Lynch's turn. And if she is confirmed, to hear Lynch's former colleagues tell it, the Senate will have made a difference on behalf of society's most vulnerable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, today I rise to talk about what has come to define the Obama administration, which is a consistent pattern of lawlessness that disrespects the Constitution, that disrespects the Congress, and that disrespects the people of the United States.

In any administration, under any President, the person charged with being the chief law enforcement officer is the Attorney General. I have been blessed to work in the U.S. Department of Justice, and there is a long, bipartisan tradition of Attorneys General remaining faithful to the law and to the Constitution and setting aside partisan considerations and politics. Unfortunately, that tradition has not been honored during the Obama Presidency.

Attorney General Eric Holder has been the most partisan Attorney General the United States has ever seen. The Attorney General has systematically refused to do anything to seriously investigate or prosecute the IRS for targeting citizens for expressing their First Amendment rights. Indeed, he has assigned the investigation to a major Democratic donor and partisan Democrat who has given over $6,000 to President Obama and the Democrats. Eric Holder has abused the office and has turned it, in many respects, into a partisan arm of the Democratic Party. He is the only Attorney General in the history of the United States to be held in contempt of Congress.

So there are many, including me, who would very much like to see Eric Holder replaced. There are many, including me, who would very much like to see an Attorney General who will return to the bipartisan traditions of the Department of Justice of fidelity to law, and that includes most importantly the willingness to stand up to the President who appointed you even if he or she is from the same political party as are you.

During the confirmation hearings, I very much wanted to support Loretta Lynch's nomination. Bringing in a new Attorney General should be turning a positive page in this country. But, unfortunately, the answers Ms. Lynch gave in the confirmation hearing, in my opinion, rendered her unsuitable for confirmation as Attorney General of the United States. That was a shame.

Ms. Lynch's record as the U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of New York had earned her a reputation as a relatively no-nonsense prosecutor, so it was my hope that we would see a similar approach and similar answers from Ms. Lynch at the confirmation hearing. Instead, she chose to embrace the lawlessness of the Holder Justice Department.

When she was asked whether she would defend President Obama's illegal Executive amnesty, which President Obama has acknowledged no fewer than 22 times that he had no constitutional authority to undertake and which a Federal court has now enjoined as unlawful, she responded affirmatively, saying she thought the administration's contrived legal justification was ''reasonable.''

The nominee went on to say that she sees nothing wrong with the President's decision to unilaterally grant lawful status and work authorizations that are explicitly barred by Federal law to nearly 5 million people who are here in this country illegally.

When asked further who has ''more a right to a job, a United States citizen or a person who came to this country illegally?'' she responded, ''I believe that the right and obligation to work is one that is shared by everyone in this country, regardless of how they came here.'' Well, a very large majority of American citizens would beg to differ. Rule of law matters.

When she was asked about the limits of prosecutorial discretion—the dubious theory President Obama has put forth to justify his illegal executive amnesty—she could give no limits to that theory.

When asked if a subsequent President could use prosecutorial discretion to order the Treasury Secretary not to enforce the tax laws and to collect no more income taxes in excess of 25 percent, she refused to answer.

When asked if a subsequent President could use that same theory to exempt the State of Texas—all 27 million people—from every single Federal labor law and environmental law, she refused to answer.

When asked if she agreed with the Holder Justice Department that the government could place a GPS sensor on the car of every single American without probable cause, she refused to answer. That extreme view was rejected by the U.S. Supreme Court unanimously.

When asked if she agreed with the Holder Justice Department that the First Amendment gives no religious liberty protection whatsoever to a church's or synagogue's choice of their own pastor or their own rabbi, she

again refused to answer. Likewise, that extreme view was rejected unanimously by the U.S. Supreme Court. Indeed, Justice Elena Kagan—appointed by President Obama—said at the oral argument that the Holder Justice Department's position that the First Amendment says nothing about the religious liberty of a church or a synagogue—Justice Kagan said, ''I find your position amazing.'' Well, I am sorry to say that Ms. Lynch was unwilling to answer whether she holds that same amazing position, that the First Amendment does not protect the religious liberty of people of faith in this country.

When asked in her hearing if she believes the Federal Government could employ a drone to kill a U.S. citizen on U.S. soil if that individual posed no imminent threat, she refused to answer.

When asked if she would be willing to appoint a special prosecutor to investigate the IRS's targeting of citizens and citizen groups for their political views—something which President Obama said he was ''angry about and the American people had a right to be angry about''—and when asked if she would appoint a prosecutor who was at a minimum not a major Obama donor, she refused to answer.

This nominee has given every indication that she will continue the Holder Justice Department's lawlessness. That was her testimony to the Senate Judiciary Committee.

I wanted to support this nomination. I wanted to see a new Attorney General who would be faithful to law. But her answers made that impossible.

I would note that there is a difference. Eric Holder began disregarding the Constitution and laws after he was confirmed as Attorney General. Ms. Lynch has told the Senate that is what she is going to do. That means each and every one of us bears responsibility. In my view, no Senator can vote for this confirmation consistent with her or her oath given the answers that were given.

I would note that a particular onus falls on the new Republican majority. For several months, I have called on the Republican majority to block the confirmation of President Obama's executive and judicial nominees other than vital national security positions unless and until the President rescinds his lawless amnesty. I am sorry to say the majority leadership has been unwilling to do so.

The Republican majority, if it so chose, could defeat this nomination, but the Republican majority has chosen to go forward and allow Loretta Lynch to be confirmed.

I would note that there are more than a few voters back home who are asking: What exactly is the difference between a Democratic and Republican majority when the exact same individual gets confirmed as Attorney General promising the exact same lawlessness? What is the difference? That is a question each of us will have to answer to our constituents when we go home.

In my view, the obligation of every Senator to defend the Constitution is front and center why we are here. We have a nominee who has told the Senate she is unwilling to impose any limits whatsoever on the authority of the President of the United States for the next 20 months. We are sadly going to see more and more lawlessness, more regulatory abuse, more abuse of power, more Executive lawlessness.

Now more than ever, we need an Attorney General with the integrity and faithfulness of law to stand up to the President. Attorneys General in both parties, Republican and Democratic, have done so. When credible allegations of wrongdoing by Richard Nixon were raised, his Attorney General, Elliot Richardson, appointed a special prosecutor, Archibald Cox, to investigate regardless of partisan politics. Likewise, when credible allegations by Bill Clinton arose, his Attorney General, Janet Reno—a Democrat—appointed Robert Fisk as the independent counsel to investigate those allegations. Eric Holder has been unwilling to demonstrate that same faithfulness to law, and unfortunately Ms. Lynch has told us that she, too, is unwilling to do so. For that reason, I urge all of my colleagues to vote no on cloture and to insist on an Attorney General who will uphold her oath to the Constitution and to the people of the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I come before the Senate today to vote and to urge my colleagues to vote in favor of confirming Loretta Lynch as Attorney General.

I disagree with my colleague from Texas. I serve on the Judiciary Committee, as does the Senator from Texas. I listened to her questions. I asked her questions. I listened to her answers. In my view, she passed her senatorial interview. She has picked up support from several Republicans. She answered questions for 8 hours during her confirmation hearing and submitted detailed responses to 900 written questions.

What I would like to focus on today are the claims I just heard from the Senator from Texas that she is somehow lawless.

Let's look through the facts. She has earned the support of Members of both parties. Do the Republicans who support her for this position think she is lawless? I don't think so. She has earned the support of top law enforcement groups and 25 former U.S. attorneys from both Republican and Democratic administrations.

Now let's start with the obvious. She is supremely qualified for Attorney General. She has a world-class legal mind, an unwavering commitment to justice, an unimpeachable character, and an extraordinary record of achievement.

During her time as U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of New York, she tackled some of our Nation's hardest cases, from public corruption, to civil rights violations, to massive crime rings. She currently leads the U.S. attorney's office that has been charged with prosecuting more terrorism cases since 9/11 than any other office in the country, including trying the Al Qaeda operative who plotted to attack New York City's subway system. Would you hand this over to a lawless person? No. You would hand this over—this important job of going after terrorists—to someone who respects the law, who enforces the law, not, as my colleague from Texas said, to someone who is lawless.

This is a concern in my State. Just this week, our U.S. attorney, Andy Luger, indicted six people—six people—in the Twin Cities area who were plotting to go back to assist ISIS, to assist a terrorist group. So I care a lot about having an Attorney General in place who actually knows how to handle these terrorism cases, who is going to lead the Justice Department and understands the importance of going after these cases. Loretta Lynch is exactly the type of tough and tested leader we need at the Justice Department to lead the effort.

She has been endorsed by leaders ranging from the New York police commissioner—I don't know if my colleague from Texas considers him lawless—to the president of the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, to the president of the National Association of Chiefs of Police. Alberto Gonzales says it is time to vote on Ms. Lynch. Rudy Giuliani says it is time to confirm her. These are not people my colleagues on the other side of the aisle normally say are lawless.

This is the story of Loretta Lynch and why I think she has been able to wait out this long process. Loretta Lynch has a lot of patience. When she was a little girl, she took a test and did incredibly well on that test. She did so well that they didn't believe she took that test. They asked her to take that test again, and she scored even higher. When she was valedictorian of the class, the principal came up to her and said: You know, this is a little awkward. You are African American, and we might want another White student to share the honor. That is what happened to her. She said: All right. That is a woman who has been through something and can wait this out. She will wait no longer after today.

The other thing I heard from our friends on the other side of the aisle—from Senator CRUZ—was that somehow she is lawless because she supported something that every President since Dwight Eisenhower has supported, has asked their Attorney General to do. The Attorney General has looked at the legal issues surrounding the issuance of an Executive order regarding immigration. Every Attorney General since Eisenhower's administration has advised their President on these issues. The first George Bush, the second George Bush, Ronald Reagan—with

every single one of these Presidents, there was some kind of Executive order issued involving immigrants.

I know because we have Liberians in Minnesota who, because of unrest in their country, have been there for decades under an Executive order, something that sometimes Congress gets involved and sometimes the President reissues. But that is one example of a group of people who have been able to stay in our country legally, work in our hospitals, work in our industries, and raise their families in this country because of Executive orders.

So to say that it is sometimes lawless—how lawless for her to support this simple idea that a President can issue an Executive order. Of course, we can debate the merits of that. We can talk about the fact that of course we would rather have comprehensive immigration reform. That is why I voted it. Of course that would be better, so the President could just tear up his Executive action. He said he would be glad to do that.

But the point of this is that every Attorney General in the Republican administrations since Dwight Eisenhower has supported their President when they issued an Executive order. So this idea that by somehow saying that is legal makes this nominee lawless is just plain wrong.

We look forward to another robust debate on immigration policy. Comprehensive immigration reform should be debated and passed by Congress. But Ms. Lynch should be judged on her record and her record alone. When we look at her record, we should be proud to have her as our next Attorney General of the United States of America.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I would like to make a few remarks about Loretta Lynch. While she should have been confirmed as Attorney General months ago, I want to make the following points: Her qualifications are sterling. Her education, her experience as a U.S. attorney under two Presidents, as well as her accomplishments are unassailable.

I have never seen a nominee in my 22 years handle a confirmation hearing with such poise and answer questions with such command. During her hearing, I said Loretta Lynch was a combination of steel and velvet, and that, to me, sums her up perfectly.

I met with her prior to her hearing and was deeply impressed. I reviewed her stellar record and found her to be a firm yet fair prosecutor—as a matter of fact, probably the prosecutor in one of the toughest districts—the Eastern District of New York—that exists in America.

Having led this very large and important U.S. Attorney's Office under two Presidents, she is a proven leader and she also knows how to bring people together to get the job done. I think that is important.

Let me just talk about national security. The Eastern District of New York, where Ms. Lynch served as U.S. attorney, has led the Nation in terrorism convictions among all U.S. Attorney Offices since 2001. She has overseen these cases. The six individuals connected to Najibullah Zazi, who was part of an Al Qaeda plot and planned to set off bombs on the New York subway system; Rezwanul Nafis, who attempted to use a weapon of mass destruction against the New York Federal Reserve Bank; four individuals, including Russell Defreitas, who plotted to attack JFK Airport; an individual who tried to go to Yemen to join Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula; and two individuals who allegedly were members of Al Qaeda and attacked U.S. military forces overseas.

In February, her office announced that three individuals had been charged with attempting and conspiring to provide material support to ISIL. Two were planning to fly to Syria to join ISIL. The third was arrested while boarding a flight to Turkey at JFK. Her office has also charged 11 individuals, alleging that they illegally worked to secure more than $50 million in high-tech equipment for Russian military and intelligence agencies.

At her confirmation hearing, Lynch emphasized the importance of the government having the ''full panoply of investigative tools and techniques to deal with the ever-evolving threat of terrorism.'' In sum, I am confident she is going to be a very strong voice leading the Justice Department on issues of national security. I can only say I think, as those of us on the Intelligence Committee see—and the Presiding Officer is one of them—this becomes more important every day.

Her experience is just as deep on domestic issues. As U.S. attorney for a major urban district, she clearly understands the importance of protecting us from gangs and organized crime, issues that are front and center in my home State of California.

Her work in this area shows she understands local and international criminal organizations.

In the last year, under her leadership, three individuals connected to a major organized crime family pleaded guilty to a racketeering conspiracy.

A gang leader was found responsible, after a five-week trial, ''for six murders, two attempted murder[s], armed robberies, murder-for-hire, narcotics, distribution, and gambling on dog fighting.''

Another gang leader was convicted and sentenced to 37 years in prison for ordering the murder of two individuals, one of whom was believed to be associated with a rival gang.

Three individuals in a New York cell of an international cybercrime organization were also convicted on charges stemming from cyberattacks that resulted in $45 million in losses.

She has also made combatting human trafficking a priority. Over the last decade, her office's anti-trafficking program has indicted more than 55 defendants in sex trafficking cases and rescued more than 110 victims of sex trafficking, including more than 20 minors.

Simply put, Loretta Lynch has been on the frontlines in investigating and prosecuting a range of perpetrators, and I believe she will continue that work as Attorney General.

I would be remiss if I did not express my extreme disappointment in the delay over Ms. Lynch's confirmation. We have before us a nominee with impeccable credentials to serve as the Nation's chief law enforcement officer. During her confirmation, Senator LEAHY asked a panel of witnesses who were pro and supposedly con to raise their hands if they opposed her. Not a single witness raised their hand. To me, that spoke volumes.

Even Republicans who will vote against her because they disagree with the President praise her credentials and personal qualifications. But despite all of that, the Senate subjected her to, I think, an inexcusable delay. It is particularly sensitive because this would be the first African-American woman as Attorney General in the history of the United States.

If you look at race relations today and the impartial and important role that the Department of Justice plays, it seems to me that her appointment may well be the most important possible appointment at this particular point in time. Her nomination has been pending for 56 days on the floor. That is more than twice as long as the seven most recent Attorneys General combined.

So, hopefully, it is done now. I recognize the other side will say they could not move the nomination because of the trafficking bill or for some other reason. But the fact remains that, historically, we customarily move back and forth between executive and legislative business. We could have done that here as well. We have confirmed district judges, we have confirmed individuals who serve in various other executive capacities, including subcabinet positions. So we could have easily considered the nominee for one of the most important posts in this government.

Let me conclude with this. I regret that a vote on her nomination cannot be unanimous. I hope it will be close to that. I do not think that will be possible. She is that good. She deserves a unanimous vote. She is as fine as I have seen in my time in the Senate.

Senator DURBIN remarked in committee that her confirmation will be a truly momentous occasion for the Senate and for our Nation. He said this should be a ''solemn, important, and historic moment for America.'' I truly believe he was right. I truly believe this is an uncommon nominee at an uncommon time who can display a tremendous will, drive, motivation, and sense of justice as our U.S. Attorney

General. I am very honored to cast my vote in favor of her nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, briefly, this should be a happy day for America. This should be a day that is circled on the calendar as another day, as the Presiding Officer of this Senate knows, that this is about the American dream. This woman is the embodiment of the American dream in action. We should be celebrating her confirmation to the most important law enforcement position in the United States of America.

So why am I not happy? I am sad. I am depressed, because what we are going to witness in a few minutes is base politics at its ugliest. It does not get any uglier than this because what we are saying today—what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are saying today is that it does not matter if you are qualified. It does not matter if you are one of the most qualified nominees for Attorney General in the history of our country. That makes no difference. We have a new test: You must disagree with the President who nominates you. Let me say that again because we love common sense in Missouri. This defies common sense. You must vote against a nominee for the Cabinet of the duly elected President of the United States because she agrees with the duly elected President of the United States. Think of the consequences of that vote. Think what that means to the future of advise and consent in this Senate.

If we all adopt this base politics ''place in the cheap seats,'' I can't get elected President unless I am against Loretta Lynch, if we all adopt that in the future, how is any President elected in this country going to assemble a Cabinet? Because it will be incumbent on all of us to be against Cabinet members who have the nerve to agree with the President who has selected them for their team.

It is beyond depressing. It is disgusting. She is so qualified. She has worked so hard all of her life. She is a prosecutor's prosecutor. She has prosecuted more terrorists than almost anybody on the face of the planet. The notion that this has occurred because she agrees with the man who selected her—I think everyone needs to understand what that means to the future if all of us embrace that kind of base politics in this decision. It is not a happy day. It is a very sad day.

I am proud of who Loretta Lynch is. I am proud she will be Attorney General of this country. I am sad it will be such a close vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Loretta Lynch is an historic nominee. What I worry about is this body is making history for the wrong reasons. Senate Republicans have filibustered her. She becomes the first out of 82 Attorneys General in our Nation's history to face a filibuster.

On one hand she is an historic nominee for the right reason; the first African-American woman for Attorney General, a woman who is highly, highly qualified. Everybody agrees with that. But what a shame that we have the second part of history, to have her be the first out of 82 Attorneys General to be filibustered—to be held to this very disturbing double standard. This woman has had to face double standards all her life—why one more? I will proudly vote for her.

I ask unanimous consent to yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

CLOTURE MOTION

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 the nomination of Loretta Lynch to be Attorney General.

Mitch McConnell, Richard Burr, John Cornyn, Lamar Alexander, Bob Corker, Jeff Flake, Susan M. Collins, Orrin G. Hatch, Thom Tillis, Lisa Murkowski, Harry Reid, Richard J. Durbin, Patrick J. Leahy, Patty Murray, Amy Klobuchar, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Charles E. Schumer.

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 the nomination of Loretta E. Lynch, of New York, to be Attorney General 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.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 66, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 164 Ex.]

YEAS—66

Alexander	Flake	Murphy
Ayotte	Franken	Murray
Baldwin	Gardner	Nelson
Bennet	Gillibrand	Peters
Blumenthal	Graham	Portman
Booker	Hatch	Reed
Boxer	Heinrich	Reid
Brown	Heitkamp	Roberts
Burr	Hirono	Rounds
Cantwell	Johnson	Sanders
Capito	Kaine	Schatz
Cardin	King	Schumer
Carper	Kirk	Shaheen
Casey	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cochran	Leahy	Tester
Collins	Manchin	Thune
Coons	Markey	Tillis
Corker	McCaskill	Udall
Cornyn	McConnell	Warner
Donnelly	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Mikulski	Wyden

NAYS—34

Barrasso	Cruz	Hoeven
Blunt	Daines	Inhofe
Boozman	Enzi	Isakson
Cassidy	Ernst	Lankford
Coats	Fischer	Lee
Cotton	Grassley	McCain
Crapo	Heller	Moran
Murkowski	Sasse	Toomey
Paul	Scott	Vitter
Perdue	Sessions	Wicker
Risch	Shelby	
Rubio	Sullivan	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). On this vote, the yeas are 66, the nays are 34.

The motion is agreed to.

Cloture having been invoked, under the previous order, there will be up to 2 hours of postcloture debate equally divided between the two leaders prior to a vote on the Lynch nomination.

Mr. LEAHY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 1191

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, last week the Senate entered a unanimous consent agreement to get on the bipartisan Iran congressional review act at a time to be determined by the two leaders. Now that the Senate has passed the antitrafficking bill and the Lynch confirmation vote has been scheduled for later today, it is my intention to turn to the Iran legislation.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that at 3 p.m. today the Senate agree to the motion to proceed to H.R. 1191, as under the previous order, with debate only during today's session of the Senate following the offering of a substitute amendment by Senator CORKER or his designee, as under the previous order.

I further ask that following leader remarks on Tuesday, April 28, 2015, Senator CORKER be recognized to offer an amendment to the pending substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, it is my understanding that on Monday there will be opportunity for debate.

Is that right, Mr. Leader?

We will do that at closing tonight. That would be good.

Madam President, I appreciate very much the understanding of the Republican leader, the majority leader, about how to proceed on this. This is a really important piece of legislation. I don't know of a piece of legislation in recent years that is more important than this. So I look forward to the Senate turning to this legislation.

I again applaud and commend Senators CORKER and CARDIN for the delicate and very good work they have done on this. This measure, I repeat, is important. It deals with matters of international affairs and Congress's role in carrying out the constitutional responsibilities we have. This bill will take some time. I hope we can finish it as rapidly as possible. That is what I want.

I also want to comment that I think it is important we have the opportunity—and I am sure the Republican leader—to have our caucus on Tuesday, so that we by that time will have an idea how we are going to proceed forward on this.

I have heard some Senators want to offer amendments really to hurt this bill. I hope that, in fact, is not the case. I hope people are trying to be constructive. Regardless of that, the leader has assured us that there will be an open amendment process. So no matter how a person feels about this bill, they will have an opportunity to offer amendments. In my opinion, we need to support the Corker-Cardin agreement. Those Senators worked so we can get the bill passed as soon as possible.

So I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCONNELL. 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. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, today the Senate takes up the nomination of the 83rd Attorney General.

We all know the former Democratic leadership could have processed this nomination during last year's lame duck. But in the limited time we had, they chose to concentrate on confirming a number of judges and getting a losing vote on NSA reform. Ms. Lynch, at that time, wasn't high on the priority of the Democratic majority, but now I am pleased that the Senate was finally able to come to an agreement on the sex trafficking legislation, so we can turn to the Lynch nomination.

I voted against Ms. Lynch's nomination in committee and will oppose her nomination again when it is time to vote this afternoon. I will spend a few minutes now explaining my reasons to my colleagues.

This nomination comes at a pivotal time for the Department of Justice and our country. The next Attorney General will face some very difficult challenges—from combatting cybercrime, to protecting our children from exploitation, to helping fight the war on terror. But beyond that, the new Attorney General has a mess to clean up. The Justice Department has been plagued the last few years by decisionmaking driven by politics—pure politics. Some of these I have mentioned before, but I would like to give just a few examples.

The Department's own inspector general listed this as one of the top management challenges for the Department of Justice: ''Restoring Confidence in the Integrity, Fairness, and Accountability of the Department.'' That is quite a major management challenge the Department faces.

This inspector general cited several examples, including the Department's falsely denying basic facts in the Fast and Furious controversy. The inspector general concluded this ''resulted in an erosion of trust in the Department.''

In that fiasco, our government knowingly allowed firearms to fall into the hands of international gun traffickers, and, I am sorry to say, it led to the death of Border Patrol agent Brian Terry.

Then how did the Department respond to all this obviously wrong action on their part? They denied, they spun, and they hid the facts from Congress. And if you hide the facts from the American Congress, you are hiding the facts from the American people.

They bullied and intimidated whistleblowers, members of the press, and, you might say, anyone who had the audacity to investigate and help us uncover the truth.

But Fast and Furious isn't the Department's only major failing under the Holder tenure. It has also failed to hold another government agency accountable, the Internal Revenue Service.

We watched with dismay as that powerful agency was weaponized and turned against individual citizens who spoke out in defense of faith, freedom, and our Constitution. What was the Department's reaction to the targeting of citizens based on their political beliefs? They appointed a campaign donor to lead an investigation that hasn't gone anywhere, and then, after that, the Department called it a day.

Meanwhile, the Department's top litigator, the Nation's Solicitor General, is arguing in case after case for breathtaking expansions of Federal power.

I said this before, but it bears repeating: Had the Department prevailed in just some of the arguments it pressed before the Supreme Court in the last several years—and I will give five examples:

One, there would be essentially no limit on what the Federal Government could order States to do as a condition for receiving Federal money.

Two, the Environmental Protection Agency could fine homeowners $75,000 a day for not complying with an order and then turn around and deny that homeowner any right to challenge the order or those fines in court when the order is issued.

Three, the Federal Government could review decisions by religious organizations regarding who can serve as a minister of a particular religion.

Four, the Federal Government could ban books that expressly advocate for the election or the defeat of political candidates.

And five, lastly, the way this Solicitor General argued, as I said, would bring the most massive expansion of Federal power in the history of the country. The Fourth Amendment wouldn't have anything to say about the police attaching a GPS device to a citizen's car without a warrant and constantly tracking their every movement for months or years.

Now, I have given five reasons of expansion of the Federal Government. These positions aren't in any way mainstream positions. At the end of the day, the common thread that binds all of these challenges together is a Department of Justice which has become deeply politicized. But that is what happens when the Attorney General of the United States views himself—and these are his own words—as the President's ''wingman.''

Because of all the politicized decisions we have witnessed over the last few years, I have said from the very beginning of this process that what we need more than anything else out of our new Attorney General is independence. Ever since she was nominated, it was my sincere hope that Ms. Lynch would demonstrate that sort of independence. It was my hope that she would make clear that, while she serves at the pleasure of the President, she is accountable to the American people, because the job of Attorney General is defined by a duty to defend the Constitution and uphold the rule of law. The job is not simply to defend the President and his policies.

I voted for Attorney General Holder despite some reservations and misgivings, but I have come to regret that vote because of the political way he has led the Department. I realize that the quickest way to end his tenure as Attorney General is to confirm Ms. Lynch, but, as I have said, the question for me from the start has been whether Ms. Lynch will make a clean break from the Holder policies and take the Department in a new direction.

Some of my Democratic colleagues have said that no one has raised any objection to Ms. Lynch's nomination. This, of course, is inaccurate. No one disputes that she has an impressive legal background. It was her testimony before the committee that caused concerns for many Senators, including me. After thoroughly reviewing that testimony, I concluded that she won't lead the Department in a different direction. That is very unfortunate. After 6 years of Attorney General Holder's leadership, the Department desperately needs a change of direction.

I would like to remind my Democratic colleagues that it was not too long ago that a majority of Democrats voted against Judge Mukasey for Attorney General—not based on his records but instead based upon his testimony before the committee. In fact, then-Senator Obama had this to say about Judge Mukasey: ''While his legal credentials are strong, his views on two critical and related matters are, in my view, disqualifying.''

I asked Ms. Lynch about her views on Fast and Furious, on the IRS scandal, and other ways the Department has been politicized. She did not demonstrate that she would do things differently. Instead, she gave nonanswers.

She was eloquent and polished but nonresponsive.

The bottom line is that Ms. Lynch does not seem willing to commit to a new, independent way of running the Department. That surprised me very much. Based on everything we were told, I expected Ms. Lynch to demonstrate a bit more independence from the President. I am confident that if she had done so, she would have garnered more support.

As I said when the committee voted on her nomination, to illustrate this point, we need to look no further than the confirmation of Secretary Carter to the Department of Defense earlier this year. When he testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee, Secretary Carter demonstrated the type of independent streak that many of us were hoping we would see in Ms. Lynch.

Most of the media reporting on the two nominations seemed to agree. Headlines regarding the Carter nomination in the New York Times and the Washington Post commended his shift from the President's policies with headlines such as ''Defense nominee Carter casts himself as an independent voice,'' which was in the Washington Post, and in the New York Times, ''In Ashton Carter, Nominee for Defense Secretary, a Change in Direction.'' But on the Lynch nomination, those same newspapers highlighted that she defended the President's policies on immigration and surveillance with headlines such as ''Lynch Defends Obama's Immigration Action,'' which was in the New York Times, and from the Huffington Post, ''Loretta Lynch Defends Obama's Immigration Actions.''

Secretary Carter was confirmed with 93 votes. Only five Senators voted against Secretary Carter's nomination. That lopsided vote was a reflection of his testimony before the Senate, which demonstrated a willingness to be an independent voice within the administration. Unfortunately, Ms. Lynch did not demonstrate the same type of independence.

I sincerely hope Ms. Lynch proves me wrong and is willing to stand up to the President and say no when the duty of office demands it. But based upon my review of her record, I cannot support the nomination.

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. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I rise today to discuss the nomination of Loretta Lynch, a proud New Yorker and soon-to-be Attorney General of the United States of America. She was born in North Carolina, and her father was a fourth-generation Baptist minister, a man who grew up in the segregated South, and her mother picked cotton when she was a girl so her daughter would never have to. Their daughter grew up to be one of the keenest legal minds our country has to offer, someone who has excelled at every stage of her education and her career while cultivating a reputation—well deserved—as someone who is levelheaded, fair, judicious, and eminently likable.

If there is an American dream story, Loretta Lynch is it. Still, despite her intellectual and career achievements, Ms. Lynch has always been a nose-to-the-grindstone type, rarely seeking acclaim, only a job well done.

Throughout her career, she has had a yearning to serve the public, which began when she took a 75-percent pay cut to join the Eastern District as a prosecutor. There, she found her calling, handling some of the toughest litigation cases in the country on cyber crime, public corruption, financial fraud, police abuse, gang activity, organized crime, and especially terrorism.

When you look at the breadth and the depth of the cases she has handled, it is clear that Loretta Lynch is law enforcement's Renaissance woman. Because of her judicious, balanced, and careful approach to prosecuting on complex and emotional community-police relations matters, Ms. Lynch has always emerged with praise from both community leaders and the police. America needs this kind of leadership in our top law enforcement position.

In this age of global terrorism, the Attorney General's role in national security has never been more important.

I know her well. I was the person who recommended her to the President to be U.S. attorney twice. I know how good she is. In some of the most difficult cases—cases where the community was on one side and the police were on the other—she emerged with fair decisions that made both sides praise her. In this difficult world we are in, where we have so much tension, she is going to be great. That is why I was so proud when the President nominated her for Attorney General. She is just great. But one sad note—there is one cloud on this sunny day, and that is the long time it took to confirm her. We heard about a whole lot of issues completely unrelated to her experience or her qualifications. No one can assail Loretta Lynch—who she is, what she has done, how good an Attorney General she would be.

One quick story about Ms. Lynch. As I mentioned, I originally recommended Loretta Lynch for the position of U.S. attorney in 1999 because I thought she was excellent. Sure enough, she was.

When President Bush took office, Ms. Lynch went to the private sector to earn some money. When I had the opportunity to recommend a candidate for U.S. attorney again when President Obama became President in 2009, I was certain I wanted Ms. Lynch to serve again. She had only served for about 1½ years. She had done such a good job, I said, we need her back. But she had a good life. She was making a lot of money and had gotten married in the interim.

Knowing what a great person she is, I decided I would call her late on a Friday afternoon. I was confident that with the weekend to think it over, she would be drawn to answer the call to public service. When I called her Friday afternoon, she said to me, I was dreading this call, because she was happy in her life. But sure enough on Monday morning she called me back and said, I cannot turn this down because my desire to serve is so strong.

She is a great person in every way. On top of decades of experience at the highest levels of law enforcement and a sterling track record, Loretta Lynch brings a passion and deep commitment to public service befitting of the high office she is about to attain.

She will make an outstanding Attorney General. I believe every Member of this body will be proud of her, and I look forward to voting for her with great enthusiasm.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, today I underscore my opposition to the nomination of Loretta Lynch to be the next Attorney General of the United States. While her experience is extensive, both her judgment and independence were called into question by her expressed views on President Obama's clearly unconstitutional actions on immigration, and this is something that cannot be overlooked when considering a nominee to be our Nation's chief law enforcement officer.

Let's review Ms. Lynch's testimony before the Judiciary Committee on whether she believes the President's actions are constitutional. During that hearing, Ms. Lynch stated that she ''thought the legal opinion was reasonable'' and that the President's actions were a ''reasonable way to marshal limited resources to deal with the problem.'' When asked for a yes or no answer on whether she thinks Obama's executive actions on immigration were legal and constitutional, she stated, ''[A]s I've read the opinion, I do believe it is.''

What do these statements tell us? On the specific question of whether she thought the executive action was constitutional, Ms. Lynch was, at best, ambiguous. She attempted to obfuscate by saying that she found the underlying legal opinion ''reasonable.'' In my view, all obfuscation aside, she sufficiently conveyed to the committee that she, in fact, thought the executive actions were legal and constitutional.

Many have asked me: But, Senator MCCAIN, wouldn't you expect a Presidential nominee to support a position being taken by the President who is nominating her? In most cases, the answer is yes. And, it is well known that, historically, I have been deferential to the President's prerogative to select his senior advisors—even those who require Senate confirmation. But, on

matters regarding the U.S. Constitution—particularly those that implicate the separation of powers between the executive and legislative branches, the Attorney General is different.

It is the job of the U.S. Attorney General to represent the people of the United States and to ''do justice.'' It is not to serve as a policy instrument or cheerleader for the President. We have had years of that with Attorney General Holder. It has to stop with this nomination. Inasmuch as, by her own testimony, Ms. Lynch sees merit in a position that impinges on the constitutional prerogatives of the branch of government that I serve, I must vote in opposition to her nomination.

By the President's own repeated appraisal, the executive actions on immigration are unconstitutional. At least 22 times in the past few years, President Obama claimed he did not have the authority to unilaterally change the law in the way he did. For years, he pointed to Congress as the only way this change could take place, but reversed that position last November with his executive actions declaring the law as currently drafted to be inapplicable to millions of people. The following is a just a sampling of these oft-repeated statements:

''Comprehensive reform, that's how we're going to solve this problem. . . . Anybody who tells you it's going to be easy or that I can wave a magic wand and make it happen hasn't been paying attention to how this town works.''

''I can't simply ignore laws that are out there. I've got to work to make sure that they are changed.''

''I am president, I am not king. I can't do these things just by myself.''

''But there's a limit to the discretion that I can show because I am obliged to execute the law. That's what the Executive Branch means. I can't just make the laws up by myself. So the most important thing that we can do is focus on changing the underlying laws.''

''With respect to the notion that I can just suspend deportations through executive order, that's just not the case . . .''

''Believe me, the idea of doing things on my own is very tempting. I promise you. Not just on immigration reform. But that's not how our system works. That's not how our democracy functions. That's not how our Constitution is written.''

Whether you call it prosecutorial discretion or prioritizing enforcement, the argument does not survive scrutiny. With the stroke of a pen, the President's Executive action on immigration unilaterally changed the law as he saw fit, in violation of our Constitution and the way our system of government wisely provides for laws to be changed.

To the extent Ms. Lynch is willing to characterize this as reasonable and even constitutional, I cannot support her nomination. For all these reasons, I cast my vote in opposition to her confirmation to be U.S. Attorney General and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SCHUMER. 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. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I rise in strong opposition to the fast-track bill the Finance Committee approved last night, and that I think will be on the floor next week or the following week, on the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

I think the most important aspect of this debate is that what we are discussing with the TPP is not a new concept. It is not as though somebody came and said, I have a great idea; let's try this trade agreement, and it is going to be really good for the American worker and the American middle class and the American people. The truth is that we have seen this movie time and time and time again. Let me tell my colleagues that the ending of this movie is not very good. It is a pretty bad ending. I think most Americans understand that our past trade agreements have failed our American workers and have led to the loss of millions of decent-paying jobs.

What I simply don't understand—if we were going forward in the first place, with a new idea, maybe we should give it a shot. But when we went forward with NAFTA, when we went forward with CAFTA, when we went forward with Normal Permanent Trade Relations and there were all of these folks telling us how great these agreements were going to be and it turned out that virtually everything they said was inaccurate—not true—why in God's Name would we go forward with another trade agreement which is, in fact, larger than previous trade agreements?

Let me give an example of what I mean. On September 19, 1993, President Bill Clinton said the following:

> I believe that NAFTA will create 200,000 American jobs in the first two years of its effect. . . . I believe that NAFTA will create a million jobs in the first five years of its effect.

So President Clinton was pushing the NAFTA agreement very hard, and that is what he said.

In 1993, the same year, the Heritage Foundation, which is one of the most conservative think tanks in the country—so here we have a liberal President, Bill Clinton, and we have a conservative think tank, the Heritage Foundation—this is what they said: ''Virtually all economists agree that NAFTA will produce a net increase of U.S. jobs over the next decade.''

In 1993, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, who is now our majority leader, MITCH MCCONNELL, said: ''American firms will not move to Mexico just for lower wages.'' MITCH MCCONNELL: ''American firms will not move to Mexico just for lower wages.''

Well, was President Clinton right? Was the Heritage Foundation right? Was Senator MCCONNELL right? No. I think the evidence is pretty clear they were all wrong.

According to a well-respected economist at the Economic Policy Institute—and their facts usually hold up pretty well—NAFTA has led to the loss of more than 680,000 American jobs. What President Clinton said was wrong, what the Heritage Foundation said was wrong. We lost substantial numbers of jobs.

In 1993, the year before NAFTA was implemented, the United States had a trade surplus with Mexico of more than $1.6 billion. Last year, the trade deficit with Mexico was $53 billion. We had a trade surplus of $1.6 billion; last year we had a deficit of $53 billion. Now, how is that a success? I don't know.

In other words, NAFTA has been a disaster for American workers.

What about the Chinese trade agreement? I remember hearing all of the discussions about how great it would be if we had a trade agreement with a huge country such as China; thinking about all of the American products they would be buying, manufactured here in the United States. Here is what President Bill Clinton said about PNTR with China back in 1999. It is important to remember what people said because they are saying the same thing about this trade agreement. But this is back in 1999, Bill Clinton, President, PNTR with China:

> In opening the economy of China, the agreement will create unprecedented opportunities for American farmers, workers and companies to compete successfully in China's market. . . . This is a hundred-to-nothing deal for America when it comes to the economic consequences.

Once again, that is a liberal President.

Now, we have the conservative think tanks that love unfettered free trade. In 1999, discussing PNTR with China, the conservative economists at the Cato Institute—these are really conservative guys and this is what they said:

> The silliest argument against PNTR is that Chinese imports would overwhelm U.S. industry. In fact, American workers are far more productive than their Chinese counterparts. . . . PNTR would create far more export opportunities for America than the Chinese.

Well, what can we say about that? The Cato Institute wrote in 1999: ''The silliest argument against PNTR is that Chinese imports would overwhelm U.S. industry.''

Sure. Right.

If we go out to any department store in America and we buy products, where

are those products made? Guess what. They are made in China. It appears that, in fact, Chinese imports did overwhelm U.S. industry. The Cato Institute was dead wrong.

Again, nobody is really surprised at this. There is no more debate about this. Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China, that trade agreement, was a disaster.

The Economic Policy Institute has estimated that trade agreement with China has led to the loss of 2.7 million American jobs. The trade deficit with China has increased from $83 billion in 2001 to $342 billion in 2014.

Now, in terms of China, I don't know that the American people have any doubt about it. Every time we go shopping, the products overwhelmingly are made in China. People look in their own towns and in their own States—my State—and see losses of more and more manufacturing jobs. Since 2001, we have lost 60,000 manufacturing facilities in America. Not all of it is attributable to trade; there are other reasons, but a lot of it is attributable to trade. Millions of decent-paying jobs are gone; people thrown out on the street as companies move to China, Vietnam, and other low-wage countries. There is not a debate about it. That is exactly what has happened. Corporation after corporation has said, Why do I want to pay an American worker $15, $20 an hour? Why do I want to deal with the union? Why do I have to obey environmental regulations? I can move to China, I can move to Vietnam, I can move to Malaysia or Mexico and I can pay people pennies an hour and bring the product back into the United States. That is what they said, and that is what they have done.

Major corporation after major corporation has reduced employment in America at the same time as they have increased employment in other countries.

Not only is it the loss of jobs, it is the race to the bottom. It is employers saying to workers, Look, I am cutting your health care, I am not giving you a raise, and if you don't like it, I am moving to China because there are people all over the world who are prepared to work for wages a lot lower than you are receiving. You can take it or leave it. That is one of the reasons why today the typical American worker is working longer hours for lower wages than he or she used to and why wages have gone down in America. That is what the global economy has done. That is what these horrendous unfettered free-trade agreements have pushed on American workers. That is the Chinese trade agreement: an estimated 2.7 million American jobs lost.

Then we have the Korea Free Trade Agreement, which has led to a loss of some 60,000 jobs. Our trade deficit with that country has gone up from $16.6 billion in 2012 to $25 billion in 2014.

So we have a history of failed trade agreement after failed trade agreement after failed trade agreement and people say, Hey, we failed, we failed, we failed; let's do the same thing again and this time we are really, really, really going to succeed. I don't think anybody really believes that.

I do understand that Wall Street loves this trade agreement and they are staying up nights worrying about ordinary Americans; and I understand that the major corporations in this country love this agreement and the truck companies love this agreement, which gives us enough reason to hold this agreement in doubt.

Now, the Obama administration says, Well, trust us. Forget about the other trade agreements. This TPP is something different. It is a better agreement. This time will be different. This time it will support about 650,000 American jobs. Well, supporters of unfettered free trade were wrong about NAFTA, they were wrong about CAFTA, they were wrong about PNTR with China, and they were wrong about the Korea Free Trade Agreement and—surprise of all surprises—they are wrong again.

If the fast-track is approved, it would pave the way for the passage of the TPP—the Trans-Pacific Partnership—trade agreement. As my colleagues know, this trade agreement is poised to be the largest free-trade agreement in history, encompassing 12 nations that account for roughly 40 percent of the global economy. This is a very big deal.

Let me speak about two of those countries that are involved in the TPP; those are Vietnam and Malaysia. We are fighting here—and I understand there are differences of opinion—we are fighting here in the U.S. Congress to raise the minimum wage. I happen to believe a $7.25 minimum wage, which is what it is federally, is a starvation wage. I would like to see it go up over a period of years to $15 an hour. The Presiding Officer may disagree, and there are others who disagree.

Let me tell my colleagues what the minimum wage is in Vietnam. The minimum wage in Vietnam is 56 cents an hour—56 cents an hour. So we have American workers being forced to compete against people who make 56 cents an hour. And we have a situation, just as one example of many, where the Nike company—a company which produces over 365 million pairs of athletic shoes each year—goes all over the world. Do you know how many of those athletic shoes are manufactured in the United States of America? Fifty million? Twenty million? Ten million? One million? Zero. On the other hand, they employ 330,000 workers in Vietnam—mostly young women—and while they refuse to tell us, give us the detailed information, our supposition is that most of those women make very low wages.

Let's be clear about what is going on. According to a November 11, 2014, article in the Vietnamese newspaper Thanh Nien News: ''Analysts acknowledge that Vietnam's abundance of cheap labor has played an increasingly pivotal role in wooing foreign firms looking to set up overseas manufacturing operations in a country with a population of 90 million.''

In other words, that is what this is all about. Wages are very low in Vietnam. Companies from the United States and all over the world will go to that country. Allowing the TPP to pass will make it easier for multinational companies to shut down in America and move to Vietnam. That is wrong.

When we talk about free trade, it is important to understand what is involved. Whom are we competing against? Are we competing against Canadian workers whose standard of living is as high or higher than ours? Are we competing against workers in Germany whose standard of living may be higher than ours? No. We are competing against people who are struggling to stay alive, earning the lowest possible wages that keep a human being alive.

Last year, the Human Rights Watch published a report on Vietnam. Here are some of the quotes from that report:

> The human rights situation in Vietnam deteriorated significantly in 2013, worsening a trend evident for several years. The year was marked by a severe and intensifying crackdown on critics, including long prison terms for many peaceful activists whose ''crime'' was calling for political change.

In other words, in Vietnam, if you speak up, you want political change, there is a likelihood you will end up in jail.

> Vietnam bans all political parties, labor unions and human rights organizations independent of the government. . . . The authorities require official approval for public gatherings and refuse to grant permission for meetings, marches, or protests they deem politically or otherwise unacceptable.

It is not my point to beat up on Vietnam. They are a struggling country—a poor country that went through a terrible war with the United States that caused them incredible harm. But when we look at a trade agreement, when we say to American workers: This is your competition, people who are making 56 cents an hour in some cases, people who can't form an independent trade union, people who politically can't stand up and speak up for their rights, is that really appropriate and fair to the American worker? I don't think it is. I don't think it is.

Let me say a word not just on Vietnam but another country in that consortium of partners in the TPP; that is, the country of Malaysia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a New York Times article, dated September 17, 2014.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 17, 2014]

REPORT CITES FORCED LABOR IN MALAYSIA'S ELECTRONICS INDUSTRY

(By Steven Greenhouse)

Nearly one in three migrant workers in Malaysia's thriving electronics industry

toils under forced labor conditions, essentially trapped in the job, a factory monitoring group found in a report issued on Wednesday.

The monitoring group, Verité—which conducted a two-year investigation commissioned by the United States Department of Labor—found that 32 percent of the industry's nearly 200,000 migrant workers were employed in forced situations because their passports had been taken away or because they were straining to pay back illegally high recruitment fees.

The report said those practices were prevalent among the migrants from Bangladesh, India, Myanmar, Nepal, Vietnam and other countries who work in Malaysia's nearly 200 electronics factories. Those factories, which produce consumer electronics, motherboards, computer peripherals and other electronic goods, account for a third of Malaysia's exports and produce for many well-known companies, including Apple, Flextronics, Samsung and Sony.

The Verité report said that 92 percent of the migrant workers in Malaysia's electronics industry had paid recruitment fees and that 92 percent of that group had paid fees that exceeded legal or industry standards, defined as more than one month's wages.

The report said about half of the migrant workers who borrowed for their recruitment fees spent more than a year paying off those fees. According to the report, 94 percent of the migrants did not have their passports when Verité's investigators interviewed them, and 71 percent said it would be impossible or difficult to get their passports back when needed.

''This most modern of industrial sectors is characterized by a form of exploitation that long ago should have been relegated to the past,'' said Daniel Viederman, chief executive of Verité. ''The problem is not one of a few isolated cases. It is indeed widespread.''

Labor Department officials commissioned the study because the federal government frowns on the importation of goods made by forced labor. They sought an investigation after seeing evidence that the problem was serious in Malaysia.

Twelve investigators working for Verité interviewed a total of 501 workers from nearly 200 Malaysian factories. According to the study, ''92 percent reported feeling compelled to work overtime hours to pay off their debt, and 85 percent felt it was impossible to leave their job before paying off their debt.'' Seventy-seven percent had to borrow money to pay their recruitment fees.

''Workers are paying too much to get their jobs,'' Mr. Viederman said. ''That leaves them vulnerable to being trapped in their jobs.''

He told of a migrant worker from Nepal who spoke good English and was the only one of five children with a college degree. His family paid a recruitment agent $1,500 for his job, which was more than twice the annual income in Nepal, and they borrowed much of that at a 36 percent annual interest rate.

When the Nepali arrived in Malaysia, his passport was taken from him at the airport, and he has not seen it since, he told the Verité interviewer. ''He has now completed 14 months of a three-year contract, and he has not been able to save any money'' because he is still paying back the recruitment fees, Mr. Viederman said. The Nepali works 12 hours a day, often seven days a week, and said it would take two years to finish repaying the loan.

''He doesn't want to be in Malaysia anymore,'' Mr. Viederman said. ''He wants to quit and return home, but then he would have to pay a hefty fine and purchase his own plane ticket and still have the loan payment hanging over his head. He wasn't sure if he could get his passport back.''

The report found that 30 percent of foreign workers said they slept in a room with more than eight people, and 43 percent said there was no place where they could safely store their belongings. Twenty-two percent of the workers said they had been deceived about their wages, hours or overtime requirements during the recruitment process.

Mr. Viederman said many workers faced a ''one-two punch''—being charged high recruitment fees and then being paid less than they had been promised. He said many workers were told that their wages would be withheld or they would be reported to authorities if they complained or protested.

The Malaysian Embassy in Washington did not respond to inquiries—Tuesday was a national holiday.

Officials from Samsung and Sony did not respond to questions about Malaysia.

Asked about the reports of forced labor, Chris Gaither, a spokesman for Apple, said: ''This is an issue we have paid a lot of attention to and done a lot of work on. We were the first electronics company to mandate reimbursement to workers who were charged excessive recruitment fees.''

Mr. Gaither said Apple's supply chain, which employs 1.5 million workers worldwide, employs 18,000 in Malaysia, including 4,000 migrant contract workers. He said that since 2008, Apple had helped migrant workers in Malaysia and elsewhere to reclaim $19.8 million in excessive recruitment fees, which he defined as more than one month's wages. Apple uses about 30 factories in Malaysia, and Apple had audits done at 18 of them in the last year to investigate forced labor and other problems.

Mr. Viederman said companies should strengthen their codes of conduct to bar payment of recruitment fees for workers at any factories they use and to prohibit supplier factories from taking migrant workers' passports. He said companies should make sure their factory monitors engaged in aggressive investigations to unearth such practices. In addition, he called for a grievance procedure for workers that would hold the companies, suppliers and labor brokers accountable.

The Verité report found 62 percent of migrant workers said they were unable to move around freely without their passports. Fifty-seven percent said they could not leave their job before their contract was finished because they would be charged an illegally high fine, lose their passport or be denounced to the authorities.

Forty-six percent reported having encounters with police, immigration officials or a volunteer citizens security corps. Most of the 46 percent said they had to pay a bribe, were detained or were threatened with detention or physical harm. Twenty-seven percent of the foreign workers said they could not come and go freely from their housing.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, what the New York Times article talks about is that today there are nearly 200 electronics factories in Malaysia where high-tech products from Apple, Dell, Intel, Motorola, and Texas Instruments are manufactured and brought back into the United States. It turns out Malaysia is a major center for the manufacturing of electronics, and some of the largest electronics manufacturers in the world are centered or have plants in Malaysia. If the TPP is approved, that number will go up substantially. Now, what is wrong with that?

Well, let's talk about what is going on in Malaysia, where American companies in this country and American workers will have to compete as part of the TPP. Well, it turns out that many of the workers at the electronics plants in Malaysia are immigrants to that country and are forced to work there under subhuman working conditions.

According to Verite, which conducted a 2-year investigation into labor abuses in Malaysia, which was commissioned by the U.S. Department of Labor—this report was commissioned by the U.S. Department of Labor.

This report tells us that 32 percent of the electronics industries' nearly 200,000 migrant workers in Malaysia were employed in forced situations because their passports had been taken away or because they were straining to pay back illegally high recruitment fees.

According to the New York Times article commenting on the study, 92 percent of the migrant workers in Malaysia's electronics industries had paid recruitment fees, and 92 percent of that group had paid fees that exceeded legal or industry standards defined as more than one month's wages.

Ninety-four percent of the migrants did not have their passports when Verite's investigators interviewed them. Let me repeat that. The passports were taken away from 94 percent of the people whom these investigators interviewed. Now, if you are a migrant in a foreign country and your passport is taken away, you have no rights at all. You can't leave. You may not be able to travel. You have no rights at all. In other words, many of these workers who wanted to leave Malaysia were unable to do so. They were forced to stay and continue to work under these subhuman conditions.

Mr. President, 30 percent of foreign workers—this is again in the report from Verite, commissioned by the U.S. Department of Labor—30 percent of foreign workers said they slept in a room with more than eight people, and 43 percent said there was no place where they could safely store their belongings.

Well, when we talk about competition and a competitive global economy, I do not believe the American worker should be forced to compete against workers who are literally held in slave-like conditions, unable to leave the country, having their passports taken away, working for pennies an hour.

Let me conclude simply by saying this: This trade agreement is being pushed on the Congress by the largest corporations in the United States of America. They love unfettered free trade because it enables them to shut down in America and move to low-wage countries where they can employ workers at pennies an hour. This trade agreement is pushed on us by Wall Street, that wants to make sure that around the world they will have financial regulations that make it easier for them to do what they do, rather than serve the economies of countries around the world.

This legislation is strongly supported by the pharmaceutical industry that will have the opportunity to prevent poor countries around the world from moving to generic drugs and make medicine affordable to the poor people in these countries. So all of the billionaire class, all of the powerful corporate world is supporting this trade agreement.

Who is opposing this trade agreement? Well, virtually every trade union in America whose job it is to stand up for American workers. They are in opposition. I was just at a rally with them the other day. They are united. They are in opposition. You have many environmental groups that understand this is a bad agreement. You have medical groups that understand this is a bad agreement for poor people in developing countries, and you have millions of workers in this country who do not want to compete. They are not afraid of competition. We are a productive country. They do not want to compete against people making 56 cents an hour or against forced labor in Malaysia. That is where we are today.

Where we are today is, Do we go forward with a failed trade policy or do we take a deep breath and say enough is enough? Let us rethink trade policy. Let us figure out a way we can grow the American economy, create decent jobs in the United States, and, by the way, help poor people around the world. All of us want to see wages go up in poor countries around the world, but that does not mean wages have got to go down in the United States of America. We need a trade agreement that works for our people, works for people around the world but is not a trade agreement that only works for the Big Money interests in the United States.

I hope very much the Senate will take a real hard look at this trade agreement, take a hard look at what people have been saying for years about previous trade agreements and say we are not going down this failed path anymore.

With that, Mr. 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. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING DR. IRWIN SCHATZ

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I came across an article in the New York Times on Sunday that called my attention to the passing of an amazing man, a man who has a connection to the U.S. Senate.

I rise to pay my respects to a man of uncommon integrity. Dr. Irwin Schatz passed away on April 1 at the age of 83. Beloved and respected in the medical community, Dr. Schatz spent his career helping people. He was a major contributor to the Honolulu Heart Program, a landmark study with half a century of followup on Japanese American men in Hawaii.

Dr. Schatz was the rare critic of the notorious Tuskegee, AL, syphilis medical experiments.

From 1952 to 1972, the U.S. Public Health Service conducted the Tuskegee clinical study on poor African-American sharecroppers. They wanted to know about untreated syphilis on African Americans. There were 600 men enrolled in the study. Almost two-thirds had syphilis, while the rest were used as control subjects. Between 1932 and 1947, the date when penicillin was determined to be the cure for the disease, at least seven men died, and their wives, children, and untold number of others had been infected.

Men participating in the study were told they were being treated for bad blood. Bad blood wasn't running in the veins of these men, it was running in the veins of those who decided this study was worth more than their humanity.

Dr. Irwin Schatz was 4 years out of medical school working as a cardiologist at Henry Ford Hospital in Detroit when he came across the December 1964 issue of the journal ''Archives of Internal Medicine,'' which mentioned the Tuskegee study. We cannot be sure how many other people read this issue, but Dr. Schatz read it, and he was horrified.

Dr. Schatz wrote to the study's senior author, Dr. Donald Rockwell. His letter was only three sentences long. These three sentences could have put his career at risk. Here was this young doctor criticizing an investigation overseen by some of the leading figures in the American Public Health Service.

Here is what he wrote:

> I am utterly astounded by the fact that physicians allow patients with a potentially fatal diseases to remain untreated when effective therapy is available. I assume you feel the information which is extracted from observations of this untreated group is their sacrifice. If this is the case, then I suggest the United States Public Health Service and those physicians associated with it in this study need to reevaluate their moral judgment in this regard.

The sad reality is that the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention buried Dr. Schatz' letter, and it would sit in their archives until 1972. A Wall Street Journal reporter found the letter the same year that Peter Buxtun, health service employee turned whistleblower, told the world about this horrific study.

Dr. Schatz went on to serve in a variety of hospitals. In 1975 he joined the University of Hawaii and eventually became chairman of their department of medicine. In 2009, he was named a medical hero by the Mayo Clinic because of his career but also because of the moral fury he expressed in that three-sentence letter.

Irwin Schatz was truly a hero. My prayers and thoughts go out to his sons, Jacob, Edward, Stephen, and our colleague Senator BRIAN SCHATZ, his nine grandchildren and his family.

Mr. President, I would like to speak on a separate topic very briefly.

The moment is going to finally arrive in just a few minutes when we are going to, I hope, approve by a bipartisan vote the nomination of Loretta Lynch to be our next Attorney General. This is a milestone in the history of the United States—the first African-American woman to become Attorney General of this country.

I would like to say that I am sorry—and I am—for the delay in bringing this nomination before the Senate. It should have been done long ago. She is an extraordinary person from an extraordinary family. We have been blessed with her public service for so many years, and now she has reached the top in her career to be able to serve as our next Attorney General.

I will, with a great deal of admiration and respect, be voting in favor of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I eagerly echo the words of my dear friend, the senior Senator from Illinois. This is a great, historic moment. Earlier today, we ended the filibuster on this woman, Loretta Lynch. We ended the filibuster of her nomination to be Attorney General of the United States.

The good news is that we ended the filibuster. The bad news is that for the first time in our Nation's history, we had to overcome a filibuster for an Attorney General nominee—of either party. Eighty-two prior Attorneys General, going back to George Washington straight through, and not one of them has been treated the way Loretta Lynch has been treated.

I have come to know what a strong and good woman she is from her time as U.S. attorney and straight through to her confirmation hearing. At her confirmation hearing, those opposed to her brought witnesses but when I asked them, are there any of you who would vote against her, not a single hand went up.

You see, I know her strengths. I know she has persevered through much more difficult circumstances in her life. I believe this will make her even stronger. But do I hope after this extended delay, that Senate Republicans will show her more respect as Attorney General of the United States than she has received as a nominee.

She deserves all of America's respect and our gratitude for being willing to continue to serve our Nation. Loretta Lynch is eminently qualified to be Attorney General. She has twice been unanimously confirmed by the Senate to be U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of New York. Her record as a top Federal prosecutor in Brooklyn is unimpeachable.

I have no doubt that as Attorney General, Ms. Lynch will effectively, fairly, and independently enforce the law.

She has received the highest praise from those on both sides of the aisle. A group of 26 former United States Attorneys from both Republican and Democratic administrations have written, ''Ms. Lynch has the experience, temperament, independence, integrity, and judgment to immediately assume this critically important position.'' A former Associate Attorney General serving at the Justice Department under President Bush wrote to me saying that ''[Ms. Lynch is] uniquely qualified to serve as Attorney General.'' Former Republican mayor of New York City, Rudy Guiliani, said, ''If I were in the Senate, I would confirm her,'' and Louis Freeh, former director of the FBI and Federal judge, has written ''[i]n my twenty-five years of public service—23 in the Department of Justice—I cannot think of a more qualified nominee to be America's chief law enforcement officer.'' This is just a glimpse of the broad support she has received.

Loretta Lynch deserves to be considered by this Chamber based on her record, her accomplishments, and her extraordinary character. Let us come together. Let us make history by confirming Loretta Lynch to be the first African-American woman to serve as Attorney General of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent to yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Loretta E. Lynch, of New York, to be Attorney General?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 165 Ex.]

YEAS—56

Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murphy
Baldwin	Graham	Murray
Bennet	Hatch	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Peters
Booker	Heitkamp	Portman
Boxer	Hirono	Reed
Brown	Johnson	Reid
Cantwell	Kaine	Sanders
Cardin	King	Schatz
Carper	Kirk	Schumer
Casey	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cochran	Leahy	Stabenow
Collins	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	McConnell	Warren
Feinstein	Menendez	Whitehouse
Flake	Merkley	Wyden
Franken	Mikulski	

NAYS—43

Alexander	Fischer	Roberts
Barrasso	Gardner	Rounds
Blunt	Grassley	Rubio
Boozman	Heller	Sasse
Burr	Hoeven	Scott
Capito	Inhofe	Sessions
Cassidy	Isakson	Shelby
Coats	Lankford	Sullivan
Corker	Lee	Thune
Cornyn	McCain	Tillis
Cotton	Moran	Toomey
Crapo	Murkowski	Vitter
Daines	Paul	Wicker
Enzi	Perdue	
Ernst	Risch	

NOT VOTING—1

Cruz

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As a reminder, expressions of approval or disapproval are not permitted from the gallery.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I appreciate the majority leader making the usual request that the President be notified, but I have a sneaky suspicion the President knows what the final vote was.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session and be in a period of morning business until 3 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FIRST 100 DAYS OF THE REPUBLICAN-LED SENATE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, last Thursday marked the 100th day of the new Republican-led Senate. While it is still very early, and there is still much to be done, we can report there has been bipartisan progress in a number of important areas. So I am optimistic. I am optimistic that the momentum we have seen over the last several months is going to translate into further successes on behalf of Americans.

It is interesting to read from last Thursday's USA TODAY: The first 100 days of Republican Congress. The headline is: ''Lawmakers try to prove it's possible to be productive.'' So people are noticing the fact that we are keeping our campaign promises.

During the last campaign season we told people all across the country that if they just gave us the opportunity to govern, we would do it in a bipartisan way. In November, the American people did send an unmistakable message to Washington. Voters across the country said they were tired of gridlock and tired of a lack of action. They said it was time for a new majority—a Republican majority—a majority to get the Senate working again and to get America on a better course.

Republicans have responded, and we are working hard to make the Senate accountable again to the people who sent us here. And you don't have to take my word for it. Just the other day, the Bipartisan Policy Center came out with its healthy Congress index. This is a group of former Republican and Democratic leaders of Congress. They talked about how the new Senate has been showing signs of life. The total number of days worked, they report, is up from that of previous years—43 days in the first 100 calendar days of this Senate versus 33 days at the same point last Congress, and 33 days in the Congress before that.

Also, the number of bills reported out of committee is way up. In the first 100 days we had 15 bills reported out of committees in the Senate compared to just 8 in the first 100 days of the previous two Congresses. Imagine that, our committees are working, and we are pushing out bipartisan bills, such as the Iran congressional review bill that passed unanimously in the Foreign Relations Committee.

The number of amendments voted on is larger than it has been in previous Congresses. In the first 100 days of this Congress, we voted on more than 100 amendments. These are amendments by both Republicans and Democrats. For all of last year there were only 15 up-and-down votes on amendments—just 15 for the entire year. This year we topped that number of amendment votes by January 22.

That is just one more way the Senate is working again. In the first 100 days we passed a dozen bipartisan bills. We passed the bipartisan Keystone XL Pipeline jobs bill. We passed a bill to make much-needed reforms to the Medicare program and to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program. We passed the Clay Hunt Veterans Suicide Prevention Act. We reached an agreement to help victims of modern slavery who are abused and exploited by human traffickers. These important bills are just part of our commitment to work together to solve problems for the American people.

On top of all that, we passed a budget that actually balances over the next 10 years. Even former Democratic Senate leader Tom Daschle recently said that ''there's been more open debate and

consideration of issues'' under Senator MCCONNELL's leadership. Well, that is exactly right. The Senate is working again, and we are just getting started.

I am hopeful we can continue to work together to find solutions for more issues that matter to the American people. As chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee, I can say that we have made real progress on bills to improve the lives of people across Indian Country. We have passed bills to improve irrigation projects, to help protect children in foster care, and to increase self-governance by Indian tribes. It has been a positive agenda, and I am grateful for the hard work and dedication of all the committee members.

Along with a group of six Democrats and six Republicans who are working as cosponsors, I introduced a bill to speed up exports of American liquefied natural gas. We have bipartisan agreement on the need to streamline the permitting process for the sale of this clean American energy.

This week we also made great progress on a bipartisan bill on the waters of the United States. I am optimistic we can reach an agreement with Senators on the other side of the aisle to get that issue behind us.

The American people want an honest debate on important issues such as these. The American people want their representatives in the Senate to be able to offer amendments. The American people want to see their Senators take a stand and cast a vote up or down. That is how the Senate should work. That is how the Senate has been working for the first 100 days under Republican leadership.

I am pleased with how productive the Senate has been over the first 100 days. Of course we want to do more, and we will have the chance shortly. I look forward to more votes, more debate, and more consideration of ideas from both sides of the aisle. This is the commitment Republicans made to the American people, and we are keeping that commitment.

Mr. 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. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I am happy to stand here today knowing that the Senate has had a pretty good week of getting its work done—or I should say the people's work done—and overwhelmingly passing important legislation that will actually help, first of all, victims of human trafficking, but generally speaking, help make the lives of our constituents, the American people, just a little bit better. I am talking about the antitrafficking legislation in particular—something I am particularly excited about—the unanimous, 99-to-0 vote yesterday. We passed this piece of legislation after a hard-fought few weeks of debate. The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act was a bill we all agree was worth fighting for. Why? Is this important to the rich and powerful, the people who have a lot of influence here in Washington and around the country? No. We thought it was worth fighting for because it would help the people who, frankly, need a voice. They need somebody to speak up for them because they can't speak for themselves. This antitrafficking bill, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, protects the most vulnerable people in our country.

I thank the majority leader for his tireless help and commitment to making sure we got this job done to fight this monstrous crime and punish those who seek to hold our children in what has been appropriately called nothing less than modern-day slavery.

As the majority leader said yesterday, today is a new day. Under his leadership, the Senate is now in a new era of bipartisanship and functioning. If there is one thing I heard last year as I was campaigning for reelection in Texas or traveling around the country—I am sure the Presiding Officer had the same experience—it is that people would tell me how frustrated they were with Washington and the fact that no one seemed to be working together to try to solve the problems that were making their lives more difficult. ''Dysfunction'' was the word most commonly used.

But now, after this first 100 days of a new Congress, I think we are demonstrating that we are capable of functioning and working together in the best interest of the American people. Does that mean we are sacrificing our principles? People are Republicans or Democrats for good reason: They have a different point of view. But what is inexcusable is for Republicans and Democrats to refuse to work together and get nothing done.

We have a colleague, a very conservative colleague who years ago told me, while working with a very liberal colleague—I asked him: How is it that somebody who really represents the book ends in terms of ideology—Republican versus Democrat, liberal versus conservative—how is it that you actually are able to get things done?

He said to me: Well, it is easy. It is the 80–20 rule. We take the 80 percent we can agree on and we leave the 20 percent we can't agree on for another day and another fight.

As we are celebrating, in a sense, a new era of bipartisanship and functioning here in the Senate, it is clear we can't rest on our laurels. We still have a lot of work to do, and I would like to spend a couple minutes talking about that.

Our upcoming agenda will include some very important and weighty matters, including the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, which will give Congress the ability and time to scrutinize any agreement reached between the Obama administration and the P5+1 nations, while also prohibiting the President from lifting sanctions on Iran during this period of review.

This commonsense bill was unanimously reported out last week by the Foreign Relations Committee. I think that is a little bit of a surprise to many given the fact that the President initially said that if Congress were to pass this sort of legislation giving the American people a voice in this nuclear agreement, he would veto it. Well, when this came roaring out of the Foreign Relations Committee with unanimous support and when it became clear that enough Democrats were going to join together with Republicans to pass this legislation and prevent a veto by having enough votes to override a veto, then the President very commonsensically said: Well, I think I will sign it. I will agree to go along with that.

So the President finally agreed with Republicans and Democrats in the Senate that congressional oversight was warranted and admitted last week that he would not stand in the way of this legislation.

We are here not to guard our own prerogatives or privileges as individual Senators. That means essentially nothing. What we are here for is to stand in the shoes of our constituents—the 26.9 million people whom I represent in Texas, the people of Arkansas whom the Presiding Officer represents—and it is absolutely critical that we, as the representatives of the American people, have the opportunity to review this Iran deal and to consider its implications, to debate it, and to make that entirely transparent to the American people because this is about not just the national security of the nation of Israel, this is about our national security as well as that of our other allies.

We will spend much of the next few days and perhaps through next week discussing this bill, so I won't belabor my thoughts on that at this time, but I did want to express a few concerns on the current state of the proposed framework with Iran.

On April 2, President Obama announced not a deal with Iran but a ''historic understanding with Iran.''

Well, people naturally asked: What does that understanding look like? What does it consist of? Where can I get a copy of it so I can read it?

To our surprise, there wasn't a deal. Nothing was written. It was somehow a historic understanding that—even the parties who negotiated it disagreed about the details. So it should come as no surprise that the President and the P5+1 countries have not been able to secure an actual deal with Iran, which is our biggest threat and most dangerous adversary in the Middle East. After all, let's think about whom we are talking to and with—the nation of Iran. This is the No. 1 state sponsor of international terrorism, a country that has repeatedly lied to and deceived inspectors in the past as a matter of

standard operating procedure. As Prime Minister Netanyahu of Israel reminded us just last month, for more than 30 years Iran has been hostile to America and her allies. In fact, Iran first killed Americans back in the early 1980s and has subsequently killed Americans mainly through proxies since that time until the present time. This is the same regime that has continued to target the United States since 1979. It is the same regime that has been on the State Department's terrorism blacklist since 1984 following an Iran-backed terrorist attack that resulted in the deaths of hundreds of American servicemen, including many from my State. Given this track record, does anybody really wonder what Iran would do with a nuclear weapon?

As these important negotiations continue for the next months, there remain a lot of question marks about Iran's true intentions and about whether the deal—once it is done—the Obama administration is finalizing will essentially cement Iran's status as a nuclear threshold nation.

I remember Prime Minister Netanyahu speaking to a joint meeting of the Congress. He said the framework he has seen doesn't prevent Iran from gaining a nuclear weapon. What he said is that essentially the framework paves the way or paves the path to a nuclear weapon, which, of course, would represent a tremendous change in American policy.

Our policy has been—the administration's policy has been, as stated, no nukes for Iran, none. But at least according to the framework that has been leaked, there appears to be more of the nature of a pathway toward a nuclear weapon as opposed to a prohibition. I look forward to continuing the discussion in the coming days, but Iran is only one issue we will be turning to as the Senate continues to work on bipartisan legislation to get work done for the American people.

We will be working on the very important issue of trade. Trade is important to my State, and it is important to the United States. Anytime we can open new markets to the things we grow in our agricultural sector or the livestock we raise—the beef, pork, poultry sector—anytime we can create and open new markets to the things we manufacture and we make in the United States, it strikes me it is a good thing, because while we occupy only 5 percent of the world's territory, we constitute 20 percent of the purchasing power in the world. That means 95 percent of the population—80 percent of the purchasing power in the world—lies beyond our shores. It just makes sense to me that we would want to open our markets, our goods that we make and grow and raise to markets overseas; in this case, primarily to Asia. But once we take up the Trans-Pacific Partnership, once it is negotiated, then at some future point we will turn to Europe and the so-called TTIP negotiation.

Last night, I am glad to report that the Finance Committee reported out the trade promotion authority piece of this legislation. This is something that has been a little bit misunderstood and, frankly, it is a little confusing. People have asked, Why in the world would you want to give the President authority to negotiate this Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiation? The simple answer is this trade promotion authority is not just for President Obama and his administration—he is only going to be there for the next 20 months. This will last for 6 years and go into the next Presidential administration.

The fact is, you can't negotiate something as complex as a trade deal like the Trans-Pacific Partnership with 535 negotiators; in other words, all the Members of the Senate and all the Members of the House. But what this does provide is that once a deal is reached, it has to be laid before the Congress and it has to be laid before the American people so they can read it and understand it.

After about 6 months, then there will be a debate in the Senate, and we will have an up-or-down vote. If we do not think it serves the interests of the United States, of our citizens and of our country, we can vote it down. But conversely, if we think this does improve trade and the economic prospects, jobs and wages for the American people, then we can vote to approve it. This bill will open American goods and services to global markets, which is good for our economy, good for jobs, and good for better wages, something that has been under a lot of negative pressure over the last few years.

To sum up this week, we passed legislation that will help thousands of victims of modern-day slavery—typically, a girl between the ages of 12 and 14—who are routinely sex trafficked in our own backyards. This will provide real resources. It will not only help rescue them but begin to help them heal and to begin the path to restoration.

I think this should be a proud accomplishment for the Senate. But the bottom line is, we still have a lot of work to do, and I look forward to more accomplishments with my colleagues and for the new spirit of bipartisanship to continue as we tackle real problems for the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I come to the floor to discuss the importance of trade and the Nebraskans who depend upon it. Since 1989, U.S. agricultural exports have nearly quadrupled in value. This is a direct result of our trade agreements, which have opened foreign markets to our goods. In 2014 alone, the value of U.S. agriculture exports was $152.5 billion, yielding a trade surplus of more than $43 billion. This surplus is the result of hard work by millions of American farmers and ranchers.

My home State of Nebraska is leading the way in progress as a top producer and exporter of agriculture and manufacturing products. In 2013, Nebraska exported $7.3 billion in products tied to agriculture and the processing industries. By trading internationally, we are creating jobs and long-term income here at home. From farms and ranches to food processing, transportation, and manufacturing industries, countless parts of our economy rely on flow of goods across our Nation and around the world.

Nebraska's Governor, director of agriculture, and 22 Nebraska agriculture stakeholders echoed the necessity of these trade agreements, urging congressional leaders to quickly pass important legislation for these agreements to materialize. This point was reinforced in a recent Omaha World-Herald Editorial, which noted that Nebraska producers operate on a global scale and therefore understand the economic benefit of robust free-trade agreements.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates that every $1 billion of U.S. agricultural exports generates $1.3 billion in economic activity and supports the full-time work of approximately 6,600 Americans throughout the economy. Simply put, international trade is an essential component of opening foreign markets to U.S. agriculture and food products. The best avenues we have to open new markets, increase that productivity, and create jobs are through strong, fair, and inclusive free-trade agreements.

With more than 95 percent of the world's population located outside the United States, economic growth and job creation depend on trade opportunities that allow our U.S. companies and our producers to tap into new markets to sell more American products.

As we debate, the world's population continues to grow. In more and more countries, we see a growing middle class with a mounting appetite. What do they want to eat? They want high-quality meat, produce, and food products from the United States of America. What a tremendous opportunity for American producers to capture new markets and reach more consumers worldwide, but these new markets cannot be developed unless the United States is at the table and at the table negotiating for comprehensive free-trade agreements that ensure producers and exporters receive that fair deal.

In order to accomplish this goal, the Senate must first pass trade promotion authority or the TPA. TPA effectively combines Congress's authority to regulate foreign commerce alongside the President's authority to negotiate treaties. It reinforces the role of Congress to set negotiation priorities, and it requires the President to consult extensively with legislators throughout

this entire negotiation process. Under TPA, Congress retains its authority to review and determine whether the proposed trade agreement will be implemented through an up-or-down vote.

TPA has been granted to every President since Gerald Ford. This longstanding and proven partnership between the legislative and executive branches is essential to finalizing those free-trade agreements that create countless opportunities for American enterprise. TPA will allow us to actually complete the trade negotiations that are currently underway. America is on the brink of some very ambitious and progrowth deals. It will also provide our negotiators with the credibility they need in order to conclude those trade agreements. Our trading partners must be certain the United States is serious about its trade priorities and that we are serious about our commitments. To get the best deal, there is no doubt our trade negotiators need this vital negotiating tool.

Furthermore, as this administration negotiates the two largest regional trade agreements in history, we must position ourselves to extract the best deals possible. The Trans-Pacific Partnership or the TPP includes countries such as Japan, Vietnam, and Malaysia, which have great, tremendous opportunities for our exports. This agreement will give us greater access to the fastest growing economic region in the world. The Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership is between the European Union and the United States, which together account for nearly half of global GDP.

I support the negotiations for each of these regional trade agreements. Both agreements hold enormous potential for continued progress in agricultural exports, and they will create jobs here at home. The United States has negotiated free-trade agreements with 20 countries over the past three decades. These trading partners only represent 10 percent of the global economy, but they consume nearly half of the U.S. exports. Economic growth and American job creation would only expand under TPP, where negotiating countries represent the fastest growing economies in the world.

That said, it is critical trade agreements eliminate barriers and level the playing field for American businesses. Fair, two-way market access that eliminates tariffs is essential to any comprehensive trade agreement.

We are in the 21st century, and our trade agreements should reflect 21st century principles. TPA is critical to providing our trade representatives with the necessary tools to finalize these pending negotiations, while also ensuring that the unsung heroes of the American dinner table—our farmers, our ranchers, our food processors—receive the greatest benefit.

Nebraska's farmers and ranchers are global leaders and the very best at producing safe, high-quality food to feed the world. It is imperative that foreign markets are open, balanced, and that they provide a level playing field for all of our U.S. products. One of best ways we can do this is by expanding free trade and authorizing TPA.

I encourage my colleagues to support this very important legislation.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). Under the previous order, the motion to proceed to H.R. 1191 is agreed to.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1191) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 1140

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1140, which is the text of the substitute amendment to S. 615, which was reported out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. CORKER], for himself and Mr. CARDIN, proposes an amendment numbered 1140.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I am thrilled to be here on the floor with my partner, Senator BEN CARDIN, who is the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee. We had an outstanding week last week in our Foreign Relations Committee in passing out this bill that is now before us on a 19-to-0 vote. I thank all of the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which obviously includes Senator CARDIN, Senator RISCH, Senator MENENDEZ, Senator RUBIO, Senator KAINE, Senator JOHNSON, Senator COONS, Senator FLAKE, Senator UDALL, Senator GARDNER, Senator BOXER, Senator PERDUE, Senator SHAHEEN, Senator ISAKSON, Senator MURPHY, Senator PAUL, Senator BARRASSO, and Senator MARKEY.

Also, before we get into discussing the text, I wish to thank Senator BOB MENENDEZ and Senator MARK KIRK, who have been all things Iran. From the very beginning, these two Senators have led this body to put in place sanctions—crushing sanctions—that have led us to this place. I cannot thank them enough for their leadership in dealing with the issue of Iran.

Last year, we did a significant amount of work on creating some kind of review process relative to a final agreement that might be worked out with Iran. I thank Senator LINDSEY, GRAHAM who has been a stalwart in ensuring that Congress play a role in the ultimate final deal that may or may not occur. Senator GRAHAM has been steadfast in wanting congressional review. Senator JOHN MCCAIN has joined in that effort and has been outstanding to work with, as well as Senator JIM RISCH and Senator MARCO RUBIO, who have also pushed for this type of legislation.

When we began this process, there were some original—or when we moved to the process we are now in, there were some original supporters of this current bipartisan bill who really caused us to have the leverage, if you will, to move to the place where we are today. Again, Senator MENENDEZ certainly was one of those who led us in that effort; Senator GRAHAM; Senator TIM KAINE, who came here as a former Governor of Virginia and who has been so focused on Congress playing its appropriate role. Obviously, Senator MCCAIN, as he has been a leader from the beginning, Senator JOE DONNELLY, Senator MARCO RUBIO, Senator HEIDI HEITKAMP, Senator KELLY AYOTTE, Senator BILL NELSON, Senator JIM RISCH, and Senator ANGUS KING have played a role in creating the leverage, if you will, to get us where we are today.

As Senator CARDIN knows, we now have 62 cosponsors of this legislation that is now before us, obviously from both parties. So I think this is quite an accomplishment.

Obviously, we have a tremendous amount of work in front of us with this bill now on the floor. I know Senator CARDIN and I hope that people will come to the floor and begin offering their amendments, begin debating, begin discussing. Obviously, we won't be taking up any amendments, per the order that is before us, until Tuesday, but we hope people will begin bringing their ideas and amendments to the floor and certainly begin discussing the important issue of Iran.

Let me speak a little bit about what this bill does. First of all, I think everyone knows the administration is part of the P5+1. It is today negotiating an agreement to try to keep Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. I think all of us know there was a political agreement that was achieved the first part of April that was more of a verbal agreement about how the P5+1 and Iran might interact in a manner that hopefully would keep Iran from getting a nuclear weapon.

One of the things that I think everyone in this body knows and many people on the outside may not is that Congress has played a substantial and

maybe the biggest role in getting Iran to the table in the first place. There were three sets of sanctions, three types of sanctions that have been instrumental in making this happen. They include the U.N. Security Council sanctions that have been put in place. The executive branch has put some sanctions in place as well. But Congress especially has four tranches of sanctions which have been put in place since 2010 which really have had a crushing effect on Iran's economy. They haves created all kinds of inflation, and they have caused them not to be able to export the amount of oil—the 40 percent of the oil that they produce. That has hurt them in manufacturing.

I see Senator MENENDEZ has just come to the floor. He may not have heard me, but I cannot thank him and Senator KIRK enough for their leadership on each set of those tranches—putting them in place, taking the leadership, and bringing Iran to the table.

I think the second thing people may understand is that on the U.N. Security Council sanctions, the White House has the ability, with the other members of the permanent Security Council, to lift those at any time they wish. They can obviously lift the executive sanctions. One of the things that all of us have been concerned about, though, is that Congress put in place the sanctions that really brought them to the table. We want to ensure that Congress has the ability, before those sanctions are lifted, to be able to voice an opinion through a vote.

What this legislation does—and we will be talking about it a great deal over the next week—is four things:

First of all, it forces the administration, in the event a final deal is agreed to, to bring all of those details to Congress, including the classified annexes we would likely not see until 6 months or so after an agreement is reached, without this legislation, if we can pass it.

Secondly, it keeps the executive branch from being able to lift the congressionally mandated sanctions that we put in place, while we have a reasonable period of time to go through the documents that have been provided to us.

Thirdly, it allows Congress to take a vote. The vote can take all kinds of forms. It can be a vote of approval. It also allows the leader to decide not to take a vote at all or we could take a vote of disapproval. If we decided that this was not something that was good for our country, not good for the Middle East, then we could cause this vote of disapproval to take place, and if it passed, it would keep the executive branch from being able to lift the congressionally mandated sanctions we have put in place.

The fourth and very important component is that it causes us to know whether Iran is in compliance. This bill stipulates, if passed, that the President would have to certify to us every 90 days as to whether Iran is in compliance. If there are significant violations, on a 10-day basis, let us know that is taking place so we can respond accordingly.

Let me close by saying this: I believe everybody in this body hopes we are able to achieve a negotiated agreement that will keep Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. I think everyone understands that is the best thing for our country. I think everybody also understands that Iran is a country in which we have little trust. Iran is a country that is the major exporter of terrorism in the region. Iran is a country that has a terrible human rights record. Iran is a country that is really moving ahead relative to its ballistic missile design. And, obviously, Iran is a country that has been doing some things in its nuclear program that give us reason to believe they are moving toward a nuclear weapon.

One of the worst things we could possibly do is enter into an agreement with Iran that doesn't keep them from getting a nuclear weapon—in other words, one that is faulty, that has flaws, and that allows them to get a nuclear weapon. What that would mean is we would have a situation where the No. 1 exporter of terrorism in the region had access to not just a nuclear weapon but very quickly had access to the $130 billion-plus that they have trapped overseas to conduct even more terrorism in the region, which could allow their economy to all of a sudden be growing at more rapid rates and, again, to have resources available to conduct even more terrorism in the region. As we can imagine, having an actor such as Iran has acted—and we hope at some point that behavior will change—having access to a nuclear weapon certainly would create the possibility of nuclear proliferation in the region.

So I think this is a very important piece of legislation. I thank Senator CARDIN for the way he has come into this and worked with us in a manner to reach an accommodation so that we have sufficient, ample, actually extraordinary support on both sides of the aisle to ensure that Congress has its rightful role in this agreement. It is one of the biggest geopolitical agreements we will deal with probably during the time we are here in the Senate.

With that, I yield the floor to my good friend Senator CARDIN. Again, he has done exemplary work in bringing us to this point. I thank him for all of his efforts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I wish to thank and congratulate Senator CORKER for his extraordinary work in reaching this moment where we have brought to the floor of the Senate a bill that deals with congressional oversight of the nuclear discussions and agreements taking place between the P5+1, our negotiating partners in Iran.

It was just 3 weeks ago that the framework was announced by the White House and that Senator CORKER and I started our discussions to see whether we could find a common path forward on a bill which, to say the least, was very controversial; a bill which the President of the United States had threatened to veto; a bill in which there were Democrats and Republicans lined up on different sides of this issue, and it appeared just about impossible that we would be able to reach a bipartisan agreement on a path forward for the legislation.

Senator CORKER exercised the greatest leadership and diplomacy. He mentioned all the members of our committee. Each of those members has pretty strong views on this issue. This was not a simple matter of people saying: Gee, I will just yield to the thoughts of others. The only way we could reach this moment was to ask and solicit and listen to each member of the committee, and that is what Senator CORKER did. He encouraged me to do the same in regard to not just the Democratic members, because Senator CORKER talked to some of the Democratic members and I talked to some of the Republican members. We had to have that type of confidence.

I again congratulate Senator CORKER on his leadership. It has been a real pleasure to work with him. I am proud that we bring this bill forward with a 19-to-0 vote from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

We have a long history in this country of putting aside partisan differences on foreign policy issues. I know we often quote from one of our former colleagues, but I think it is worth putting into the RECORD the comments of Senator Arthur Vandenberg, Jr.

He was a Republican Member of this body who said 63 years ago:

> To me ''bipartisan foreign policy'' means a mutual effort under our indispensable two-Party system, to unite our official voice at the water's edge so that America speaks with maximum authority against those who would divide and conquer us and the free world. It does not involve the remotest surrender of free debate in determining our position. On the contrary, frank cooperation and free debate are indispensable to ultimate unity. In a word, it simply seeks national security ahead of partisan advantage.

Mr. President, that is exactly what the Foreign Relations Committee did. We had a very robust debate, there were many different views, but at the end of the day we spoke with unity. In speaking with unity, our country today is stronger, and that is exactly where we needed to be.

What we are trying to do, and I think as a result of the actions of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—and I hope it will be approved by this body and by the House and sent to the President for signature—we are in a stronger position to accomplish our goal. Our goal is pretty simple, to prevent Iran from ever acquiring a nuclear weapon because we know that is a game changer in the region—a game changer in regard to not just one country in that region but to just about every country in

that region. Their security is threatened and the U.S. security is threatened.

So what we did in the bill that we bring forward to you is a compromise—a compromise. Each of us gave and listened and we found common ground. We could use more compromise on the issues that confront this country in the work we do. I would hope my colleagues would look at how we worked out these issues and use it as a model for other opportunities to move forward on issues that are important.

Senator CORKER pointed out why we are here—why we had a bill for congressional review. It started in the 1990s, when Congress passed sanctions against Iran because we saw, at the time, that Iran was developing the nuclear capacity to develop a nuclear weapon, and we said that could not happen. We imposed sanctions against Iran. Congress did this on several occasions in an effort to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear weapons state, telling them there would be an economic price to pay until they changed course.

Administrations—including President Obama's administration—worked with the international community and we were able to get U.N. sanctions. Congress's action was responsible for leading Iran to being willing to negotiate, and that is where we are today. Only Congress—only Congress—can permanently remove those sanctions or permanently change those sanctions.

So Congress must be involved in the sanctions and in the discussions. That is exactly what this legislation does. It provides an orderly process for us to review any agreement reached by the President and our negotiating partners with Iran. No congressional action will take place until and unless the President submits an agreement that he has made with our negotiating partners and Iran.

The April 2 framework that was recently announced is not an agreement and is not subject to review. There would be a 30-day review period, during which Congress would have the opportunity to review the agreement. No sanctions or additional sanction relief could be imposed during that 30-day period. If you read the April 2 framework, the President has made it clear that Iran will only get sanction relief if they earn sanction relief, if there is concrete progress made in dismantling their nuclear program. It is hard to believe that could take place within 30 days. So this 30-day period is a very reasonable period for Congress to be able to review any agreement.

As Senator CORKER pointed out, all information—all information—would be presented to us, and we would have an opportunity for full hearings and debate as to what we should do. It would follow the regular congressional order as far as committee hearings and potential action on the floor of the Senate and the House. Senator CORKER pointed out the options we would have. We could approve the agreement, we could disapprove the agreement, we could pass legislation affecting the sanctions, we could take whatever action we think is appropriate, but no action is required.

The agreement can commence without congressional action. If we do take congressional action, the President has the prerogative of a veto, and if the President vetoes, we have the prerogative of an override of the veto. That is how the checks and balances system of our country should operate.

There is a second major component to this legislation and that is for the oversight of an agreement after it is reached; that is, there would be a quarterly certification by the President of the United States to Congress that Iran is in compliance with the agreement. If there is a material breach, it would trigger an expedited process so Congress could act, that we could not only snap back sanctions that may have been relieved, but if appropriate, we could impose additional sanctions if Iran had a material breach of the agreement. That is very important because I think we all agree, if we are going to have an effective agreement, that agreement must give us time before Iran can become a nuclear weapons country; that we can, through full inspections, determine if they have breached the agreement because, quite frankly, no agreement is going to be based on trust because we don't trust Iran. It is going to be based upon inspections and being able to confirm their compliance with the agreement. If they don't comply with the agreement, we need to make sure we have adequate time and take adequate steps to prevent them from becoming a nuclear weapons state. This review process and an expedited process in Congress puts Congress in the position of working with the administration to make sure we take those effective steps.

As Senator CORKER pointed out, there are other issues with Iran in addition to the nuclear proliferation issues. We have serious concerns about Iran. It sponsors terrorism. Its human rights violations against its own citizens is horrible. Its ballistic missile program is of great concern. The threats against Israel and other countries in that region are all of direct interest to the United States. So, in this legislation, we provide for regular reports twice a year to the Congress of the United States about the activities that Iran is participating in, in regard to terrorism and human rights.

I call our colleagues' attention to the detailed requirements, on pages 37 and 38 of the bill, concerning issues about whether Iran's financial institutions are engaged in money laundering, whether Iran is advancing its ballistic missile program, an assessment of whether Iran has directly supported, financed, planned or carried out any terrorism against the United States, ''whether, and to the extent to which, Iran supported acts of terrorism . . . all actions, including international fora, being taken by the United States to stop, counter, and condemn acts by Iran'' involving terrorism; ''the impact on the national security of the United States and the safety of United States citizens as a result of any Iranian actions reported under this paragraph. . . . '' It is all required that that information be given to us because we may want to use that for other strategies against Iran.

An amendment that was added requires ''an assessment of whether violations of internationally recognized human rights in Iran have changed, increased, or decreased, as compared to the prior 180-day [period].''

We are going to monitor their human rights record, and we will have that information. So, yes, we are concerned about issues beyond nuclear proliferation, but this agreement that is now being negotiated by the President deals with preventing Iran from becoming a nuclear weapons state.

It is clear. I want to underscore this because Senator CORKER was very strong to make sure it got into the bill. It says that ''United States sanctions on Iran for terrorism, human rights abuses, and ballistic missiles will remain in place under an agreement. . . .'' We are not talking about actions we have taken against Iran for terrorism or human rights violations. That is a separate issue—a major concern to us. What we are talking about is how do we implement oversight and review an agreement concerning nuclear weapons programs.

And lastly, we make it very clear in this agreement that ''the President should determine the agreement in no way compromises the commitment of the United States to Israel's security, nor its support for Israel's right to exist.'' Israel is a key ally of the United States and our friendship is deep. Our commitment is solid. We make that very clear in the bill that is before you.

Let me conclude with two additional points—one dealing with the amendment process. As Senator CORKER pointed out, we asked Members who believe they can approve this bill to come forward. Let's see the amendments and try to work with you on the amendments. Let's maintain the bipartisan cooperation we have. Let's maintain a strong bill that accomplishes its purpose. Come down and let us take a look at it. Remember, we have a lot of strong views in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and we came together. Let's keep that same spirit, and I would just urge those who may have amendments to come on down and let us see them. We have today and up to before next Tuesday. Share them with us so we have an opportunity to keep the unity we have.

Then, lastly, I just want to join where Senator CORKER began, and that is to thank the incredible effort that took place on behalf of this bill. Senator CORKER already mentioned all my colleagues who were involved here.

Senator MENENDEZ and Senator KAINE are both on the floor. On the Democratic side, they are the authors of this bill. They are the ones who drafted it. They are the ones who are responsible for why we are here today—from the Democrats. I thank both of them. From the beginning they said: We want a process to review. We are not talking about the merits. The merits are something we will pick up later. We want to preserve the normal prerogatives of the Senate, and we want to keep politics out of it. That was their intent from day one. Quite frankly, working with Senator CORKER, that is what I carried out in my negotiations with Senator CORKER; to maintain that balance that was the intent of the legislation. So I thank both of them and the other members of our committee who were involved.

Lastly, on a point of personal privilege right now, because I might forget to do this later, I want to thank Jodi Herman of our staff and Margaret Taylor, Algene Sajery, and Chris Lynch for the extraordinary amount of time they put in.

I want to thank President Obama. I want to thank President Obama for giving me his time so I understood what he was trying to achieve and how we could work together in order to achieve the objectives of the United States, and I thank Katie Fallon and Denis McDonough of his staff for the work they put in so we could reach this moment.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I want to rise in support of this bipartisan legislation, with a sincere hope that we can pass the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act as it was unanimously voted out of the committee.

I have worked tirelessly with the chairman and with the ranking member and with members of the committee—Senator KAINE, who had so much input in the conceptualization of what we wanted to do to bring this bill to the floor with the strongest bipartisan support.

In my view, the best way to send a clear message to Tehran about our expectations is for Congress to pass the Corker-Menendez Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act as it was voted out of committee. The spirit of bipartisanship that underscores Congress's critical role in the highest priority, national security, the nuclear nonproliferation challenge of our time, was unanimously passed out of the Foreign Relations Committee. I hope we can send this same message from the Senate floor.

Countering Iran's nuclear ambitions has been something I have worked on passionately for a long time. Senator CORKER and I fashioned language that became the framework of this final bill to ensure that Congress remains engaged in reviewing and, if there is an agreement, overseeing its implementation.

So I want to thank Chairman CORKER. He has just done an exceptional job. He had this concept before any of us were agreed to it, and he was willing to work with us—and was dogged, I must say—until we got to the point that we would come together and offer the legislation in a bipartisan way. That has been the hallmark of his chairmanship and it was the hallmark of his time as ranking member when I was chairman. I appreciate the fashion in which he has worked to continue to move the committee, as I started it, in a bipartisan way, because as the ranking member Senator CARDIN says, that is when we are most powerful in terms of foreign policy.

I thank Senator CARDIN for his work in helping to forge a deal that both sides of the aisle can come to this floor and support with a clear conscience, knowing that we have sent a clear message to Tehran and that we are united, as we have always been, on Iran policy, and on this issue we speak with one voice.

The simple fact is, if the P5+1 and Iran ultimately achieve a comprehensive agreement by the June deadline, at the end of the day, Congress must make a judgment on it and have oversight responsibility. This legislation provides it. It establishes a managed process for congressional review and a framework for congressional oversight.

Now, I differentiate between this agreement and others the administration has cited for exclusive Executive action because the sanctions relief that is at the heart of this deal was crafted by Congress and enacted by Congress into law. It is primarily statutory. As the author of those sanctions, working with others, I can tell you we never envisioned a wholesale waiver of sanctions without congressional input and without congressional action.

The limited sanctions relief provided in the law was intended to provide the President with discretion to waive specific sanctions in specific circumstances, such as if a country was making real progress in reducing their oil purchases from Iran. So my goal has always been one goal; that is, to make certain Iran does not have the infrastructure to develop a nuclear weapon.

I have worked on that goal since my earliest days in Congress. Now, as we approach the witching hour for an agreement, the best way to achieve our goal is with bipartisan support on this legislation that strengthens the U.S. hand in moving from a political framework to a comprehensive agreement and sets out clear and decisive expectations for Iranian compliance.

The message we send to Tehran is that sanctions relief is not a given, and sanctions relief certainly is not a prize for signing on the dotted line. This bill ensures that Iran must fully comply with all provisions of an agreement that effectively dismantle its nuclear weapons program and provide robust inspection and verification mechanisms to ensure its compliance with every word of that deal.

If Iran breaches an agreement, Congress will have the ability to restore sanctions on an expedited basis. Now, as I have said, I have been outspoken on this issue from the beginning, for years, for as long as I have been here. Frankly, I have many questions about the framework agreement. I have questions about the divergent understandings of the agreement.

I have questions about the pace of sanctions relief. I do not believe Iran should get a signing bonus. I am concerned by the President's most recent statement that greater sanctions relief could come upfront for Iran. I have questions about Iran's retention of research and development authorities and to what extent they can advance their research and development, because greater research and development means more sophisticated centrifuges that can spin faster and, therefore, dramatically reduce breakout time toward a nuclear bomb.

I am concerned about the ability to snap back sanctions if there are violations of the agreement. From what I can see, we have a committee process that will not guarantee that the snapback will take place or that it will take place expeditiously. I am concerned about the International Atomic Energy Administration's ability to obtain ''anytime-anywhere'' snap inspections. What happened to Iran having to come clean about the possible military and weapons dimensions of their program?

More than anything else, I am concerned about what will happen when the critical elements of the proposed agreement expire after 10 years. Are we relegated to accepting Iran as a nuclear weapons state? The presumption that Iran will become a compliant Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty state in that time for me is not borne out when you see their insistence and our acquiescence to keeping key nuclear infrastructure and key nuclear facilities under the agreement.

It is not borne out by history. Iran has been on a single path toward nuclear weapons for more than 20 years. By deceit and deception—sometimes without detection until there were well-established covert facilities—they have advanced their drive for nuclear power to the precipice of achieving a nuclear bomb. For me, these are all issues that speak more forcefully to the reasons for having congressional review and oversight of any potential agreement.

Now, I did not fashion, along with colleagues, a sanctions regime for the sake of sanctions. It was for the sake of getting Iran to deter its course. There is no one who would want to see the successful result of that design more than I. But by the same token, I do embrace what the administration has said time and time again that no deal is

better than a bad deal. I will independently judge what that deal is when and if there is a final deal.

At a minimum, this legislation gives us the oversight role to monitor and address our concerns. So I urge my colleagues, when the bill comes for a vote, to vote for it as it was voted out of committee, because it does what all of us want to do: provides a clear opportunity for a review of any agreement, so we can express, if desired, our support or opposition to any agreement and have a clear oversight role with established parameters for compliance.

Let's vote on what the agreement does, not what it might have done or could have done if we had different amendments to it. I respect everybody's views and everybody's rights to have amendments. I hope those who have ideas will work with the chairman and the ranking member. But I will oppose amendments, at least with my own vote, that I consider to be poisonous and that undermine the very essence of what we have accomplished in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Sometimes you have to know when you hit a home run and be able to cross the plate and say, We hit a home run—and not think that you are still stuck in the dugout. What we did in the committee is pretty close to a home run as far as I can see it. So let's vote on the merits of the bill that give us the oversight and the ability to pass the judgment that we need to send a clear message that we are united in our determination to prevent Iran from ever becoming a nuclear weapons state, potentially igniting a nuclear arms race in the most dangerous tinderbox of the world.

So I urge my colleagues to suppress any intentions that will drive us to a point that we can't have that strong vote, that we can't send that strong message to Iran. There is no stronger message to Iran, particularly in this critical time, in which I think we strengthen the administration and the P5+1's hand by saying there is a congressional review and potential judgment.

So that final agreement we get, hopefully, can be one we can all embrace. We can do that—we can actually have an effect by passing this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I just want to again thank Senator MENENDEZ for his tremendous leadership on this issue. He brought up a point I wish I had made in my opening comments. I have made it every time I have presented this bill elseways. But a lot of people do not realize that at present, because of the waivers that are part of the sanctions that we put in place—some of them through independent pieces of legislation, some of them through NDAAs—in each case the President was given a national security waiver.

Again, as the Senator mentioned, it was never thought that waiver would be utilized to waive things ad infinitum. At present—a lot of people do not realize this—but the President today has the power, without this legislation, to go straight to the U.N. Security Council, without coming to Congress, and implement whatever deal he wants to implement with Iran. He has that ability.

So when you think about what is happening here, and this is what is so powerful about this bipartisan effort, is that we together—we together—have said: Wait a minute. If we pass this legislation, we want to retake the ability ourselves to lift those sanctions or to have them lifted; we do not want the President going straight to the U.N. Security Council.

I know Senator KAINE is on the floor. I cannot thank him enough for getting involved at the time he did. I remember distinctly in the committee meeting, where we had testimony from our Secretary of State, him articulating, better than anyone yet, the fact that at some point down the road we are going to have to permanently lift the sanctions, which, by the way, could be 5, 6, 7 years down the road, long after the sanctions regime has totally imploded. We are going to have to do it permanently down the road.

Would it not make sense for us to go ahead and review this on the front end and have the opportunity, if we think it is not something worthy of this, to disapprove or to approve if we decide to do that.

So I know Senator KAINE wants to speak. I cannot thank him enough for his knowledge of congressional responsibilities as it relates to these kinds of issues and his input, which was invaluable at the time it occurred. He really created the momentum for us to move ahead.

I will yield the floor, thanking him very much for his efforts in this regard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise to speak in favor of the Corker-Menendez bill. I thank Chairman CORKER for his kind words and for the opportunity to work together on something, in what I believe to be the best traditions of our committee and the Senate. I thank my ranking member, Senator CARDIN, for being a great facilitator at the end to help us get over a number of challenging issues, to a point of unanimity on the committee, and to Senator MENENDEZ, whose long-term interest on this issue has been so consistent and so helpful and whose work on this particular piece of legislation was critical.

I believe Senator CORKER began, and I want to begin as well, with a condolence to the family of Dr. Weinstein, a Marylander who—the announcement today about his death in Afghanistan in a drone strike sort of reminds us of the stakes that are involved in these kinds of issues. When we are talking about American military action or about diplomacy around a nuclear weapons program, it is not a bill we are talking about, it is not a concept we are talking about, we are talking about human lives; that even in the best of circumstances there will be days like today when there will be sad news and Americans who are in harm's way because of the dangerous nature of the world—and I feel like the announcement today about Dr. Weinstein—our condolences to his family should remind us of the seriousness of our obligation.

Senator CARDIN started with that great wisdom of Senator Vandenberg that ''politics stops at the water's edge.'' Now, we probably all know that was never 100 percent true. I know a little bit about some of the challenges Jefferson and other Virginians had early. There is always politics, but there is a core wisdom to that principle, a very important wisdom.

Of course, we are going to battle because we see things differently, and people seeing things differently can sometimes get to a greater understanding. That is what we hope to do. But the reason politics should stop at the water's edge is because we want to send a unified message to our allies as they depend on us. We need to send a unified message to our adversaries about our intentions.

But I would say in a personal way, because of maybe representing the Commonwealth of Virginia, we have to send a unified message to the men and women in our armed services who serve, who are serving in battlefields, who are serving in theaters of military operations around the world. When we are contemplating decisions about something so big that could potentially lead to war—we just deployed Virginia-based ships like the *Theodore Roosevelt* to Yemen to potentially check Iranian ambitions vis-a-vis the Houthi rebels in Yemen. Those are Virginians, many from other States, who are deployed on those ships.

We owe it to those who are serving and risking their lives to try to be as nonpartisan as we can, so they know they are not serving just because one party thinks they should or the other party thinks they should, but the missions they are undertaking are missions of national consensus. I feel that very strongly. That is why I am so gratified this bill now reaches the floor on a fundamental matter in a bipartisan way.

With respect to our negotiations with Iran, there was a view out there on the table that if Congress wanted to be involved, it must be because we are against diplomacy. In the committee I said that notion was offensive to me. There were those even who suggested that those who wanted a congressional oversight role were prowar, which was highly offensive and insulting.

I am prodiplomacy. I supported the President's commencement of these negotiations in November of 2013. I think America has a wonderful diplomatic

tradition where we have been able to achieve a lot when diplomacy is done right.

I actually think the negotiation period from November 2013 to today has produced tangible benefits for the United States, our allies, and the world because Iran has rolled back its stockpile of 20-percent enriched uranium. They have allowed inspections they didn't allow before. And even nations and leaders who were skeptical about whether the negotiation would work have admitted to me: Maybe I shouldn't have been skeptical. The negotiation period has produced some benefits.

In the framework announced on April 2, I see some items I like and I see some other things I have some deep questions about. But a commitment by Iran, for example, to roll back uranium stockpiles from 10,000 kilograms to 300 kilograms—just a fraction of what would be necessary to produce even one weapon—would be very positive.

But I say all that just to say that as a prodiplomacy Senator, as someone who would love to find a negotiation that would work to a positive end, I believe strongly that a congressional review role of a matter such as this is necessary, it is helpful, and it is something, frankly, that the American public deserves. It is necessary for the reasons that have been described.

Now, a President, under article II powers, has significant ability to conduct foreign policy and even strike agreements without congressional approval. There are many things a President can do in the foreign policy sphere without congressional approval.

But this is fundamentally a negotiation about what Iran must do to get out from under sanctions that Congress has constructed, that Congress has imposed, and that Congress has perfected and approved over the years. If that is the negotiation, there is no way to have an ultimate deal about the unwinding and eventual repeal of a congressional sanctions statute without congressional review. So Congress is necessary to this deal.

Second, congressional review is helpful. It is helpful for the negotiators, as they are in this final chapter, to know that they must negotiate to their very best because they will have to sell this deal to Congress as the elected representatives of the American people. That is a helpful discipline for our negotiators. It is helpful for the Iranians who want to get out from under congressional sanctions to have some sense of how Congress might ultimately look at this deal.

Put yourself in the Iranian shoes. We want them to make huge concessions, not modest ones. But what is their incentive to make big concessions to get out from under congressional sanctions if they have no idea what Congress will likely do? We have put a process in place that will give them some sense of what Congress would do in an orderly way, and that will be an incentive, I believe, for larger concessions.

Not only is this review bill necessary, not only is it helpful, but it is what the American public expects and deserves. I think we have all been looking at the way the American public has been reacting to this negotiation.

The American public is like all of us. They are deeply worried about an Iranian nuclear weapons program. They are like all of us. They would love it if we could find a diplomatic end to the Iranian nuclear weapons program. They are like all of us. They are skeptical about whether Iran will follow an agreement, and they overwhelmingly believe that if there is an agreement, it should be an agreement that Congress approves.

Why do they think Congress should approve it? Is it because we have fantastic approval ratings? Absolutely not. We don't have great approval ratings. But, the American public says: In our anxiety about whether we can trust Iran on a deal, we will feel better if both the executive and the legislative have looked at this deal and concluded—like you would try to get a second opinion from a doctor on something that was very important—that it is a good deal for our country and our national security. They are going to feel more comfortable, given the natural anxiety they have about Iranian compliance.

That is why this bill is so important.

Finally, I want to talk about how the bill got here because I do think there is a lesson for the floor activity on the bill but also for the body, more generally.

This bill was filed in original version in 2014, and I did not sign onto it.

Our chairman, Senator CORKER, and I were in the Middle East in January with five other Senators, in Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and Israel.

As we returned after a set of discussions with governmental leaders, military leaders, civil society, and political leaders about many topics, including the Iranian negotiation, Senator CORKER, a friend, sort of challenged me a little bit: Hey, you are the guy who likes to say that Congress needs to play a role. I have been pushing hard for Congress to play a role in an authorization of military force against ISIL. If that is what you think, why aren't you on this bill about congressional approval of a deal with Iran?

I said: You are absolutely right congressional approval, but there are some aspects of the bill I don't like.

The chairman said to me: Then, fine, you rewrite it or propose amendments, and let's see if we can work together.

So I did and others did, and we put our best good-faith proposals down on the table. We found a listening ear, a staff, and a set of Senators on both sides of the aisle who were willing to try to exercise that congressional approval role—but do it in the right way, not the wrong way.

When we filed this bill on September 27, there were two Democratic original sponsors and two Republican original sponsors. Then there were five additional Democratic cosponsors and five additional Republican cosponsors.

So from the very day this bill hit the floor, we were trying to build it in a bipartisan way to show that the Vandenberg maxim, although it is not as true even when it was stated and it certainly is not as true today as we would like it, still had some power. And we wanted to show the body that we could do it in a bipartisan way so that our allies, our adversaries, and our troops would see that we could act in a bipartisan way on something so important.

There were steps between the filing of the bill and the Foreign Relations Committee action that threatened to push the bill off of the bipartisan rails into partisanship in ways that might have served the short-term purpose but that would have probably killed the bill. The chairman and others made sure that did not happen.

So when we got to the vote in the Foreign Relations Committee—and it went from 2 plus 2, to 7 plus 7, and eventually, 19 to zero—we carefully worked at every step along the way to make this bipartisan and, hopefully, to send an example on the floor that this is what it should be. Robust debate and amendment, of course, is what this body is about. But we want to make sure that review of this most important matter is done in a way that is careful, prompt, and deliberate, according to rules that all can respect and all can understand.

I conclude with thanks to my colleagues on the committee, to the leadership of the chair—both as the original drafter of the bill, then as the drafter willing to entertain other ideas, and then as the chair of this committee, trying to bring this to a productive place.

I thank Senator CARDIN for his great role in helping us bridge differences and, especially, for his communication with the White House. The White House threatened to veto this bill, but Senator CARDIN, probably better than most, was able to listen to the concerns and then try to respond to the concerns in a way that we could make the bill productive.

This matter is so important that we just cannot tackle it in any way other than trying to follow—the best we humanly can—that Vandenberg maxim. I hope, as we get into deliberations on the floor next week, that this would be the spirit of all the colleagues who tackled this most important matter.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I thank Senator KAINE. I appreciate his outline of how this legislation went from unlikely to have much impact, because we didn't have the consensus and the numbers necessary to get it through the finish line. It would have had a very, very difficult time getting through the committee—let alone the floor of the Senate, the House, and

signed by the President—but for how people listen to each other.

So I am pleased the two of you went on the trip together because I think we need to do more of that in the Senate.

Senator KAINE and Senator CORKER are both individuals who have a deep respect for the proper role of the Senate, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the Senators.

I am proud to serve with both of you. I am pleased to see that we have found ways that we really can bridge differences in order to achieve a common purpose. We were not interested in scoring political points. We are interested in doing what our responsibility is all about.

So Senator CORKER is now probing a way in which we can reauthorize the State Department, the role that our committee should have, and, therefore, to directly deal with our responsibilities in the Senate through the appropriate committee. I think all of these are efforts with which, working together, we can have the Senate perform the proper role in this government of ours to make sure that the legislative branch weighs in where it is appropriate on foreign policy issues.

I thank Senator KAINE and Senator CORKER for giving us a good model as to how legislation should be developed. I was proud to work with Senator CORKER so that we could get the White House and get some of our Members who didn't quite share the enthusiasm of this legislation to a place where they are comfortable in supporting the bill—not only supporting the bill but enthusiastically supporting the bill in order to get it done.

I also appreciate your mentioning Warren Weinstein. Warren Weinstein was a resident of Maryland. His wife, Elaine, I talked to on frequent occasions. She is a very brave woman and did everything she could to bring her husband home. Warren Weinstein was a USAID worker in Pakistan. He did that because he wanted to do good for the world.

He was very well respected, carrying out his mission in a most professional way. He was on his way home, basically, when he was kidnapped in 2011 by Al Qaeda. As we know, the President announced today that he was killed in January, along with an Italian national who was also serving. Our thoughts and prayers first go out to the families. Our hearts are broken.

Senator MIKULSKI, Congressman DELANEY, and I have frequently met with the family over the years to try to put a spotlight at the appropriate time in dealing with the hostage situation. It is very difficult to deal with a hostage situation when it is not a government that is holding the person, and it makes it much more complicated.

But I do think that in addition to doing everything we can to keep our Americans safe who go to these countries on our behalf, using diplomacy, basically, and developing assistance for a more stable country, we have to do everything we can to keep them safe. We have to recognize the risk factors in circumstances such as this. We have to have strategies to do everything we possibly can to bring these people back home safely.

I know you all share that. But then we have to make the world a little bit safer, and that is what this review statute is all about. I do believe it does give us a better opportunity to get the right agreement from Iran that would prevent it from becoming a nuclear weapons power, which is a game changer for the security in that region.

I wish to mention just one other example. There was an enormous human tragedy when another boat carrying desperate refugees and migrants capsized in the Mediterranean Sea. In the most recent instance over 850 men, women, and children have died. Now these are very desperate situations when you take these dangerous voyages.

The number of people who have died in the Mediterranean—in 2014 we know that well over 218,000 refugees and migrants crossed the Mediterranean Sea, many fleeing violence, conflicts, and persecution in Syria, Iraq, and Eritrea. We also know that Yemen is involved here. Last year's death total surpassed 1,750 victims.

I mention that because what Iran is doing in this region is adding to the migration and refugee issues. Its support of terrorism, its involvement in Yemen, its involvement in Syria, and its involvement in other countries are causing people to take desperate action in order to stay safe. So we are here today to do something about that.

It is just another motivation for us to do everything we can to provide the types of policies that are necessary in that region of the world to make people safer and to have sustainable countries that can protect all of their citizens.

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. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, today we will begin the most important debate this Congress will have this year, probably this Congress, perhaps in the entire tenure any Member of this Senate has. This debate is not just about this piece of legislation but about a nuclear Iran and the consequences a nuclear Iran would create for the world.

Iran is today the greatest threat to the world. Iran already is the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, according to the Obama administration's own State Department. We see their regional aggression on display in Syria, in Lebanon, in Iraq, and now in Yemen. They have a very bad habit of killing Jews around the world, from Israel, to Bulgaria, to Argentina. They hold four U.S. citizens hostage today without just cause or due process. They do all those things without a nuclear weapon and with tens of billions of dollars frozen overseas.

What could we expect if Iran is able to develop nuclear weapons capabilities?

First, we will see more regional aggression as they use their nuclear umbrella to continue their drive for regional dominance throughout the Middle East. They would use the tens of billions of dollars sanctions relief would give them not to build hospitals or schools or roads or to improve the lives of their people but, rather, to prop up their proxies, such as the Hezbollah or the Houthis or the Shiite militia currently at risk of tearing Iraq apart.

Second, they are likely to use those nuclear weapons. Ayatollah Khamenei, the original Supreme Leader, upon taking power said the Islamic revolution did not care about Iran or the Persian nation or its history, they cared about spreading worldwide Islamic revolution. This is not a normal state, and these are not normal leaders.

Third, we will see a nuclear arms race throughout the Middle East. As many Senators in this institution have heard from senior government officials of Sunni states throughout the gulf, they cannot tolerate a Persian Shiite nuclear power. Whether they develop with their indigenous capabilities, in some instances, or whether they purchase it from overseas, we will see the world's most dangerous and volatile region strung with nuclear tripwires.

Fourth, these countries may provide nuclear weapons to terrorists to be used against American troops in the region, against our allies, such as Israel, or other countries or in one of the harbors on America's coasts, if not in America's heartland.

Fifth, terrorists or insurgents could get their hands on nuclear materials if they were able to destabilize or topple the wrong regime, as has tended to happen in the Middle East in the last 4 years and in recent decades.

The President started these negotiations on the grounds that we would stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. Yet he has consistently backpedaled, conceded, and reversed himself. Rather than now trying to dismantle and disarm Iran's nuclear arms program, we are content to trying to manage it, to limit its breakout time to 1 mere year, if that.

The United Nation's Security Council has passed multiple resolutions saying that Iran has no right to enrich uranium. Yet now we are going to concede Iran the right to keep thousands of centrifuges, to continue advanced research into centrifuges, and to keep its stockpile of uranium.

The President said barely more than a year ago, after the negotiations started, that Iran had no reason to

have a hardened underground military bunker in which they kept centrifuge cascades in Fordow. Yet, according to our own proposed fact sheet—much of which Iran disputes—we are going to concede the Fordow issue.

The President said at the very same time after negotiations had begun that Iran had no reason to keep its uranium stockpiles, and Iran had, in fact, reportedly agreed to tentatively export those to a third party. At the last minute, in Switzerland earlier this month, they reversed themselves, saying they were going to insist on keeping their stockpile, and we conceded on that front as well.

We have insisted throughout the period of these negotiations that we would not grant Iran immediate sanctions relief. The President's own term sheet said we wouldn't grant such relief. Iran's term sheet says differently. Just Friday, when confronted with this discrepancy, the President said we may have to find creative ways around this disagreement—creative ways to give Iran, the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, on its way to becoming a nuclear threshold power, tens of billions of dollars and reportedly even a $50 billion signing bonus, as if Iran were not a theocratic dictatorial regime but a blue chip prospect in the NFL draft.

These negotiations have also excluded most of Iran's outlaw behavior—currently developing intercontinental ballistic missiles for which there is no reason other than striking the United States; holding those four hostages without due process or fair trials—and stopping its regional aggression and stopping its support for terrorism.

This legislation has some good elements in it. It would suspend the President's ability to waive any sanctions for approximately 7 weeks while we consider any proposed bill if such a deal is reached at some point in the future. It would also require the President to certify every 90 days that Iran is living up to its obligations under any such deal. But it only goes into effect after such a deal is announced. Any deal along the lines the President proposed 2 weeks ago is dangerous for the United States and dangerous for the world, and it is Congress's job to stop such a deal before it happens.

The sponsors of this bill didn't upend the constitutional baseline. This bill should be submitted for a treaty. The President should have to get 67 votes for a major nuclear arms agreement with an outlaw regime. Instead, Congress has to get 67 votes in the Senate to block such a bill. That is why I intend to support Senator JOHNSON's amendment that would require this to be submitted as a treaty.

This legislation omits most of Iran's outlaw behavior, and it doesn't lay out the terms on which Congress would insist, before there is sanctions relief, in addressing this outlaw behavior. And it may allow the President to argue in the future—if a mere 34 Senators vote against a resolution of disapproval—and say that Congress has acquiesced in his agreement and that he now has support from the Congress and is not just acting on his own whim.

Therefore, I expect to offer and I expect to support amendments that are offered in three main categories—first, an amendment that would treat any resolution of disapproval as a privileged amendment subject not to a 60-vote threshold but to a 51-vote threshold. We should not let 34 Senators block a resolution of disapproval from going into effect. We certainly shouldn't allow 41 Senators to impede the will of 59 Senators who disagree with any future deal from forcing the President to veto it and depriving him of the ability to claim that Congress has acquiesced to his action.

The second main category would be to limit the administration's discretion in the future on reporting about breaches of an agreement, should an agreement be reached and should it not be blocked by the Congress.

This legislation says the administration should report potentially significant breaches to the Congress and then determine whether those potentially significant breaches are a material breach, which is defined as substantially reducing Iran's breakout time or improving Iran's nuclear program. We should strike those lawyers' vague terms. They should submit every breach to us. They should submit every time the breakout time is decreased or Iran's nuclear program improves its position. It is our job as the people's representatives to decide whether it is material, whether it is significant.

The third category of amendments is that Iran should not get sanctions relief until they live up to their international obligations, until they meet the very baseline terms the President himself laid out at the beginning of these negotiations or even after the negotiations had begun, and until Iran acts like a civilized country.

There should be no sanctions relief until the President can certify that the hardened underground military facility at Fordow is closed. He himself said Iran had no need for it.

There should be no sanctions relief until Iran has lived up to its international obligation to the IAEA—the U.N.'s nuclear watchdog—and disclosed the past military dimensions of its nuclear program, without which inspectors have no baseline to know what the status of their program is today.

There should be no sanctions relief until the President can certify that Iran is not developing intercontinental ballistic missiles. They have missiles that can defend their own territory and that can strike most of their neighbors in the Middle East. They are developing intercontinental ballistic missiles for one reason: to strike the United States with a nuclear warhead.

There should be no sanctions relief until the President can certify that Iran is no longer sponsoring terrorism because it goes to the heart of the threat Iran poses. Other countries in the world are a nuclear threshold power—Japan, Germany, and South Korea. We don't have debates about those countries being a nuclear threshold power because they are normal countries with normal leaders who do not call us the Great Satan and Israel the Little Satan and threaten to wipe Israel off the map. Until the nature of the Iran regime changes, we cannot allow them to have weapons of this nature. And they will not change until they have renounced terrorism.

Next, the President should have to certify that Iran is not cooperating with North Korea—as it has done countless times on ballistic missile programs and nuclear technology—an outlaw regime whose current nuclear status foretells the future of this deal. In 1994, the agreed framework was supposed to stop North Korea from becoming a nuclear power. Yet, just 12 years later, they have developed nuclear weapons. Now, by most estimates, they have 20—a number that could double in just a few years—with much of the United States falling underneath the threat of a North Korean nuclear attack.

Next, there should be no sanctions relief until all four American hostages are released—Pastor Saeed Abenini; Amir Hekmati, a decorated marine; Robert Levinson; and Jason Rezaian, a Washington Post reporter. That should have been a term before we even sat down at the table, that no American citizen will be held hostage by an outlaw, third-rate regime like Iran—before we started negotiating with them. They and their families deserve no less.

There should be no sanctions relief until the President can certify that Iran has agreed to anytime, anywhere inspections. This is an ongoing point of major dispute between President Obama and Iran's leaders, but if we can't go to their military facilities, if we can't inspect any facility instantly, without notification, we will be engaged in the same kind of cat-and-mouse regime that has caused inspection regimes to fail time and time again.

Finally, Iran should recognize Israel's right to exist. It is not too much to simply say that Israel has a right to exist as a Jewish and a democratic country. This is a country that just a few months ago was tweeting—tweeting—nine different reasons why Israel should be annihilated from the world.

These are very simple terms, most of which President Obama himself outlined before these negotiations began or which are clear and binding international obligations on Iran. They are good amendments that would strengthen this bill—a bill that touches on the most important issues that most of us will address during our time in the Senate.

When we considered the Keystone Pipeline bill—an important bill but a

bill that dealt with a single pipeline—we considered almost 250 amendments, and we voted on 40. Surely, we should have the same kind of robust consideration, debate, and voting on this bill. I strongly support the majority leader's call earlier this morning for exactly that kind of robust process. Most of these amendments touch directly on the heart of this legislation. I look forward to casting up-or-down votes on a 51-vote threshold on all of these amendments and many more that my colleagues may offer.

I regret that I may miss some of this debate. I may have to ask some of my colleagues to submit amendments for me. My first child is due today. By the time this bill gets to the floor next week for debate and voting, I expect my first child will have arrived. But I will not allow my son to live under the threat of a nuclear Iran—the threat of nuclear attack and ultimate nuclear war—any more than I will allow the sons and daughters of all Americans to live under that threat.

So I look forward to this debate. I look forward to stopping Iran from getting a nuclear weapon.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORKER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING VIETNAM VETERANS AND NORTH DAKOTA'S SOLDIERS WHO LOST THEIR LIVES IN VIETNAM

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I rise today to continue our efforts to honor the Nation's and North Dakota's Vietnam veterans and specifically those brave servicemembers who were killed in action during the Vietnam war.

Mr. President, 198 soldiers from North Dakota died while serving in Vietnam. Today, I am honored to speak about some of these brave men and the stories their families have shared with us.

I need to credit David Erbstoesser of Bismarck, a Vietnam veteran, for his service and for his years of reaching out to the family members of these fallen North Dakota patriots. Over the past 20 years, David contacted each family to obtain a photo of every servicemember and a photo of their gravestone. I am grateful to David for meeting with my staff to share his collection of obituaries, news articles, and photos he has collected.

The Bismarck High students and their teachers are also researching North Dakota's servicemembers who didn't come home from Vietnam. Today, I am happy to include research from BHS's 11th grade students about two such men: Gary Myers and David Bujalski.

RAPHAEL ''JOHN'' FROST

The first of our soldiers is John Frost. John was from Hunter. He was born on March 16, 1948. He served in the Army's 196th Infantry Brigade. John was 20 years old when he was killed on December 20, 1968.

John was the oldest of three children and helped his dad on the family farm. During high school, John participated in the school newspaper, choir, the Letterman's Club, a school play, and was a class officer. He was also an all-around athlete who earned letters in track, baseball, football, and basketball. His mother Lois still remembers how proud she was the day he scored 33 points in one basketball game in a winning effort.

After high school, John enrolled at Valley City State College. He was a quiet, fun-loving boy who dreamed of returning to his hometown to work as a teacher and basketball coach.

John's mother and brother Kevin remember John's kindness, especially toward his Grandma Alice while she was staying with the family recuperating from breaking her hip. While his parents were out of town, John stayed home caring for his grandmother, even making potato pancakes for her.

JON GREENLEY

Jon Greenley was from Fargo. He was born on January 30, 1942. He served in the Air Force's 774th Tactical Aerial Flight Squadron. Jon died on January 7, 1966. He was 23 years old.

Jon was one of three sons. His brother Doug remembers that Jon respected authority. Jon sent Doug a letter stating that the only time he questioned their parents' judgment was when he was buying a lawnmower and they suggested he buy a type he didn't like.

From a young age, Jon had an interest in planes and in the military. He joined the North Dakota Air National Guard. When his parents wouldn't take him to see the Air Museum in Ohio, he hitchhiked there.

Jon attended North Dakota State University and became president of the international relations group there. He was named Outstanding ROTC of the Air Force and was the first alternate to the Air Force Academy. The Fargo AMVETS post, founded in 1980, was named after Jon.

His body has never been recovered.

DAN HERDEBU

Dan Herdebu was from Baldwin. He was born on July 21, 1948. He served in the Army's 1st Aviation Brigade. He was 19 years old when he died on March 10, 1968.

Dan and his two brothers attended their two-room school through the eighth grade and attended Bismarck High School.

Dan planned to put his aviation experience to good use by flying helicopters for law enforcement or medical facilities someday.

Dan's older brother Eugene was in basic training when Dan was killed in a helicopter crash in Vietnam. After Dan's death, Eugene also served in Vietnam in the Army.

ALAN HINZPETER

Alan Hinzpeter was from Minot. He was born on May 12, 1949. He served in the Army's 101st Airborne Division. Alan died on September 6, 1971. He was 22 years old. Alan was one of four children. His brother Gordie also served in Vietnam, and their father served in World War II in the Navy.

Alan's friends and family called him Pete and remember him as a hard worker who was smart and generous with his money. He was a jokester who liked everyone and whom everyone liked. His oldest sister Jean tells about the time he wanted to watch the World Series, so he smoked a cigarette at school so he would be suspended. Jean says that Alan was 5 feet 4 inches but had a big personality. Many people attended his funeral and still to this day remember him fondly.

GERALD ALLEN ''AL'' IVERSON

Al Iverson was from Oakes. He was born on May 26, 1947. He served in the Army's 9th Infantry Division. He was 20 years old when he died on November 1, 1967.

Al was the second youngest of 14 kids—7 boys and 7 girls. Al's siblings say he was a fun-loving brother with red hair and freckles. He loved baseball and fishing. He also enjoyed spending time with his older siblings' kids, the oldest in his family, and he wanted to get married someday and have six kids of his own.

Al had 3 months left before he was scheduled to return home. He was the first Dickey County soldier to die in Vietnam.

NORBERT FROEHLICH

Norbert Froehlich was from Belfield. He was born on March 4, 1947. He served in the Army's 503rd Airborne Infantry Regiment. Norbert died on January 30, 1968. He was 19 years old.

He was the ninth of 10 kids and grew up on his family farm. Three of his brothers also served our country in the military.

His friends, both in the Army and from high school, remembered Norbert as a friend who stuck by them through thick and thin. His brother Don says that Norbert was wounded in Vietnam and was supposed to be on R&R in Australia but chose to stay in Vietnam to

help his fellow soldiers. His church in Belfield recognizes him every year on the anniversary of his death. After his death, the Army promoted Norbert to corporal.

GERHARDT JUST

Gerhardt Just was from Wishek and was born October 31, 1925. He served in the Army's 1st Aviation Brigade. Gerhardt died on August 27, 1965. He was 39 years old. He was survived by his wife Lillian, daughters Oteeka and Cora, and his son Butch.

Gerhardt joined the Army, served in Korea, and then reenlisted in the Army to provide for his family.

Gerhardt's oldest child, Oteeka, remembers that it was so important for her dad to support his family financially that after his pickup caught fire and burned the driver's seat, he put a kitchen chair in the cab so he could drive to his second job.

His kids have memories of spending their last time together working on the house he bought them, installing grass in the yard and painting the house days before his deployment.

Gerhardt was killed just a month after arriving in Vietnam.

Gerhardt's children appreciate how after his death, Gerhardt's parents and siblings always welcomed his widow and children into their family with open arms.

GARY MYERS

Gary Myers was from Fort Yates and was born on November 4, 1947. He served in the Marine Corps's 3rd Reconnaissance Battalion. Gary was 20 years old when he died on May 13, 1968.

Gary's father served in the Army during the Korean war and was stationed in Germany, where Gary was born. Gary spent 1 year at Dickinson State University before enlisting.

Gary's sister Linda remembers him as an outgoing person who loved to help people when he had a chance. He was an honor student and enjoyed playing sports, including wrestling, football, and rodeo. When we wasn't busy with sports, Gary was helping his father work on their cattle ranch.

Gary's hometown friends and fellow soldiers reported that Gary was killed in Vietnam while leading a mission to retrieve his lieutenant's body 1 month before Gary was scheduled to return home to his family in the United States.

LARRY OLSON

Larry Olson was from McHenry. He was born on June 26, 1945. He served in the Army's 25th Infantry Division. Larry died on June 19, 1968. He was 22 years old.

Larry's grandfather served in World War I, his father in World War II, and his brother and nephews also served our country.

Larry was the oldest of six children. His sister Rita remembers him as the big brother who always watched out for her and kept bullies away.

Larry was a hard worker and a good friend. Fellow soldiers from his regiment loved Larry so much that they asked Rita to show them his grave.

RICHARD ''RICK'' BORGMAN

Rick Borgman was from Minot and was born on January 23, 1947. He served in the Army's 101st Airborne Division. He was 21 years old when he died on March 3, 1968.

Rick's mother Anita and sister Pat remember him as a loving, gentle person. He participated in Boy Scouts, worked at the Red Owl grocery store, and enjoyed fast cars and life in general.

Rick left behind his widow Linda, his son Shannon, and daughter Laura. Linda learned that she was pregnant with Laura shortly after Rick's funeral. Linda remembers Rick's big heart, great sense of humor, and that he was loved by many. She says she can see Rick whenever she looks at Shannon and Laura and that Shannon's laugh is contagious, just as his dad's was.

Linda is grateful that her second husband, Bruce Sullivan, a Vietnam veteran, adopted Shannon and Laura and lovingly helped her raise them.

DAVID BUJALSKI

David Bujalski was from Carrington. He was born on August 18, 1940. He served in the Army Corps of Engineers' 65th Energy Battalion. On August 15, 1967, David died. He was 27 years old.

David was the youngest of six children, lovingly called ''Little David.'' But after reaching the height of 6 foot 2 inches, his family more often referred to cheerful and friendly David as a gentle giant.

He graduated in the top third of his class from West Point and married Barbara. They had a daughter Elizabeth while David was stationed in Germany. They moved to Arizona, and David became a commander. His first sergeant there was quoted saying, ''He was revered by his cadre, loved by his students, and respected by his superiors.''

David felt a duty to serve in Vietnam, and 8 days after arriving there, he was killed by a sniper. His second daughter Kathleen was born 6 weeks later.

David's brother Jack, also a West Point graduate, wrote the following about his brother:

> David's life was too short for him to have reached his full potential. We can only conjecture as to what he would have achieved, but we do know that he influenced the lives of all who knew him.

LESLIE CARTER

Leslie Carter was from Jamestown. He was born on November 3, 1943. He served in the Navy as a medic. He was 24 years old when he died on July 1, 1968.

Leslie left behind his widow Marlys and his daughter Heidi. Leslie met Marlys through his brother Douglas. While home on leave, Leslie won Marlys over, and the couple later married. A year after their wedding, their daughter Heidi was born. Heidi was 5 months old when her father died and never had an opportunity to meet him.

One of Leslie's high school friends, who also served in the Navy, James Bitz, called Leslie ''Butch'' and remembers him as one of the nicest, most generous people he had ever had the pleasure of knowing.

DAVID CORCORAN

David Corcoran was from Grand Forks. He was born on May 5, 1951. He served in the Army's 101st Airborne Division. David died on June 26, 1969. He was 18 years old.

David was one of five children and the only son. He loved hunting with his father, grandfather, and uncles. He also loved cars and playing basketball. David helped construct a figure 8 racetrack in Grand Forks and was happy to be able to race his own cars on the track a few times before being deployed.

Wanting to serve his country like his World War II veteran father, David joined the Army at age 17. His family hoped he would not be assigned to a combat unit because he was only 17, but a day after his 18th birthday, he received his orders to Vietnam.

WILBERT FLECK

Wilbert Fleck was from Breien and was born November 22, 1949. He served in the Army's 1st Infantry Division. He was 19 years old when he died on July 27, 1969.

Wilbert was one of 13 children—7 boys and 6 girls. Six of the seven boys served in the military.

Wilbert's brothers and sisters remember him as a selfless and caring person. He was always willing to help out a neighbor. He was dedicated to caring for his aging parents and was extremely protective of those he loved.

Wilbert died taking charge of his platoon after his platoon leader was killed. His sister Pauline says that this was just the kind of person he was—always willing to put the needs of others before his own. Wilbert was Pauline's best friend.

LOWELL HARDMEYER

Lowell Hardmeyer was from Mott. He was born on February 16, 1949. He served in the Army's 198th Light Infantry Brigade. He died on June 10, 1970. He was 21 years old.

Lowell was the younger of two sons. He was a blue-eyed boy who loved horses and grew up on his family farm and ranch in the Prairie Hills.

In 1967, Lowell graduated from high school and enrolled in the National Electronics Institute in Denver before serving in the Army.

In Vietnam, Lowell had various duties, including rear security guard, walking on point patrol, and radio operator. He was killed when his company came under mortar attack.

Lowell's cousin, Lauren, remembers Lowell was a shy, sweet young man. Lauren says that Lowell's parents, George and Clara Hardmeyer, grieved Lowell's death until their own in the 1990s.

MERLYN PAULSON

Merlyn Pauslon was from Fargo and he was born on June 19, 1936. He served

in the Air Force's 8th Tactical Fighter Wing. He was 35 years old when he went missing on March 29, 1972.

Merlyn was one of nine children, six boys and three girls. Five of the boys served their country, three in World War II and two in Vietnam.

Merlyn's brother Bob remembers him as a wonderful boy who people couldn't help but love. Bob jokes that Merlyn had personality to burn.

Merlyn went missing when his plane was shot down by a surface-to-air missile. Fourteen years later, in 1986, his body was finally recovered. Years later, his family was finally able to lay him to rest in Arlington National Cemetery.

These are just a few stories that, by sharing today with the Senate and sharing today on the floor of the Senate, I hope will remind us all of the tremendous sacrifice that not only these young men have provided for their country but the sacrifice also of their families, their children, and the wives they leave behind, the parents they leave behind, and that it is a constant reminder that we must never forget the duty to our country and we must never forget those among us who have paid the ultimate price.

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. 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.

THE STATE OF THE SENATE AS AN INSTITUTION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in the last Congress, I came to the Senate floor to express my concern about the state of the Senate as an institution, how it had been beset by dysfunction, destructive partisanship, and corrosion of its vital characteristics.

Today, I wish to reflect on some of the progress we have made in the first few months of this Congress in restoring this great institution to its essential role in our constitutional system. While significant progress has been made, there still remains much more to be done.

Central to properly understanding our responsibilities as Senators is an appreciation of the Senate's role in our system of government. Consider the particularly distinct purposes of the two Houses of Congress. The House of Representatives is the organ of government designed to embody the will of the people. Its small constituencies and short terms allow its Members to be as closely in touch with the voters as possible. With 435 Members, robust participation by every Member in each debate is impossibly cumbersome. Thus, the House's work is defined by majority rule as logically befits a body that represents the popular will.

By contrast, the Framers designed the Senate to serve as what they called ''a necessary fence'' against the ''fickleness and passion'' that sometimes drives popular pressure for hasty and ill-considered lawmaking—or, as Edmund Randolph put it, ''the turbulence and follies of democracy.'' Similarly, James Madison described its purpose as ''protect[ing] the people against the transient impressions into which they themselves might be led.''

Through its character and its institutional structure, the Senate not only checks transient and occasionally intemperate impulses but also refines the popular will with wisdom and sound judgment. Perhaps the most important characteristic that guarantees this key function is the Senate's relatively small size, which enables each and every Senator to contribute meaningfully in debate.

The primacy of individual Senators' rights has long guided the development of the Senate's rules and traditions, including the right to extend debate, open amendment consideration, and a committee system that gives all Members, from the most seasoned chairman to the newest freshman, a hand in drafting and improving legislation. Moreover, there is the reality that to function efficiently and effectively, the Senate frequently requires temporary modifications to the institution's oftentimes complex and cumbersome rules—agreements that require the unanimous consent of all Senators to take effect.

The expansive rights of Senators are a double-edged sword—at once both the great genius of the institution and the source of some of the greatest pitfalls that may befall it. By giving a minority of Senators—sometimes even a minority of one—great sway over the business of the whole body, each one of us is entrusted with enormous powers that can be used to grind the Senate to a halt. These powers can be used to do enormous good when used wisely and judiciously—from forcing a majority to reconsider misguided legislation to extracting important guarantees from the executive branch in exchange for allowing a nomination to go forward.

The former Senator from Oklahoma, Dr. Tom Coburn, was a leading exponent of these rights. During his time in the Senate, he was legendary for his use of the rules to stop wasteful spending and limit the expansion of the Federal Government. While we may not always have agreed on particular matters, it is beyond question that his willingness to stand up for what he believed in—even in the face of overwhelming opposition—did enormous good for our Nation. Dr. Coburn's service demonstrates exactly why the Senate allows a minority to hold such a sway over this body.

Nevertheless, while the whole Republic has benefited time and again from a Senate minority's judicious exercise of its rights, we know all too well how these rights can be abused. Today, the Senate's procedures have become bywords for mindless obstruction. In the minds of many of our fellow citizens, what drives the exercise of minority rights is not the interests of thoughtful legislating or productive oversight but, rather, reflexive partisanship and political grandstanding.

From various quarters, including some within this very body, we often hear calls to eliminate the various rights of the minority. Although these calls may be instinctively appealing, we should decisively reject them. After all, without these minority rights, the Senate would lose its unique character, which has allowed it to serve the Republic so well for so many years. The Senate, stripped of its minority rights, would merely duplicate and needlessly frustrate the work of the House of Representatives.

Those of us in the present day should recall that we are not the first in our Nation's history to confront the potential for great dysfunction. In particular, we should recall the example of the late Senator from Montana, Mike Mansfield. Senator Mansfield served as majority leader from 1961 until 1977, holding that position longer than any other Senate leader. These were turbulent times for the Nation and the Senate alike, when the issues of the day could hardly have been more divisive and problematic.

Near the beginning of his tenure, when a determined minority stalled President Kennedy's legislative priorities, Senator Mansfield faced great pressure from within his own party to exert the majority's power more assertively. In an act of great courage, Mansfield resisted these calls to bend the Senate's rules. Although tempted by the prospect of important policy and political victories, he instead counseled that the remedy to gridlock ''lies not in the seeking of shortcuts, not in the cracking of nonexistent whips, not in wheeling and dealing, but in an honest facing of the situation and a resolution of it by the Senate itself, by accommodation, by respect for one another, [and] by mutual restraint.''

Senator Mansfield was absolutely right, and his wisdom is perhaps more relevant now than ever. For the Senate to function effectively, Senators of all stripes must practice mutual restraint—Republican and Democrat, conservative and liberal, majority and minority alike.

In practice, restraint requires different sacrifices of different Senators, depending on their position. For the majority leadership, it is measured in part by what sort of measures are brought before the Senate for consideration. Do they tend to be divisive and partisan messaging bills, or do they tend to be measures that can gather bipartisan support—those that may offer less prospects of a messaging victory but greater prospects for actually becoming law? Have the measures typically been considered by the committee of jurisdiction, allowing for a

thorough vetting and best chance for bipartisan consensus?

Restraint is also measured in how the majority conducts its consideration of a particular measure. Is there an open amendment process that allows all Senators to contribute to the Chamber's work and seek means of mutual accommodation, or does the majority leader fill up the so-called amendment tree, thereby freezing legislation in the exact form that he demands? Is the full Senate allowed sufficient time for full and free debate on a measure important enough for consideration on the floor, or does the majority leader move to end debate as soon as it begins?

The need for mutual restraint also creates correlative obligations for the minority. From filibusters, to poison-pill amendments, to objections, to routine unanimous consent requests—an often underappreciated but incredibly important tool to chew up this body's valuable time—Senators in the minority have numerous ways in which they can grind this body to a halt and derail a measure. Senators on both sides of the aisle—myself included—have relied on these means before. Their use can be quite legitimate when employed judiciously and motivated by serious policy disagreement; however, when employed indiscriminately for the purpose of frustrating the operation of the Senate for partisan gain, the use of such tactics is deeply improper.

The appropriateness of the minority's behavior hinges in large part on the actions of the majority. With the power to decide the Senate's business, including what the Senate considers as well as how it considers it, the majority's behavior rightfully shapes the minority's response. Majority restraint invites minority restraint, begetting productive legislating, whereas majority overreach invites minority intransigence, causing only dysfunction.

The Senate's dysfunction over the past few years resulted from exactly that—repeated instances of overreach by the majority in direct contradiction to the restraint counseled by Senator Mansfield. This overreach occurred along a wide variety of fronts, many of which my colleagues and I spoke out against in great detail.

In the last Congress, many bills that received floor consideration had completely bypassed the committee process. In fact, each of the past four Congresses set a new record for the use of this extraordinary procedure. The unfortunate but predictable result was the waste of the Senate's valuable floor time on partisan messaging bills that no one seriously expected to become law.

Instead of allowing an open amendment process, the previous majority used the procedural maneuver known as filling the tree to deny Senators the right to offer an amendment. By refusing to allow amendments out of a desire to prevent a vote on commonsense bipartisan ideas, such as building the Keystone XL Pipeline and rolling back bureaucratic red tape, the previous majority invited minority opposition to the underlying measures, killing important bipartisan legislation such as the energy efficiency bill and the sportsman's bill.

In the last Congress, almost a year went by during which the majority allowed votes on only 11 minority amendments. During that period, all 45 Senators in the minority together got fewer votes on amendments than, for example, one House Democrat, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE. In fact, the Congressional Research Service confirms that the previous majority leader used his position to block the consideration of amendments more than twice as often as the previous six majority leaders combined.

The previous majority also frequently moved to end debate on a measure at the very same time it was brought up for consideration, employing this tactic far more often than previous majorities. Its effect is not to end debate on legislation but to prevent it all together. Whenever those of us then in the minority resisted this demand that we end debate as soon as we began consideration, the majority wrongfully labeled it a ''filibuster.'' Worst of all, the majority used this supposedly unprecedented level of obstruction to take the drastic step of abolishing extended debate all together on most nominations using the so-called nuclear option.

With the new leadership of the Senate under the senior Senator from Kentucky, we have made enormous progress toward restoring this sense of mutual restraint. Consider the sort of legislation the current majority leader has brought up for floor consideration so far this Congress: the bipartisan Hoeven-Manchin bill to authorize the Keystone XL Pipeline; the permanent solution for Medicare's Sustainable Growth Rate and reauthorization of the State Children's Health Insurance Program, which passed 92 to 8; and the Cornyn-Klobuchar bill to fight the scourge of modern-day slavery known as human trafficking.

These are not Republican messaging bills. The majority leader has admirably avoided the temptation to fill our agenda with partisan bills just to score cheap political points. Instead, we have focused on bills that command broad bipartisan support. Moreover, consider the bills that the majority leader has indicated are next up for floor consideration: the Corker-Menendez Iran nuclear agreement legislation that passed the Foreign Relations Committee with unexpected and impressive unanimity; the bipartisan Alexander-Murray rewrite of No Child Left Behind; and our bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act, which passed out of the Finance Committee last night with the support of 13 Republicans and 7 Democrats. By identifying these priorities, the majority leader has indicated that his focus on bipartisan committee-vetted legislation is not a fleeting illusion but a long-term commitment to responsible leadership.

The way in which the majority leader has conducted our consideration of these bills also demonstrates this commitment to restraint. We have seen committee consideration of legislation restored as the norm. We have also seen a renewed commitment to an open amendment process. In January, for example, the Senate voted on more amendments in 1 week than in all of last year. By my count, we have voted on 114 individual amendments in less than 4 months, the majority of which were offered by the minority. Many of these were tough votes, but the need to govern responsibly far outweighed any political cost. Instead of cutting off debate before it even begins, we have moved at a deliberate pace to allow the amendment process to flourish, tempering our own desire to move legislation faster in order to legislate according to the best traditions of this body.

This is not to say that the past 4 months have been perfect. There have been times when the sailing has been a bit rocky. While the current minority has repeatedly displayed admirable cooperation—the sort of mutual restraint that Senator Mansfield wisely lauded so many years ago—there have been times when some of my colleagues have fallen prey to the temptation of partisan obstruction.

In particular, I was extremely disappointed by the logjam that developed over the Hyde amendment and impeded progress on the bipartisan human trafficking bill. The gridlock over what should have been an uncontroversial provision indicated a troubling willingness on the part of some to derail our efforts to legislate responsibly and instead resort to tired and discredited war-on-women rhetoric to win cheap political votes.

I was so encouraged by this week's resolution of that impasse. The willingness on the part of leaders on both sides of the aisle to break the gridlock reflected the best of the Senate's great tradition of statesmanship. I want to extend my sincere thanks and respect to the senior Senators from Washington, Minnesota, and Texas, Senators MURRAY, KLOBUCHAR and CORNYN, as well as everyone else who helped craft the compromise.

By putting partisanship aside, they have not only benefitted the victims of human trafficking; they have also helped reinvigorate the ethos of accommodation and mutual restraint that is at the heart of this institution. We should all look to this example as a model of leadership worthy of the world's greatest deliberative body.

It is incumbent on all of us to get the Senate back to work for the American people. By returning to the spirit of comity that served this body so well for so long, we have already made real and meaningful progress. I urge all of my colleagues to continue in this noble pursuit. It is undoubtedly worth the cost.

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. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the millions of Armenians who were deported during the Armenian genocide in 1915, and the 1.5 million men, women, and children who were killed. April 24, 2015, marks the Centennial Remembrance Day of the Armenian genocide, and my thoughts go out to the descendants of the victims and all of the Armenian people as the world commemorates this tragedy.

As we reflect upon this horrific period in history, we are reminded of the importance of promoting tolerance and standing firm against hatred and discrimination. That is why I have always recognized the terrible atrocities that took place in Armenia as genocide and why I consistently support resolutions in the Senate to remember the anniversaries of the Armenian genocide. I will continue to support these resolutions and speak about this issue so we never forget the families who were torn apart and destroyed due to brutal intolerance.

Nevada is home to a vibrant community of thousands of Armenian Americans. Through churches and other organizations, Armenians in Nevada have demonstrated a commitment to working to improve their communities and serve others. For instance, the Armenian Relief Association in Las Vegas has dedicated years to serving the Las Vegas community and providing Saturday school for children to learn Armenian history. Kirk Kerkorian, an immensely successful Armenian American businessman and philanthropist, has shaped Nevada's booming tourism industry and created jobs with his investments on the Las Vegas Strip. Kirk has also generously donated to organizations across the Nation and in Armenia through his charitable foundation, the Lincy Foundation, to support important causes such as public education, health care, and infrastructure development. Another well-known Armenian American, the late Jerry Tarkanian, will long be remembered in Nevada not only for his success leading the University of Nevada, Las Vegas basketball team, but also for his dedication to teaching young college athletes to be better people and proudly represent their city.

I am proud that, for years, Nevada has officially recognized the Armenian genocide, and that Nevada continues to find ways to honor this strong community and Armenian history. I am grateful for the efforts of the Armenian American Cultural Society of Las Vegas, which raised thousands of dollars for an Armenian Genocide Monument at Sunset Park in Las Vegas, Nevada. The monument will represent the 12 provinces where Armenians were slaughtered during the genocide, and will provide Nevadans with a place for reflection for years to come.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the 100th anniversary of the Armenian genocide.

Between 1915 and 1923, the Ottoman Empire carried out genocide against the Armenian people. Over the course of 8 years, more than 1.5 million Armenians were marched to their deaths in the deserts of the Middle East, murdered in concentration camps, drowned at sea, and forced to endure unimaginable acts of brutality.

Over the years, this deliberate massacre of the Armenians has been well-documented and confirmed by scholars and experts. And there are countless testimonies from victims who lived to tell of their harrowing experiences.

In his memoirs, Henry Morgenthau, the American Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire between 1913 and 1916, wrote: ''When the Turkish authorities gave the orders for these deportations, they were merely giving the death warrant to a whole race; they understood this well, and in their conversations with me, they made no particular attempt to conceal the fact.''

Despite an irrefutable body of evidence, the U.S. Government has refused to call the deliberate massacre of the Armenians by its rightful name. Mr. President, 100 years have passed since the beginning of the Armenian genocide. It is long past time for our government to finally acknowledge one of the greatest atrocities of the 20th century for what it was—genocide.

This year, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of a Senate resolution calling on the President to ''ensure that the foreign policy of the United States reflects appropriate understanding and sensitivity concerning issues related to human rights, crimes against humanity, ethnic cleansing, and genocide documented in the United States record relating to the Armenian Genocide.''

But each day that goes by without full acknowledgement by the United States prolongs the pain felt by the descendants of the victims of the Armenian genocide, as well as the entire Armenian community.

By affirming the Armenian genocide, the United States would join countries across the globe—including Argentina, Canada, France, Italy, Poland, Russia, Switzerland, and Venezuela—as well as the Holy See and 43 U.S. States in standing on the right side of history.

For years, I have urged both Democratic and Republican administrations to finally acknowledge the truth of the Armenian genocide. Today, I reiterate my call and I hope that this year the United States will finally correct this century-old injustice.

During a recent mass commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Armenian genocide, Pope Francis said:

> It is necessary, and indeed a duty, to honour their memory, for whenever memory fades, it means that evil allows wounds to fester. Concealing or denying evil is like allowing a wound to keep bleeding without bandaging it!

On this April 24, as we take time to remember and honor the victims of the Armenian genocide, I hope the United States will heed the eloquent words of Pope Francis by formally and unequivocally affirming the incontestable fact of the Armenian genocide.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to solemnly observe the 100th anniversary of the Armenian genocide.

One hundred years ago, one of the greatest tragedies of the 20th Century began when the young Turk leaders of the Ottoman Empire executed more than 200 Armenian leaders and intellectuals. What followed was an 8-year systematic campaign of oppression, which by 1923, left an estimated 1.5 million Armenians dead and over a half a million survivors exiled.

These atrocities affected the lives of every Armenian living in Asia Minor and, indeed, across the globe, and many called for the United States to take action. The U.S. Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire during this dark time, Henry Morgenthau, Sr., unsuccessfully pleaded with President Wilson to take action, and later remembered the events of the genocide, saying:

> I am confident that the whole history of the human race contains no such horrible episode as this. The great massacres and persecutions of the past seem almost insignificant when compared to the sufferings of the Armenian race in 1915.

Former President Theodore Roosevelt also called for an American response, saying, ''Until we put honor and duty first, and are willing to risk something in order to achieve righteousness both for ourselves and for others, we shall accomplish nothing; and we shall earn and deserve the contempt of the strong nations of mankind.''

Unfortunately, the United States and the world did not intervene. It is a testament to the unbreakable spirit of the survivors of the Armenian genocide that they persevered and went on to enrich their countries of emigration, including the United States. That is why today we not only commemorate this grave tragedy, but we celebrate the traditions, the contributions, as well as the bright future of the Armenian people. Indeed, my home State of Rhode Island continues to be enriched by our strong and vibrant Armenian-American community.

Denial of this history is inconsistent with our country's values and as we mark this centennial, I once again join with my colleagues on a resolution that encourages the United States to recognize the Armenian genocide. We must continue to guard against hatred and oppression so that we can prevent such crimes against humanity. I would

note that, earlier this month, Pope Francis held a mass to recognize this centennial and described this mass atrocity against Armenians as the first genocide of the 20th century. On this, the 100th anniversary, the United States should similarly recognize this horrific tragedy as genocide, joining the ranks of the many countries that have already done so.

I remain committed to supporting efforts, as ranking member on the Senate Armed Services Committee and as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, to provide assistance to Armenia to promote economic growth, strengthen security, and support democratic reforms and development.

I am pleased that on May 7, at my invitation, His Holiness Aram I, Catholicos of the Worldwide Armenian Apostolic Church and the Great House of Cilicia, will serve as guest Chaplain before this body and continue this important message. We must find a way to come together to recognize what happened a century ago and show our unwavering support to those facing persecution today. I hope we can do that.

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate and reflect on the centennial anniversary of the beginning of the Armenian genocide. With great sadness, we remember the beginning of the genocide of 1.5 million Armenians, Assyrians, and Greeks who died 100 years ago. On April 24, 1915, the campaign targeting the Armenian people began. They, along with Assyrians and Greeks, were viewed as threats to the Ottoman Empire and driven from their homeland. The persecuted minorities were uprooted from their way of life leaving behind generations of family history, property, and memories. The Armenians were then force-marched into the desert without proper rations and supplies, with most dying along this brutal passage. The remaining survivors were detained in concentration camps rampant with disease and hunger. These mass killings are historically documented and served as a tragic prelude to the Holocaust.

This solemn anniversary offers us a chance to renew our commitment to the principle of ''never again,'' a vow that surfaced after the Holocaust. And so today I rise to proclaim never again can an ethnic group be targeted due to race, religion, or ethnicity.

BANGLADESH RANA PLAZA ANNIVERSARY

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, April 24 marks the 2-year anniversary of the Rana Plaza building collapse which resulted in the death of over 1,130 Bangladeshi workers and the injury of approximately 2,500 more. To date, this remains the single largest disaster of its kind. Since 2013, many in the governmental, nongovernmental, private, and business sectors have pledged their financial resources and time to addressing the numerous issues and problems surrounding the ready-made garment industry. Even though progress has been made, many promises remain unfulfilled, especially in providing Bangladeshi workers the rights they deserve.

As a long-term U.S. ally, I want Bangladesh to be prosperous because only through a growing economy that delivers shared prosperity to its people can stability be ensured.

The country's garment industry is now, and will be for the foreseeable future, the engine of economic growth as it accounts for close to 80 percent of foreign exchange earnings. The United States, which remains the single largest country buyer of Bangladeshi garments, has an important responsibility to ensure that those garments are made in a way that do not put people's lives at risk and that fairly rewards workers for their labor.

Domestically, while there has been progress in conducting safety inspections and hiring additional inspectors, much work remains in providing for freedom of association. On this front, I have been very disappointed by the role played by the government of Bangladesh. The record over the past 2 years shows that the Bangladeshi government has failed to keep promises it made to our Government and to the European Union.

It has failed to pass a labor law in line with international labor standards and has not promulgated implementing regulations for the law that exists.

Workers still have no rights to form unions in Export Processing Zones and once again the government is saying it has no power to change regulations because of contractual obligations to companies.

The government of Bangladesh has made little progress with regard to the inspection of well over a thousand factories that it agreed to inspect for fire safety.

The government of Bangladesh personnel responsible for investigating unfair labor practices are not doing so and some police have refused to accept cases filed by labor organizers who experience violence from management-hired thugs. Such antiunion behavior on the part of employers is common throughout many developing countries but in the case of Bangladesh, it is compounded by the government's actions which actively abet such behavior. For that, the government of Bangladesh must be held responsible.

There needs to be a clear, consistent and transparent union registration process. While approximately 300 factory-level garment unions have been registered in the last 2 years, more than 100 unions that filed for registration have been rejected by the government, many for arbitrary or unfair reasons.

The people of Bangladesh need mechanisms where workers can swiftly get the justice they deserve when their rights are violated. Bangladeshi authorities need to properly investigate, address and, if necessary, penalize employers for unfair labor practices to end the culture of impunity that surrounds employer resistance to legally protected union activity.

So as my colleagues can see, much work remains.

Until substantial progress is made, the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative has rightfully decided to keep in place the suspension of Bangladesh's Generalized System of Preferences—GSP—trade benefits with the United States. I support this decision.

The ''Accord on Fire and Building Safety in Bangladesh'' and the ''Alliance on Fire and Building Safety in Bangladesh'' are two private sector initiatives made up of American and European retailers which have conducted safety inspections in more than 2,500 factories. As a result, some factories have adopted new safety practices and have made physical improvements such as the installation of fire doors to make it safer for workers to evacuate when fires occur. These inspections have resulted in the full or partial shutdown of a number of unsafe factories. The private sector has a critical role to play in changing the RMG culture in Bangladesh and I strongly urge both coalitions to focus on how workers' rights can be improved in the coming years.

Aside from ensuring that improvements are made to prevent another Rana Plaza, it is critical that full compensation is paid to the victims and their families. As of today, the ''Rana Plaza Donors Trust Fund'' has received roughly $21 million from a variety of donors, including both large global brands and the Bangladeshi Prime Minister's Fund. While $21 million sounds impressive, the fund is suffering from an approximate $9 million shortfall. Because of this, some victims and their families have only received approximately 70 percent of the money they are entitled to. I am happy to hear that Benetton has recently agreed to donate to the Fund. I hope that other companies that had business at Rana Plaza come forward and contribute, or continue contributing, their fair share.

It is encouraging to see different elements of the international community come together to support the garment factory workers in Bangladesh. Real progress in the RMG sector will require continued vigilance on the part of the international community. Earlier this year, we were once again saddened by the news of yet another tragedy involving the collapse of a building in Bangladesh. On March 12, in the town of Mongla, a cement factory collapsed and tragically killed eight people while injuring approximately 60 others. Whether in a garment factory or cement factory, we must remain vigilant to ensure that workers' safety and workers' rights are top priorities of the U.S. government and international buyers in Bangladesh.

REFUGEE AND MIGRANT DEATHS IN THE MEDITERRANEAN SEA

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I wish to discuss an enormous human tragedy: another boat carrying desperate refugees and migrants capsized in the Mediterranean Sea and, in this most recent instance, over 850 men, women, and children have died. It is profoundly heartwrenching to view the anguished images of innocent refugees and migrants, men and women, old and young, who embarked on this desperate journey bound for a more hopeful future, but which instead ended in death on the Mediterranean Sea for so many people.

In 2014, we know that well over 218,000 refugees and migrants crossed the Mediterranean Sea, many fleeing violence, conflict, and persecution in Syria, Iraq, Eritrea and elsewhere, traveling on overcrowded and unseaworthy boats. Last year, over 3,500 women, men, and children died or went missing in their desperate attempts to reach Europe. According to the International Organization on Migration, IOM, this year's death toll in the Mediterranean Sea is believed to have surpassed 1,750 victims already—a drastic spike when compared to the same period last year. During the first 3 weeks of April alone, more than 11,000 people have been rescued.

This is a journey of unimaginable peril, and only the most despairing families with nothing to lose would sacrifice their lives in the hopes that this voyage will deliver an escape from misery. From Syria to Iraq, from South Sudan to Yemen, multiplying conflicts, gross human rights violations, statelessness, the effects of climate change, and food and water insecurity are all contributing to millions of people being forced from their homes in search of safety and survival.

The international community is witnessing the enormous costs of unending wars and the failure to resolve or prevent conflict. The number of refugees, asylum-seekers and internally displaced people worldwide has, for the first time in the post-World War II era, exceeded 50 million people, according to the United Nations High Commission on Refugees, UNHCR.

This massive increase is largely driven by the war in Syria, which is now in its fifth year. The Assad regime's ruthless attacks on Syrian civilians—compounded by horrific violence by armed extremists—has led to Syria's disintegration and massive internal and external displacement of its people.

Europe, facing conflicts to its south in Libya, east in Ukraine, and southeast in Syria, Iraq and the Horn of Africa, is currently seeing the largest numbers of refugees and migrants arriving by boat across the Mediterranean. To confront this enormous challenge, European Council President Donald Tusk called on member states on Monday, April 20, to meet their funding commitments for Trident, the European Union's, EU, naval operation in the Mediterranean. EU leaders also agreed to meet on Thursday, April 23, to consider increasing resources for rescue operations and the 10-point action plan on migration proposed by the Joint Foreign Affairs and Home Council.

The proposed plan would alleviate pressure on the member states receiving the majority of those rescued and also aims to combat trafficking and smuggling.

The EU's proposed 10-point plan is an important first step, but a bold and comprehensive response is urgently needed. First, rescue at sea is and should be the top priority. It is a moral imperative based on European values, as well as a fundamental principle of maritime law. A robust search and rescue operation, comparable to Mare Nostrum, that focuses on saving lives must be reinstated. While the reinforcement of the Joint Operations in the Mediterranean is welcomed, border surveillance operations are not an answer to this crisis.

Second, there needs to be a credible and firm commitment from countries both in Europe and across the globe to resettle significant numbers of refugees. Moreover, efforts to encourage legal alternatives to such dangerous voyages must be pursued. These include enhanced family reunification, private sponsorship programs, and study and labor migration programs for people in need of international protection.

Finally, I urge the U.S. Government to provide robust assistance, and to work closely with our European partners, so that we might all rise to the demands presented by this humanitarian crisis and commit to the measures needed to prevent tragedies such as the drowning deaths of 850 men, women, and children off the coast of Libya this past weekend.

NATIONAL MINORITY HEALTH MONTH

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I wish to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing April as National Minority Health Month. 2015 marks the 30th anniversary of this event, which provides us with an opportunity to celebrate the progress we have made in addressing minority health issues and health disparities in our country and to renew our commitment to continue this critically important work.

Minorities now make up more than 35 percent of the American population and that number is expected to rise in the future. However, study after study has shown that minorities, especially African Americans and Latinos, continue to face significant health disparities in diseases such as diabetes, HIV/AIDS, and asthma.

Currently, over 26 million Americans suffer from diabetes. But African Americans are twice as likely to be diagnosed with, and to die from, diabetes compared to non-Hispanic whites. African Americans are also more than 2½ times more likely to suffer from diabetes-related end-stage renal disease than non-Hispanic whites, and are more likely to have other complications, such as lower extremity amputations.

Obesity, which increases the risk of developing diabetes, is also more prevalent in minority communities. Nearly 4 out of 5 African-American women are overweight or obese, as well as 78 percent of Hispanic men. It is no coincidence that, nationwide, 27.2 percent of African Americans and 23.5 percent of Latinos lived below the Federal poverty line in 2013. Limited means and the lack of access to fresh fruits and vegetables in ''food deserts'' prevent many people from accessing the nutrition they need to lead healthy lives.

Those living in impoverished areas are also much more likely to be exposed to polluted air, which exacerbates respiratory conditions like asthma. According to the Department of Health and Human Services, in 2012, African Americans were 20 percent more likely to have asthma versus non-Hispanic whites.

HIV and AIDS, which are especially prevalent in low-income neighborhoods with widespread drug use, continue to devastate minorities across the country. African American women are 23 times more likely to have AIDS than their white counterparts and Hispanic women are four times more likely to be infected. In Maryland, African Americans are diagnosed with HIV at more than 10 times the rate of white Marylanders.

The role that access to resources, proper nutrition, and clean air plays in our well-being cannot be overstated. According to a 2012 report about Baltimore neighborhoods from the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, those living in higher-income parts of the city live, on average, nearly 30 years longer than their neighbors in impoverished areas.

Fortunately, thanks to the Affordable Care Act, ACA, we have recently made health coverage more accessible and affordable than it has been in decades. By reducing the number of uninsured Americans across the country, the ACA is working to address health inequalities. Between 2013 and 2014, the percentage of uninsured Latinos dropped by 7.7 percent, and the percentage of uninsured African Americans fell by 6.8 percent.

Also, as a result of the ACA, increased funding is available for community health clinics. Mr. President, 300,000 Marylanders, including more than 140,000 African Americans and 38,000 Latinos, are served by these clinics.

Under the ACA, preventive services, which are critical to the early detection and treatment of many diseases that disproportionately affect minorities, are now free for 76 million Americans, including 1.5 million Marylanders.

In 2011, African American women in Maryland died from cervical cancer at

nearly twice the rate of white women. This disparity is simply unacceptable and illustrates the importance of access to preventive health care services: cervical cancer is preventable through regular screening tests and follow-up and, when detected and treated early, it is highly curable.

In our country, we are incredibly fortunate to have the National Institutes of Health, NIH, which works tirelessly to improve the health of all Americans, and the NIH's National Institute for Minority Health & Health Disparities, NIMHD, has the specific mission of addressing minority health issues and eliminating health disparities. I am proud of my role in the establishment of the NIMHD, which supports groundbreaking research at universities and medical institutions across our country.

This critically important work ranges from enhancing our understanding of the basic biological processes associated with health disparities to applied, clinical, and translational research and interventions that seek to address those disparities.

Some examples of recent NIMHD-funded projects include exploring racial disparities in sudden infant death syndrome, SIDS, to inform health education interventions about safe infant sleep practices, which historically have been shown to be less effective among African Americans; evaluating a community-based intervention to promote follow-up among uninsured minority women with abnormal breast or cervical cancer screening results; and developing a culturally tailored lifestyle intervention to prevent diabetes among African American and Hispanic adults.

Enhancing our understanding of the complex disparities across racial, ethnic, and other minority populations and their specific risk factors will help us develop better preventive health care, reduce long-term health care costs, and improve the quality of life for millions of Americans.

Minority health disparities cost many of our constituents their health and even their lives, and they cost our health care system and economy, as well. A 2009 joint center study found that direct medical costs resulting from health inequities among minorities totaled nearly $230 billion between 2003 and 2006. With indirect costs such as lowered work productivity and lost tax revenue added to the equation, the tab amounts to more than $1.24 trillion.

We owe it to our constituents to do everything in our power to fight for affordable, high-quality health care for everyone. One's ethnic or racial background should never determine the quality of his or her health or the length of his or her life. This month, let us renew our commitment to ensuring access to affordable, high-quality health care for all Americans, and pledge to do everything we can to eliminate health disparities in our country.

TRIBUTE TO ROSE BAUMANN

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize my chief of staff, Rose Baumann, and to pay tribute to her hard work on behalf of the people of Minnesota as a member of my staff for the past 9 years.

For anyone who has met Rose, it will come as no surprise to you that Rose went from being a junior staffer in my office in 2006 just after graduating from Gustavus Adolphus College to my chief of staff just 7 years later. For the first 4 of those 7 years, Rose handled health care issues first as an outreach director in the Twin Cities and then as a legislative assistant in Washington. Rose approached every challenge with dedication and grace, regardless of whether she was helping a constituent access their Medicare benefits or talking with Minnesota physicians about health care reform proposals or organizing and executing a health care summit. Rose's intelligence, strong Minnesota work ethic, tenacity, and optimism always seemed to ensure success.

During the health reform debate, Rose played a critical role in helping me highlight cost-saving health care delivery models like the Mayo Clinic uses and worked to ensure we reward quality, not quantity, of care. She worked tirelessly to advocate for Minnesota's hospitals, providers, patients, and industries, and that hard work is reflected today as we watch these policies being implemented.

As my legislative director for 3 years, Rose advanced my legislative agenda while successfully managing 12 people and every policy area. My work on consumer safety, transportation, international adoptions, protection of our natural resources and cutting redtape at our Federal agencies all became law under Rose's leadership. Her natural ability, organization, and plain old hard work ensured that my legislative ideas became reality, while crucial events such as the confirmation hearing for Justice Elena Kagan were a success.

Rose has been a remarkable chief of staff. She is a natural leader who quickly adapts to any situation, no matter how large or small. Her enthusiasm has been a motivating force in my office, and her compassion toward the people of Minnesota and understanding of the problems they face has been instrumental to my ability to serve them in the Senate.

Rose Baumann—a proud native of St. Louis Park, MN—will soon begin a new professional adventure with new challenges, and I have no doubt that she will succeed. She is also getting married later this year, and I am so happy to see her so excited about this new phase of her life.

Mr. President, I hope you will join me as I say thank you to Rose Baumann for her 9 remarkable years of service to my office, the Senate, the people of the State of Minnesota, and the United States of America.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TENNESSEE NISSAN STORY

• Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of my remarks at the Nissan plant in Smyrna, Tennessee earlier this week.

TENNESSEE NISSAN STORY

Thank you Randy, Gov. Haslam, Mr. Martin, ladies and gentlemen of Nissan.

When Randy invited me, he suggested I tell a little history of the Tennessee Nissan story in 5 minutes. And I am delighted to have that opportunity, and I would like to do it by putting a few human faces on the story that is usually told in cars and trucks and dollars and cents. And the best face is the one that Randy told me of his mother.

I remember sitting up with her one night and the boys had gone to their rooms, and she said to me she was sad. And I said, ''Why would you be sad?'' She said, ''Because I've got smart boys and they will never find a job around here, and I will never see my grandchildren.'' Well as Randy said, two years later, here came Nissan.

There were many faces that had to do with the history of this company in the last 35 years. One was President Jimmy Carter. Two months after I was elected, I was at a White House dinner, and he said, ''Governors, go to Japan. Persuade the Japanese to make in the United States what they sell in the United States.'' And at that time, Nissan made no cars and trucks in the United States, and Tennessee had almost no auto jobs.

So I took a photograph of the United States at night, taken at night from a satellite, to see Mr. Kawamata, the Chairman of Nissan. I showed it to him. He said exactly where is Tennessee? I said right in the middle of the lights, which is where you want to be if you're building a plant with lots of heavy things that you want to ship around the country.

I thought Tennessee and Japan were a perfect match. They had no cars here, and we had almost no auto jobs here.

In Detroit in 1980 at the Republican Convention, the country was in a recession. Everybody was gloomy. As I looked around at all the gloomy faces, I said, ''You guys have so much more money than we do. You've got higher teacher salaries. You've got better universities. You have all these things because you've got the auto industry.''

So I skipped a meeting with Ronald Reagan, came home to meet with Takashi Ishihara, the CEO of Nissan. He was a big bluff chief executive. He knew exactly the depth of the lock in Dickson County. And he knew he wanted 400 acres in Rutherford County, where the McClary's had a farm. So one of the faces of Nissan was sitting on the back porch with the McClary family, they were in their 70's, and persuading them to sell their farm to Nissan and then Mr. Ishihara wanted to get the next 400 acres, which was owned by Maymee Cantrell. She wouldn't sell because she promised her tenant farmer that he could live there for his whole life. And she said, ''I am a woman of my word.'' We found 400 acres in Williamson County for her tenant farmer to live on, so Maymee could be a woman of her word and Mr. Ishihara got 800 acres, which you have about filled up, 35 years later.

The faces of Nissan include Marvin Runyon and the Ford team that came from Detroit to a different part of the country to start from scratch in a new environment. They knew they didn't have another advantage. That every state north of Tennessee did not have a Right To Work law, and if they could

work in the environment in which they could be competitive.

The faces of Nissan include the 300 Middle Tennesseans, who never once built a car who went to Japan and spent several weeks learning to build cars the Nissan way. It includes the governors, the local officials, and the legislatures who for 35 years, whether Republican or Democrat, have kept a consistent level of support for an environment that permits the workers of Nissan to produce quality products. It includes the faces of employees at places like Calsonic which was the first tier-one supplier, but now there are hundreds of them in 80 counties across this state, the wealth of Nissan, the family incomes, don't just belong in Middle Tennessee.

And, more than anything else, it includes the men and women of Nissan. It includes you. Those of you who proved early on that Tennesseans could not only build cars and trucks as of a high quality as those in Japan, but could build them better and produce the most efficient auto plant anywhere in North America.

So, look at those 35 years. Look at how Nissan has transformed Tennessee. Tennessee had almost no auto jobs. Today, one-third of its jobs in manufacturing are auto jobs. Then, Tennessee was the third poorest state. Today, Tennessee's family incomes have grown rapidly. Then, Nissan made no cars and trucks in the United States. Today, 85% of what it sells in the United States, it makes in North America.

But, the real story of Nissan and its transformation of Tennessee is the story of the faces of Nissan.

There's no better or more memorable face for me than the face of Lillian, sitting there late one evening in Melton 37 years ago saying that she was afraid that her boys who were talented would never have a chance to get a job around here, and she would never be able to see her grandchildren.

Think how proud she would be today.

Thank you.●

TRIBUTE TO STEVE PITTS

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate Steve Pitts on his retirement after over 35 years of service to the Reno Police Department. It gives me great pleasure to recognize his years of hard work and dedication to creating a safe environment in the local Reno community.

Mr. Pitts stands as a shining example of someone who has devoted his life to serving his State. He earned his bachelor's degree in organizational studies from California State University, Long Beach, and later pursued his master's in public administration from Golden Gate University. He is also a graduate of the National Academy at the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Leadership Program at the Center for Public Leadership at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, and the Naval Postgraduate School Homeland Security Program. His career in police services began in the early 1980s, building all the way to the top of the department in 2011. Mr. Pitts dedicated his work to major case and homicide investigations, emergency management, and crisis intervention. He also built upon his skills in special weapons and tactics over a span of 25 years, as well as gained command-level experience for over 15 years of his career. His unwavering work ethic is commendable, and his undeniable concern for the Reno community is greatly respected.

During his tenure, Mr. Pitts was promoted to deputy chief in January of 2008. He then served as interim police chief from March 2010 until March 2011, at which point he accepted the permanent position of police chief. As the leading voice of the police department, Mr. Pitts emphasized the importance of moving the organization toward what best benefitted the community. His positive legacy will be felt for years to come.

It is the brave men and women who serve in the local police department who keep our communities safe. These heroes selflessly put their lives on the line every day. I extend my deepest gratitude to Mr. Pitts for his courageous contributions to the people of Reno and to the Silver State. His sacrifice and courage earn him a place among the outstanding men and women who have valiantly put their lives on the line to benefit others.

Mr. Pitts has demonstrated professionalism, commitment to excellence, and dedication to the highest standards of the Reno Police Department. I am both humbled and honored by his service and am proud to call him a fellow Nevadan. Today I ask all of my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. Pitts on his retirement, and I give my deepest appreciation for all that he has done to make Nevada a safer place. I offer him my best wishes for many successful and fulfilling years to come.●

RECOGNIZING WESTCARE FOUNDATION

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today, I wish to recognize WestCare Foundation, WestCare, for its commitment to providing important services to Nevadans across the State and specifically for its dedication to our veterans, military servicemembers, and their families. WestCare offers programs to help with substance use disorders, mental health disorders, domestic violence, sexual assault, homelessness, criminal justice, and HIV and AIDS, and provides additional youth and veteran-specific programs. The foundation is located throughout the State, including campuses in Las Vegas and Pahrump, as well as centers offering specific services in Reno and Las Vegas. Its commitment to improving lives across Nevada does not go without notice.

WestCare's veteran programs include assistance in transitional living and case management and offer support to veterans' and active military members' families. The foundation recognizes the increasing diversity of our veteran population and works to accommodate this change. The transitional living program provides separate facilities for both male and female veterans, as well as for their children. As our Nation's military continues to adapt to a new force, it is particularly important services offered also adapt to reflect these changes. There are countless distinguished women veterans who have made sacrifices beyond measure and deserve nothing but the best treatment and services that address specific female needs. I commend WestCare for its commitment in accommodating all veterans and their individual needs.

WestCare also helps the families of those who have so bravely defended our freedoms. All too often, returning veterans and their families struggle with financial uncertainty. The foundation is a positive light in the Nevada community, working to change this reality by providing families with supportive services in times of need. Westcare stands as a shining example of an organization that has gone above and beyond to positively impact the lives of our heroes. It is important we thank not only the brave men and women that protect our freedom but also their families making so many sacrifices.

As a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I know the struggles that our veterans face after returning home from the battlefield. Congress has a responsibility not only to honor these brave individuals but also to ensure they receive the quality care they have earned and deserve. I remain committed to upholding this promise for our veterans and servicemembers in Nevada and throughout the Nation. I am very pleased that veterans service foundations, like WestCare, are committed to ensuring the needs of our veterans are met.

Today, I ask my colleagues and all Nevadans to join me in recognizing WestCare Foundation, an organization with a mission that is both noble and charitable. I am humbled and honored to recognize WestCare for its tireless efforts in helping our veteran community, and I wish it the best of luck in all of its future endeavors.●

GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS 125th ANNIVERSARY

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, today I rise to pay special tribute to the General Federation of Women's Clubs. This year is very special as they celebrate their 125th anniversary tomorrow, April 24.

The General Federation of Women's Clubs is an international women's organization dedicated to community improvement by enhancing the lives of others through volunteer service. It was founded in 1890 when Jane Cunningham Croly, a professional journalist, attempted to attend a dinner in New York City honoring British novelist Charles Dickens. Croly was denied admittance based on her gender. In response, she formed a woman's club for the purpose of educating women. In 1889, Jane Croly invited women's clubs throughout the United States to pursue the cause of a federation by attending a national convention. On April 24,

1890, 63 clubs officially formed the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

I am very proud to recognize a third-generation clubwoman, Babs J. Condon from Westminster, MD, as the 2014–2016 International President of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. And, I am very pleased that the 2016 international convention will be held in Baltimore next June. For the record, there are 34 clubs in Maryland and almost 1,500 club members statewide.

By ''Living the Volunteer Spirit'', clubwomen transform lives each day, not simply with monetary donations, but with hands-on, tangible projects that provide immediate impact. With nearly 90,000 members in affiliated clubs in every State, the District of Columbia, and more than a dozen countries, GFWC members work in their own communities to support the arts, preserve natural resources, advance education, promote healthy lifestyles, encourage civic engagement, and support international efforts to feed the hungry, encourage immunizations and impact other lifesaving and economic development initiatives.

GFWC history includes many powerful examples such as advocacy for child labor laws, promotion of nationwide outreach that led to passage of the Pure Food and Drug Act, and working to pass the Violence Against Women Act.

GFWC has been instrumental in shaping our Nation. As it celebrates a history of 125 years, let's hope they continue to build upon their traditions and pave the way for a future filled with even greater success through volunteerism.●

TRIBUTE TO FORREST COLE

● Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I call the Senate's attention to the forthcoming retirement of U.S. Forest Service official Forrest Cole, who for the past 12 years has served as the supervisor of the Nation's largest National Forest, and probably unfortunately its most controversial one, the 16.9-million acre Tongass National Forest in southeast Alaska.

Mr. Cole, a four-decade employee of the U.S. Forest Service, began his career, following receipt of a bachelor of science degree in forestry from Northern Arizona University, working on fire-related jobs in Arizona forests. In 1979 he began what he thought at the time would be a 2-year posting working in the Tongass forest in southeast Alaska, a forest that covers an area just slightly larger than the State of West Virginia. The Coles, however, found the beauty, wildlife, and resources of southeast Alaska too attractive to leave, and the family stayed. Over the past 36 years, Mr. Cole has served as the presale forester and small sales forester on the Petersburg Ranger District in the central Tongass; as timber management assistant on the Juneau/Yakutat Ranger Districts in the northern Tongass; as the timber minerals, special uses management assistant on the Juneau Ranger District; as the timber and fire management staff officer and resources staff officer on the Stikine administrative area, and later as the Forest and Fire Management staff officer for the entire Tongass National Forest based in the southern Tongass in Ketchikan.

Mr. Cole also served in the regional office as director of forest management, and as part of the planning team for the Tongass land management plan, with responsibility for the timber, vegetation, and subsistence programs in all of southeast Alaska—the land plan being the key document that guides all activities in the forest. In 2003 he was named as the forest supervisor for the Tongass, a key supervisory post, second only to the Regional Forester.

Mr. Cole during his years in Alaska has been in the midst of many controversial issues such as of how much timber should be allowed for harvest; how to protect wolves and goshawks, bald eagles, salmon and bear while harvesting timber; and how to provide the recreation that Americans increasingly demand. Mr. Cole arrived in Alaska the year before Congress passed the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, ANILCA, that cut the allowable timber harvest in the Tongass by several hundred percent, from 1.35 billion board feet a year—a level that was considered its biological, sustainable yield level when modern timber harvesting began in the 1950s—to 450 million board feet that mandated by Congress in 1980. A decade later he was involved in implementing the next Tongass timber ''reform'' bill that once again nearly cut the forest's allowable timber forest in half, creating another six areas of wilderness, and designating another 12 new areas as congressionally protected lands, bringing to 6.48 million acres the amount of the Tongass protected from development.

As forest supervisor, Mr. Cole was required to implement the national Inventoried Roadless Area rule last decade that took another 9.5 million acres of the Tongass out of the timber base. And just this year, with passage last December of the Sealaska Native Corporation final land conveyance act, Mr. Cole has started the process of revising what lands will remain in the region's slimming federal timber base. He has had to wrestle with how to guide the timber industry's survival given that only 1.8 percent of the Tongass is still ''open'' to the harvesting of older-growth trees—80 percent of them having been permanently protected, and how to manage guiding, recreation, tourism, utility and infrastructure access and development in a forest that stretches 500 miles from near Ketchikan to Yakutat.

More than any other individual Mr. Cole has been a referee between many forces. And I know it can't have been a pleasant experience implementing policy set by Congress and the executive branch, more than 3,000 miles away. It has been a hard, often thankless job managing the Tongass. I wish to publicly thank Mr. Cole for his tireless service to America in doing that job well. We have not always agreed, but I truly appreciate that he has labored long and hard to be fair. He has listened to all sides. Given the legal, political and budgetary mandates he has faced, he deserves all of our thanks for all of the difficult phone calls he has returned, all of the complaints he has patiently fielded, and for all of the tough decisions he has been forced to make. It is no wonder that Mr. Cole was the recipient of the 2008 Regional Forester Award. He deserves the gratitude of the entire Senate for doing his best to meet all of the competing demands Americans make of our national forests. And I personally thank him for his contributions and commitment to public land stewardship, community stability and for keeping the public's trust in one of America's most hotly contested regions. I think it demonstrates his love and concern for Alaska and the Tongass that he and his family are choosing to retire in Petersburg, AK. I wish him and his family well.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 9:33 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:

S. 535. An act to promote energy efficiency.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

At 12:52 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. 1195. An act to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to establish advisory boards, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1195. An act to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to establish advisory boards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 23, 2015, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 535. An act to promote energy efficiency.

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–1362. A communication from the Associate General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1363. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department of Defense's Evaluation of the TRICARE Program for fiscal year 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1364. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revisions to the Export Administration Regulations Based on the 2014 Missile Technology Control Regime Plenary Agreements'' (RIN0694–AG41) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 20, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1365. A communication from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Submission of Credit Card Agreements Under the Truth in Lending Act'' ((RIN3170–AA50) (Docket No. CFPB–2015–0006)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1366. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Removal of Transferred OTS Regulations Regarding Rules of Practice and Procedure and Amendments to FDIC Rules and Regulations'' (RIN3064–AE08) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 20, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1367. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Yemen that was originally declared in Executive Order 13611 on May 16, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1368. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Burma that was declared in Executive Order 13047 of May 20, 1997; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1369. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the stabilization of Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 13303 of May 22, 2003; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1370. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Stemme AG Gliders'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–0633)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1371. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Resources of the South Atlantic; 2015–2016 Recreational Fishing Season for Black Sea Bass'' (RIN0648–XD828) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1372. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pollock in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands'' (RIN0648–XD846) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1373. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Determination of Housing Cost Amounts Eligible for Exclusion or Deduction for 2015'' (Notice 2015–33) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 20, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1374. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a strategy for Support for Russia Democracy and Civil Society Organizations; a strategy for Assistance to Civil Society in Ukraine; and a strategy for Anticipated Defense Articles, Defense Services, and Training to Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1375. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to overseas surplus property; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1376. 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 14–148); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1377. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Financial Report for the Prescription Drug User Fee Act (PDUFA) for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1378. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Performance Report for fiscal year 2014 for the Prescription Drug User Fee Act (PDUFA); to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1379. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law the Food and Drug Administration's (FDA) annual report on Drug Shortages for Calendar Year 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1380. A communication from the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts and a Member of the Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on the Arts and Artifacts Indemnity Program for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1381. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Justice's Office of Justice Programs Annual Report to Congress for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1382. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on applications made by the Government for authority to conduct electronic surveillance for foreign intelligence during calendar year 2014 relative to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1383. A communication from the Chief Impact Analyst, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Driving Distance Eligibility for the Veterans Choice Program'' (RIN2900–AP24) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 22, 2015; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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–17. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of North Dakota urging the United States Congress to call for a constitutional convention for the sole purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which requires a balanced federal budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 3015

Whereas, Article V of the Constitution of the United States mandates that upon the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the states, Congress shall call a convention for proposing amendments; and

Whereas, this application is to be considered as covering the balanced budget amendment language of the presently outstanding balanced budget applications from other states; and

Whereas, this application shall be aggregated for the purpose of attaining the two-thirds necessary to require the calling of a convention for proposing a balanced budget amendment, but shall not be aggregated with any applications on any other subject; and

Whereas, this application is a continuing application until the legislatures of at least two-thirds of the states have made applications on the same subject; and

Whereas, the North Dakota Legislative Assembly deems an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring a balanced federal budget to be necessary for the good of the American people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of North Dakota, the Senate concurring therein:

That the Sixty-fourth Legislative Assembly urges the Congress of the United States to call a convention of the states limited to proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring that in the absence of a national emergency the total of all federal appropriations made by the Congress for any fiscal year may not exceed the total of all estimated federal revenues for that fiscal year, together with any related and appropriate fiscal restraints; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State forward copies of this resolution to the President and Secretary of the Senate and the Speaker and Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress, to each member

of the United States Congressional Delegation, and also to transmit copies to the presiding officers of each of the legislative houses in the United States, requesting their cooperation.

POM–18. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of Rockland County, New York, calling for the United States Department of Transportation to immediately turn its attention to increasing the strictness of the regulations that govern rail transport of hazardous liquids; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ISAKSON, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

Report to accompany H.R. 203, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of annual evaluations of mental health care and suicide prevention programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114–34).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Sally Quillian Yates, of Georgia, to be Deputy Attorney General.

Kara Farnandez Stoll, of Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit.

Roseann A. Ketchmark, of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Missouri.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 1064. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with regard to research on asthma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 1065. A bill to amend title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants for the development of asthma management plans and the purchase of asthma inhalers and spacers for emergency use, as necessary; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. 1066. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage, as supplies associated with the injection of insulin, of containment, removal, decontamination and disposal of home-generated needles, syringes, and other sharps through a sharps container, decontamination/destruction device, or sharps-by-mail program or similar program under part D of the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1067. A bill to require the periodic review and automatic termination of Federal regulations; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 1068. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to protect the bulk-power system from cyber security threats; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1069. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for qualified conservation contributions which include National Scenic Trails; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 1070. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for clarification regarding the children to whom entitlement to educational assistance may be transferred under Post-9/11 Educational Assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. CORKER):

S. 1071. A bill to amend the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 to expand the amount available for victims of child abuse, sexual assault, domestic violence, and other crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. COONS):

S. 1072. A bill to require the Supreme Court of the United States to promulgate a code of ethics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. WARNER, Mr. COATS, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1073. A bill to amend the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012, including making changes to the Do Not Pay initiative, for improved detection, prevention, and recovery of improper payments to deceased individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 1074. A bill to clarify the status of the North Country, Ice Age, and New England National Scenic Trails as units of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 1075. A bill to strengthen and extend the authorization of appropriations for the Carol M. White Physical Education Program and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1076. A bill to require mobile service providers and smartphone manufacturers to give consumers the ability to remotely delete data from smartphones and render smartphones inoperable; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. HATCH):

S. 1077. A bill to provide for expedited development of and priority review for breakthrough devices; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HEINRICH:

S. 1078. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to carry out programs and activities that connect people in the United States, especially children, youth, and families, with the outdoors; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 1079. A bill to amend titles XI and XVIII of the Social Security Act and title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to improve coverage for colorectal screening tests under Medicare and private health insurance coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 1080. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to limit the jurisdiction of Federal courts to consider cases involving same-sex marriage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 1081. A bill to end the use of body-gripping traps in the National Wildlife Refuge System; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 1082. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or misconduct, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. REED, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1083. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require drug manufacturers to provide drug rebates for drugs dispensed to low-income individuals under the Medicare prescription drug benefit program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 1084. A bill to promote transparency by permitting the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board to allow its disciplinary proceedings to be open to the public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. COONS):

S. 1085. A bill to expand eligibility for the program of comprehensive assistance for family caregivers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to expand benefits available to participants under such program, to enhance special compensation for members of the uniformed services who require assistance in everyday life, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S.J. Res. 12. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to marriage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL:

S.J. Res. 13. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to applying laws equally to the citizens of the United States and the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 148. A resolution condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants

on Human Rights; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Res. 149. A resolution recognizing the importance and inspiration of the Hubble Space Telescope; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. Res. 150. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate about the importance of effective civic and government education programs in schools in the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. Res. 151. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Safe Digging Month; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 71

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 71, a bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects.

S. 155

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 155, a bill to promote freedom, fairness, and economic opportunity by repealing the income tax and other taxes, abolishing the Internal Revenue Service, and enacting a national sales tax to be administered primarily by the States.

S. 223

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 223, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a pilot program on awarding grants for provision of furniture, household items, and other assistance to homeless veterans to facilitate their transition into permanent housing, and for other purposes.

S. 248

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 248, a bill to clarify the rights of Indians and Indian tribes on Indian lands under the National Labor Relations Act.

S. 299

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) were added as cosponsors of S. 299, a bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba.

S. 311

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 311, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students.

S. 330

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 330, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions, and for other purposes.

S. 338

At the request of Mr. BURR, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. 338, a bill to permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

S. 398

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 398, a bill to amend the Department of Veterans Affairs Health Care Programs Enhancement Act of 2001 and title 38, United States Code, to require the provision of chiropractic care and services to veterans at all Department of Veterans Affairs medical centers and to expand access to such care and services, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 398, supra.

S. 471

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 471, a bill to improve the provision of health care for women veterans by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 553

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors 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. 571

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 571, a bill to amend the Pilot's Bill of Rights to facilitate appeals and to apply to other certificates issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, to require the revision of the third class medical certification regulations issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 578

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 586

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 586, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to foster more effective implementation and coordination of clinical care for people with pre-diabetes, diabetes, and the chronic diseases and conditions that result from diabetes.

S. 590

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 590, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act to combat campus sexual violence, and for other purposes.

S. 609

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 609, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and increase the exclusion for benefits provided to volunteer firefighters and emergency medical responders.

S. 613

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 613, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the efficiency of summer meals.

S. 615

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 615, a bill to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 615, supra.

S. 619

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 619, a bill to include among the principal trade negotiating objectives of the United States regarding commercial partnerships trade negotiating objectives with respect to discouraging activity that discourages, penalizes, or otherwise limits commercial relations with Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 696

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 696, a bill to increase the number and percentage of students who graduate from high school college and career ready with the ability to use knowledge to solve complex problems, think critically, communicate effectively, collaborate with others, and develop academic mindsets, and for other purposes.

S. 729

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 729, a bill to amend title 11, United States Code, with respect to certain exceptions to discharge in bankruptcy.

S. 857

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 857, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of an initial comprehensive care plan for Medicare beneficiaries newly diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, and for other purposes.

S. 862

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 862, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 865

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 865, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the disability compensation evaluation procedure of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for veterans with mental health conditions related to military sexual trauma, and for other purposes.

S. 875

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 875, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to strengthen equal pay requirements.

S. 883

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 883, a bill to facilitate the reestablishment of domestic, critical mineral designation, assessment, production, manufacturing, recycling, analysis, forecasting, workforce, education, and research capabilities in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 890

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 890, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the Land and Water Conservation Fund to maximize the effectiveness of the Fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 898

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 898, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of optometrists in the National Health Service Corps scholarship and loan repayment programs, and for other purposes.

S. 925

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 925, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to convene a panel of citizens to make a recommendation to the Secretary regarding the likeness of a woman on the twenty dollar bill, and for other purposes.

S. 933

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 933, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act with respect to the timing of elections and pre-election hearings and the identification of pre-election issues, and to require that lists of employees eligible to vote in organizing elections be provided to the National Labor Relations Board.

S. 950

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 950, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a refundable adoption tax credit.

S. 957

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 957, a bill to increase access to capital for veteran entrepreneurs to help create jobs.

S. 966

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 966, a bill to extend the low-interest refinancing provisions under the Local Development Business Loan Program of the Small Business Administration.

S. 967

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 967, a bill to require the Small Business Administration to make information relating to lenders making covered loans publicly available, and for other purposes.

S. 974

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 974, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit employment of children in tobacco-related agriculture by deeming such employment as oppressive child labor.

S. 993

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 993, a bill to increase public safety by facilitating collaboration among the criminal justice, juvenile justice, veterans treatment services, mental health treatment, and substance abuse systems.

S. 1000

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1000, a bill to strengthen resources for entrepreneurs by improving the SCORE program, and for other purposes.

S. 1001

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1001, a bill to establish authorization levels for general business loans for fiscal years 2015 and 2016.

S. 1016

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1016, a bill to preserve freedom and choice in health care.

S. 1032

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1032, a bill to expand the use of E-Verify, to hold employers accountable, and for other purposes.

S. 1056

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1056, a bill to eliminate racial profiling by law enforcement, and for other purposes.

S. 1057

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1057, a bill to promote geothermal energy, and for other purposes.

S. 1060

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1060, a bill to improve the Federal Pell Grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 1061

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1061, a bill to improve the Federal Pell Grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 1062

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1062, a bill to improve the Federal Pell Grant program, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 10

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 10, a concurrent resolution supporting the designation of the year of 2015 as the ''International Year of Soils'' and supporting locally led soil conservation.

S. RES. 140

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 140, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the 100th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 1070. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for clarification regarding the children to whom entitlement to educational assistance may be transferred under Post-9/11 Educational Assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1070

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 ''GI Education Benefit Fairness Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. CLARIFICATION REGARDING THE CHILDREN TO WHOM ENTITLEMENT TO EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE MAY BE TRANSFERRED UNDER POST-9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 3319 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(c) ELIGIBLE DEPENDENTS.—

''(1) TRANSFER.—An individual approved to transfer an entitlement to educational assistance under this section may transfer the individual's entitlement as follows:

''(A) To the individual's spouse.

''(B) To one or more of the individual's children.

''(C) To a combination of the individuals referred to in subparagraphs (A) and (B).

''(2) DEFINITION OF CHILDREN.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'children' includes dependents described in section 1072(2)(I) of title 10.''.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to educational assistance payable under chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code, before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 1079. A bill to amend titles XI and XVIII of the Social Security Act and title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to improve coverage for colorectal screening tests under Medicare and private health insurance coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Supporting Colorectal Examination and Education Now, SCREEN, Act. This legislation promotes access to colorectal cancer screenings in an effort to help prevent colorectal cancer and save lives.

Colorectal cancer affects far too many Americans. The American Cancer Society, ACS, estimates that 1 in 18 Americans will be diagnosed with colorectal cancer in 2015, totaling an estimated 133,000 new cases. Colorectal cancer is expected to take the lives of nearly 50,000 Americans in 2015, making it the second leading cause of cancer deaths in this country.

Fortunately, colorectal cancer is also highly preventable, and colorectal cancer screening tests rank among the most effective preventive screenings available. Colonoscopy screenings are different from other types of preventive or screening services because precancerous polyps found during a screening can be removed during the same visit, before they progress to colorectal cancer. Early detection and intervention are key to preventing colon cancer. A 2012 study in the New England Journal of Medicine found that removal of precancerous polyps during a screening colonoscopy may prevent up to 53 percent of colorectal cancer deaths.

The need to address barriers to colorectal cancer screening, particularly in the Medicare population, is clear. The Medicare population makes up approximately two-thirds of all new cases of colorectal cancer. However, according to the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Service, CMS, only about half of Medicare beneficiaries have had a colorectal cancer screening test, and less than two-thirds of Medicare-aged adults are up to date with recommended screenings. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC, American Cancer Society, ACS, American College of Gastroenterology, ACG, and more than 200 national, State and local organizations have committed to work toward eliminating colorectal cancer through a national goal of screening 80 percent of eligible adults in the United States for colorectal cancer by 2018.

Currently, Medicare waives cost-sharing for colorectal cancer screenings recommended by the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force, USPSTF, including screening colonoscopies. However, if the doctor finds and removes a pre-cancerous polyp during a screening colonoscopy, the procedure is no longer considered a ''screening'' by Medicare, and the beneficiary is required to pay the Medicare coinsurance. Because it is impossible to know in advance whether polyps will be found and removed during a screening colonoscopy, Medicare beneficiaries do not know whether the procedure will be fully covered until it is over. In February 2013, the administration announced that private insurers participating in State-based health insurance exchanges are required to waive all cost-sharing for screening colonoscopies during which a polyp is removed. Similarly, the SCREEN Act would waive Medicare's cost-sharing requirement for screening colonoscopies during which polyps are removed in order to prevent the development of colorectal cancer. In addition, the SCREEN Act would waive cost-sharing for follow-up colonoscopies necessary to complete the ''screening continuum'' following a positive finding from another recommended colorectal cancer screening test.

The SCREEN Act also seeks to improve coordination of care and promote other important age-based recommended screenings for Medicare beneficiaries, such as Hepatitis C virus, HCV, screening, by creating a demonstration project. The demonstration project would allow reimbursement for an office visit or consultation so that a Medicare beneficiary may sit down and discuss the screening with a doctor prior to the colonoscopy procedure. According to the National Institutes of Health, ''fear of the procedure itself'' is a barrier to increasing colorectal cancer screening utilization rates. This pre-procedure visit would allow providers to allay patient anxiety about the procedure, address any questions related to the colonoscopy, assess the patient's family history and risk factors for developing colorectal cancer, and educate the patient about the importance of following the pre-procedure instructions. In addition, this visit would provide an opportunity to educate Medicare beneficiaries about the importance of HCV screening. The CDC and the United States Preventive Services Task Force recommend a one-time HCV screening for all individuals born between 1945 and 1965, and a recent study suggests offering the HCV screening in connection with colonoscopies may be an effective means of increasing HCV screening rates.

Finally, the SCREEN Act would provide incentives for Medicare providers to participate in nationally recognized quality improvement registries to ensure that Medicare beneficiaries are receiving the quality screening they deserve.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the SCREEN Act, in order to help prevent colorectal cancer and save lives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1079

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Supporting Colorectal Examination and

Education Now Act of 2015'' or the ''SCREEN Act of 2015''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Findings.
Sec. 3. Maintaining calendar year 2015 Medicare reimbursement rates for colonoscopy procedures for providers participating in colorectal cancer screening quality improvement registry.
Sec. 4. Eliminating Medicare beneficiary cost-sharing for certain colorectal cancer screenings, colorectal cancer screenings with therapeutic effect, and follow-up diagnostic colorectal cancer screenings covered under Medicare.
Sec. 5. Medicare demonstration project to evaluate the effectiveness of a pre-operative visit prior to screening colonoscopy and hepatitis C screening.
Sec. 6. Budget neutrality.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Colorectal cancer is the second leading cause of cancer death among men and women combined in the United States.

(2) In 2015, more than 130,000 Americans will be diagnosed with colorectal cancer, and nearly 50,000 Americans are expected to die from it.

(3) Approximately 60 percent of colorectal cancer cases and 70 percent of colorectal cancer deaths occur in those aged 65 and older.

(4) Colorectal cancer screening colonoscopies allow for the detection and removal of polyps before they progress to colorectal cancer, as well as early detection of colorectal cancer when treatment can be most effective.

(5) According to a 2012 study published in the New England Journal of Medicine, removing precancerous polyps through colonoscopy could reduce the number of colorectal cancer deaths by 53 percent.

(6) Although colorectal cancer is highly preventable with appropriate screening, one in three adults between the ages of 50 and 75 years are not up to date with recommended colorectal cancer screening.

(7) Over 200 organizations have committed to eliminating colorectal cancer as a major health problem in the United States and are working toward a shared goal of screening 80 percent of eligible Americans by 2018.

(8) Hepatitis C is a liver disease that causes inflammation of the liver and results from infection with the Hepatitis C virus. Chronic Hepatitis C infection can lead to serious health problems, including liver damage, cirrhosis, and liver cancer. It is the leading cause of liver transplants in the United States.

(9) According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), more than 75 percent of adults infected with the Hepatitis C virus in the United States were born between 1945 and 1965.

(10) The CDC estimates that up to 75 percent of individuals with Hepatitis C do not know that they are infected.

(11) The CDC and the United States Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) recommend a one-time screening for Hepatitis C for all individuals born between 1945 and 1965.

(12) A recent study suggests that offering Hepatitis C screening to patients in connection with screening colonoscopies may be an effective means of increasing Hepatitis C screening rates among individuals born between 1945 and 1965.

SEC. 3. MAINTAINING CALENDAR YEAR 2015 MEDICARE REIMBURSEMENT RATES FOR COLONOSCOPY PROCEDURES FOR PROVIDERS PARTICIPATING IN COLORECTAL CANCER SCREENING QUALITY IMPROVEMENT REGISTRY.

Section 1834(d)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m(d)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(F) MAINTAINING CALENDAR YEAR 2015 REIMBURSEMENT RATES FOR QUALIFYING CANCER SCREENING TESTS FURNISHED BY QUALIFYING PROVIDERS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—With respect to a qualifying cancer screening test furnished during each of 2016, 2017, and 2018, by a qualifying provider, the amount of payment to such provider for such test under section 1833 or section 1848 shall be equal to the amount of payment for such test under such section 1833 or 1848 during 2015.

''(ii) QUALIFYING CANCER SCREENING TEST.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'qualifying cancer screening test' means an optical screening colonoscopy (as described in section 1861(pp)(1)(C)).

''(iii) QUALIFYING PROVIDER DEFINED.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'qualifying provider' means, with respect to a qualifying cancer screening test, an individual or entity—

''(I) that is eligible for payment for such test under section 1833 or section 1848; and

''(II) that—

''(aa) participates in a nationally recognized quality improvement registry with respect to such test; and

''(bb) demonstrates, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, based on the information in such registry, that the tests were provided by such individual or entity in accordance with accepted outcomes-based quality measures.''.

SEC. 4. ELIMINATING MEDICARE BENEFICIARY COST-SHARING FOR CERTAIN COLORECTAL CANCER SCREENINGS, COLORECTAL CANCER SCREENINGS WITH THERAPEUTIC EFFECT, AND FOLLOW-UP DIAGNOSTIC COLORECTAL CANCER SCREENINGS COVERED UNDER MEDICARE.

(a) WAIVER OF COST-SHARING.—Section 1833(a)(1)(Y) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395l(a)(1)(Y)) is amended by inserting '', including colorectal cancer screening tests covered under this part described in section 1861(pp)(1)(C) (regardless of the code that is billed for the establishment of a diagnosis as a result of the screening test, for the removal of tissue or other matter during the screening test, or for a follow-up procedure that is furnished in connection with, or as a result of, the initial screening test)'' after ''or population''.

(b) WAIVER OF APPLICATION OF DEDUCTIBLE.—Section 1833(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395l(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) of the first sentence, by striking ''individual.'' and inserting ''individual, including colorectal cancer screening tests covered under this part described in section 1861(pp)(1)(C)''; and

(2) by striking the last sentence and inserting the following: ''Subsection (a)(1)(Y) and paragraph (1) of the first sentence of this subsection shall apply with respect to a colorectal cancer screening test covered under this part described in section 1861(pp)(1)(C), regardless of the code that is billed for the establishment of a diagnosis as a result of the screening test, for the removal of tissue or other matter during the screening test, or for a follow-up procedure that is furnished in connection with, or as a result of, the initial screening test.''

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to tests and procedures performed on or after January 1, 2016.

SEC. 5. MEDICARE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT TO EVALUATE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF A PRE-OPERATIVE VISIT PRIOR TO SCREENING COLONOSCOPY AND HEPATITIS C SCREENING.

Section 1115A(b)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1315a(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the last sentence of subparagraph (A), by inserting '', and shall include the model described in subparagraph (D)'' before the period at the end; and

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

''(D) MEDICARE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT TO EVALUATE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF A PRE-OPERATIVE VISIT PRIOR TO SCREENING COLONOSCOPY AND HEPATITIS C SCREENING.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The model described in this subparagraph is a demonstration project under title XVIII to evaluate the effectiveness of a pre-operative visit with the provider performing the procedure prior to screening colonoscopy to—

''(I) ease any patient concern or fears with respect to the procedure and answer any questions relating to the screening;

''(II) ensure quality examinations and avoid unnecessary repeat examinations by educating individuals on the importance of following pre-procedure instructions, such as bowel preparation, and addressing the individual's family history of or predisposition to colorectal cancer; and

''(III) increase Hepatitis C Virus (HCV) screening rates among Medicare beneficiaries by educating individuals about the importance of such screening during the pre-operative visit and having the pre-operative visit fulfill the referral requirement for such screening under title XVIII, allowing patients to be screened for colorectal cancer and HCV at the same time.

''(ii) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall consult with stakeholders who would be providing the pre-operative visit under the model described in this subparagraph on the implementation of such model, including payment for services furnished under the model.''.

SEC. 6. BUDGET NEUTRALITY.

(a) ADJUSTMENT OF PHYSICIAN FEE SCHEDULE CONVERSION FACTOR.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (in this section referred to as the ''Secretary'') shall reduce the conversion factor established under subsection (d) of section 1848 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–4) for each year (beginning with 2016) to the extent necessary to reduce expenditures under such section for items and services furnished during the year in the aggregate by the net offset amount determined under subsection (c)(5) attributable to such section for the year.

(b) ADJUSTMENT OF HOPD CONVERSION FACTOR.—The Secretary shall reduce the conversion factor established under paragraph (3)(C) of section 1833(t) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395l(t)) for each year (beginning with 2016) to the extent necessary to reduce expenditures under such section for items and services furnished during the year in the aggregate by the net offset amount determined under subsection (c)(5) attributable to such section for the year.

(c) DETERMINATIONS RELATING TO EXPENDITURES.—For purposes of this section, before the beginning of each year (beginning with 2016) at the time conversion factors described in subsections (a) and (b) are established for the year, the Secretary shall determine—

(1) the amount of the gross additional expenditures under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) estimated to result from the implementation of sections 3 and 4 for items and services furnished during the year;

(2) the amount of any offsetting reductions in expenditures under such title (such as reductions in payments for inpatient hospital

services) for such year attributable to the implementation of such sections;

(3) the amount (if any) by which the amount of the gross additional expenditures determined under paragraph (1) for the year exceeds the amount of offsetting reductions determined under paragraph (2) for the year;

(4) of the gross additional expenditures determined under paragraph (1) for the year that are attributable to expenditures under sections 1848 and 1833(t) of such Act, the ratio of such expenditures that are attributable to each respective section; and

(5) with respect to section 1848 and section 1833(t) of such Act, a net offset amount for the year equal to the product of—

(A) the amount of the net additional expenditures for the year determined under paragraph (3); and

(B) the ratio determined under paragraph (4) attributable to the respective section.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 1084. A bill to promote transparency by permitting the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board to allow its disciplinary proceedings to be open to the public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I am joined by Senator GRASSLEY in reintroducing the PCAOB Enforcement Transparency Act. This bill permits the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board, PCAOB, to make public the disciplinary proceedings it has brought against auditors and audit firms earlier in the process.

Over 10 years ago, our markets were victimized by a series of massive financial reporting frauds, including those involving Enron and WorldCom. These and other public companies had produced fraudulent and materially misleading financial statements, which artificially drove their stock prices up. Once the fraud was discovered, investor confidence plummeted.

In response to this crisis, the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs conducted a series of hearings, which produced consensus on a number of underlying causes, including weak corporate governance, a lack of accountability, and inadequate oversight of accountants charged with auditing public companies' financial statements.

In order to address the gaps and structural weaknesses revealed by the investigation and hearings, the Senate passed the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 in a 99 to 0 vote.

The Sarbanes-Oxley Act ensured that corporate officers were directly accountable for their financial reporting and for the quality of their financial statements. This law also created a strong, independent board, the PCAOB, to oversee the conduct of the auditors of public companies.

The PCAOB is responsible for overseeing auditors of public companies in order to protect investors who rely on independent audit reports on the financial statements of public companies and operates under the oversight of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commissioner, SEC.

To conduct its duties, the PCAOB oversees more than 2,400 registered auditing firms, as well as the thousands of audit partners and staff who contribute to a firm's work on each audit. The Board's ability to commence proceedings to determine whether there have been violations of its auditing standards or rules of professional practice is an important component of its oversight.

However, unlike other oversight bodies, such as the SEC, the U.S. Department of Labor, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission, the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, and others, the Board's disciplinary proceedings are not allowed to be public without consent from the parties involved. Of course, parties subject to disciplinary proceedings have no incentive to consent to publicizing their alleged wrongdoing and thus these proceedings typically remain cloaked behind a veil of secrecy. In addition, the Board's decisions in disciplinary proceedings are not allowed to be publicized until after the complete exhaustion of an appeals process, which can often take several years.

The nonpublic nature of these PCAOB disciplinary proceedings creates a lack of transparency that invites abuse and undermines the Congressional intent behind the establishment of the PCAOB, which was to shine a bright light on auditing firms and practices, and to bolster the accountability of auditors of public companies to the investing public.

Over the last several years, some bad actors have taken advantage of the lack of transparency by using it to shield themselves from public scrutiny and accountability. PCAOB Chairman James Doty has repeatedly stated in testimony provided to both the Senate and House of Representatives over the past two years that the secrecy of the proceedings ''has a variety of unfortunate consequences'' and that such secrecy is harmful to investors, the auditing profession, and the public at large.

In one example, an accounting firm that was subject to a disciplinary proceeding continued to issue no fewer than 29 additional audit reports on public companies without any of those companies knowing about the PCAOB disciplinary proceedings. In other words, investors and the public company clients of that audit firm were deprived of relevant and material information about the proceedings against the firm and the substance of any violations.

There are several reasons why the Board's enforcement proceedings should be open and transparent. First, as I have already noted, the closed proceedings run counter to the public proceedings of other government oversight bodies. Indeed, nearly all administrative proceedings brought by the SEC against those it regulates, including public companies, brokers, dealers, investment advisers, and others, are open, public proceedings. The PCAOB's secret proceedings are not only shielded from the public, but also from Congress, making it difficult, if not impossible, to effectively evaluate the Board's oversight of auditors and audit firms, and its enforcement program.

Second, the incentive to litigate cases in order to continue to shield conduct from public scrutiny as long as possible frustrates the process and requires the expenditure of needless resources by both litigants and the PCAOB.

Third, agencies such as the SEC have found open and transparent disciplinary proceedings to be valuable because they inform peer audit firms of the type of activity that may give rise to enforcement action by the regulator. In effect, transparency of proceedings can serve as a deterrent to misconduct because of a perceived increase in the likelihood of ''getting caught.'' Accordingly, the audit industry as a whole would also benefit from timely, public, and non-secret enforcement proceedings.

Our bill will make hearings by the PCAOB, and all related notices, orders, and motions, transparent and available to the public unless otherwise ordered by the Board. This would more closely align the PCAOB's procedures with those of the SEC for analogous matters.

Increasing the transparency and accountability of audit firms subject to disciplinary proceedings instituted by the PCAOB is a critical component of efforts to bolster and maintain investor confidence in our financial markets, while better protecting companies from problematic auditors.

I hope our colleagues will join Senator GRASSLEY and me in supporting this legislation to enhance transparency in the PCAOB's enforcement process.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 148—CONDEMNING THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN'S STATE-SPONSORED PERSECUTION OF ITS BAHA'I MINORITY AND ITS CONTINUED VIOLATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COVENANTS ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 148

Whereas, in 1982, 1984, 1988, 1990, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2006, 2008, 2009, 2012, and 2013, Congress declared that it deplored the religious persecution by the Government of Iran of the Baha'i community and would hold the Government of Iran responsible for upholding the rights of all Iranian nationals, including members of the Baha'i Faith;

Whereas the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom 2014 Report stated, ''The Baha'i community, the largest

non-Muslim religious minority in Iran, long has been subject to particularly severe religious freedom violations. The government views Baha'is, who number at least 300,000, as 'heretics' and consequently they face repression on the grounds of apostasy.'';

Whereas the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom 2014 Report stated that ''[s]ince 1979, authorities have killed or executed more than 200 Baha'i leaders, and more than 10,000 have been dismissed from government and university jobs'' and ''[m]ore than 700 Baha'is have been arbitrarily arrested since 2005'';

Whereas the Department of State 2013 International Religious Freedom Report stated that the Government of Iran ''prohibits Baha'is from teaching and practicing their faith and subjects them to many forms of discrimination not faced by members of other religious groups'' and ''since the 1979 Islamic Revolution, formally denies Baha'i students access to higher education'';

Whereas the Department of State 2013 International Religious Freedom Report stated, ''The government requires Baha'is to register with the police,'' and ''The government raided Baha'i homes and businesses and confiscated large amounts of private and commercial property, as well as religious materials.'';

Whereas the Department of State 2013 International Religious Freedom Report stated, ''Baha'is are regularly denied compensation for injury or criminal victimization and the right to inherit property.'';

Whereas, on August 27, 2014, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran issued a report (A/69/356), which stated, ''The human rights situation in the Islamic Republic of Iran remains of concern. Numerous issues flagged by the General Assembly, the United Nations human rights mechanisms and the Secretary-General persist, and in some cases appear to have worsened, some recent overtures made by the Administration and the parliament notwithstanding.'';

Whereas, on December 18, 2014, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution (A/RES/69/190), which ''[e]xpresse[d] deep concern'' over ''[c]ontinued discrimination, persecution and human rights violations against persons belonging to unrecognized religious minorities, particularly members of the Baha'i [F]aith. . .and the effective criminalization of membership in the Baha'i [F]aith,'' and called upon the Government of Iran to ''emancipate the Baha'i community. . .and to accord all Baha'is, including those imprisoned because of their beliefs, the due process of law and the rights that they are constitutionally guaranteed'';

Whereas, since May of 2008, the Government of Iran has imprisoned the seven members of the former ad hoc leadership group of the Baha'i community in Iran, known as the Yaran-i-Iran, or ''friends of Iran''—Mrs. Fariba Kamalabadi, Mr. Jamaloddin Khanjani, Mr. Afif Naeimi, Mr. Saeid Rezaie, Mr. Behrouz Tavakkoli, Mrs. Mahvash Sabet, and Mr. Vahid Tizfahm—and these individuals are serving 20-year prison terms, the longest sentences given to any current prisoner of conscience in Iran, on charges including ''spying for Israel, insulting religious sanctities, propaganda against the regime and spreading corruption on earth'';

Whereas, beginning in May 2011, officials of the Government of Iran in 4 cities conducted sweeping raids on the homes of dozens of individuals associated with the Baha'i Institute for Higher Education (BIHE) and arrested and detained several educators associated with BIHE, and 12 BIHE educators are now serving 4- or 5-year prison terms;

Whereas scores of Baha'i cemeteries have been attacked, and, in April 2014, Revolutionary Guards began excavating a Baha'i cemetery in Shiraz, which is the site of 950 graves;

Whereas the Baha'i International Community reported that there has been a recent surge in anti-Baha'i hate propaganda in Iranian state-sponsored media outlets, noting that, in 2010 and 2011, approximately 22 anti-Baha'i articles were appearing every month, and, in 2014, the number of anti-Baha'i articles rose to approximately 401 per month—18 times the previous level;

Whereas there are currently 100 Baha'is in prison in Iran;

Whereas the Government of Iran is party to the International Covenants on Human Rights and is in violation of its obligations under the Covenants; and

Whereas the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–195) authorizes the President and the Secretary of State to impose sanctions on individuals ''responsible for or complicit in, or responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, the commission of serious human rights abuses against citizens of Iran or their family members on or after June 12, 2009'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights;

(2) calls on the Government of Iran to immediately release the 7 imprisoned Baha'i leaders, the 12 imprisoned Baha'i educators, and all other prisoners held solely on account of their religion;

(3) calls on the President and Secretary of State, in cooperation with responsible nations, to immediately condemn the Government of Iran's continued violation of human rights and demand the immediate release of prisoners held solely on account of their religion; and

(4) urges the President and Secretary of State to utilize available authorities, including the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010, to impose sanctions on officials of the Government of Iran and other individuals directly responsible for serious human rights abuses, including abuses against the Baha'i community of Iran.

SENATE RESOLUTION 149—RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE AND INSPIRATION OF THE HUBBLE SPACE TELESCOPE

Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 149

Whereas the launch of the Hubble Space Telescope on April 24, 1990, from the Kennedy Space Center marked a historic moment in space discovery and observation;

Whereas the National Aeronautics and Space Administration designed, built, and placed the Hubble Space Telescope into orbit;

Whereas the Space Shuttle Discovery transported the Hubble Space Telescope on the STS-31 mission and placed the Telescope into orbit at 380 statute miles;

Whereas the crew on the Space Shuttle Discovery consisted of Commander Loren J. Shriver, Pilot Charles F. Bolden, Jr., Mission Specialist Bruce McCandless II, Mission Specialist Kathryn D. Sullivan, and Mission Specialist Steven A. Hawley;

Whereas the Hubble Space Telescope weighed more than 24,000 pounds at launch, currently weighs 27,000 pounds following the final servicing mission in 2009, and measures more than 43 feet in length;

Whereas the Hubble Space Telescope orbits the Earth at 17,000 miles per hour and has completed more than 3,000,000,000 miles of orbit around the Earth;

Whereas the Hubble Space Telescope continues to provide more than 10 Terabytes of data annually and has been heralded as one of the most productive scientific instruments known to man;

Whereas the spirit of discovery, innovation, and exploration is enshrined in the productivity of the Hubble Space Telescope; and

Whereas the Hubble Space Telescope has made significant advancements and discoveries in planetary sciences, cosmology, and galactic sciences: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on the 25th anniversary of the Hubble Space Telescope launch;

(2) recognizes the scientists, crew, engineers, and staff who contributed to the success of the Hubble Space Telescope;

(3) notes the significance of the discoveries and contributions to science of the Hubble Space Telescope as well as the subsequent innovations that were derived from the data collected from the Hubble Space Telescope; and

(4) acknowledges that the Hubble Space Telescope has captured images from and answered questions about space and has inspired generations of young people to go into the fields of science, technology, engineering, mathematics, and research.

SENATE RESOLUTION 150—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE ABOUT THE IMPORTANCE OF EFFECTIVE CIVIC AND GOVERNMENT EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 150

Whereas civic and government education is essential to the preservation and improvement of the constitutional government of the United States;

Whereas civic and government education programs foster understanding of the history and principles of the constitutional government of the United States, including principles that are embodied in certain fundamental documents and speeches, such as the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, the Bill of Rights, the Federalist Papers, the Gettysburg Address, and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s ''I Have a Dream'' speech;

Whereas research shows that too few people in the United States understand basic principles of the constitutional government of the United States, such as the natural rights set forth in the Declaration of Independence, the existence and functions of the 3 branches of the Federal Government, checks and balances, and other concepts fundamental to informed citizenship;

Whereas, since the founding of the United States, schools in the United States have had a strong civic mission to prepare students to be informed, rational, humane, and involved citizens who are committed to the values and principles of the constitutional government of the United States;

Whereas a free society relies on the knowledge, skills, and virtue of the citizens of the

society, particularly the individuals elected to public office to represent the citizens;

Whereas, while many institutions help to develop the knowledge and skills and shape the civic character of people in the United States, schools in the United States, including elementary schools, bear a special and historic responsibility for the development of civic competence and civic responsibility of students;

Whereas student learning is enhanced by well-designed classroom civic and government education programs that—

(1) incorporate instruction in government, history, law, and democracy;

(2) promote discussion of current events and controversial issues;

(3) link community service and the formal curriculum; and

(4) encourage students to participate in simulations of democratic processes; and

Whereas research shows that the knowledge and expertise of teachers are among the most important factors in increasing student achievement: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) civic and government education is essential to the well-being of the constitutional government of the United States;

(2) comprehensive and formal instruction in civic and government education would provide students a basis for understanding the rights and responsibilities of citizens in the constitutional government of the United States;

(3) elementary and secondary schools in the United States are encouraged to offer courses on the history and theories of the constitutional government of the United States, using programs and curricula with a demonstrated effectiveness in fostering civic competence, civic responsibility, and a reasoned commitment to the fundamental values and principles underlying the constitutional government of the United States; and

(4) all teachers of civics and government are well served by having access to adequate opportunities to enrich teaching through professional development programs that enhance the capacity of teachers to provide effective civic and government education in the classroom.

SENATE RESOLUTION 151—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL SAFE DIGGING MONTH

Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. BOOKER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 151

Whereas each year, the underground utility infrastructure of the United States, including pipelines, electric, gas, telecommunications, water, sewer, and cable television lines, is jeopardized by unintentional damage caused by those who fail to have underground lines located prior to digging;

Whereas some utility lines are buried only a few inches underground, making the lines easy to strike, even during shallow digging projects;

Whereas digging prior to locating underground utility lines often results in unintended consequences, such as service interruption, environmental damage, personal injury, and even death;

Whereas the month of April marks the beginning of the peak period during which excavation projects are carried out around the United States;

Whereas in 2002, Congress required the Department of Transportation and the Federal Communications Commission to establish a 3-digit, nationwide, toll-free number to be used by State ''One Call'' systems to provide information on underground utility lines;

Whereas in 2005, the Federal Communications Commission designated ''811'' as the nationwide ''One Call'' number for homeowners and excavators to use to obtain information on underground utility lines before conducting excavation activities;

Whereas ''One Call'' has helped reduce the number of digging damages caused by failure to call before digging from 48 percent in 2004 to 26 percent in 2013;

Whereas the 1,700 members of the Common Ground Alliance, who are dedicated to ensuring public safety, environmental protection, and the integrity of services, promote the national ''Call Before You Dig'' campaign to increase public awareness about the importance of homeowners and excavators calling 811 to find out the exact location of underground lines;

Whereas the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–90; 125 Stat. 1904) affirmed and expanded the ''One Call'' program by eliminating exemptions given to local and State government agencies and their contractors regarding notifying ''One Call'' centers before digging; and

Whereas the Common Ground Alliance has designated April as ''National Safe Digging Month'' to increase awareness of safe digging practices across the United States and to celebrate the anniversary of 811, the national ''Call Before You Dig'' number: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National 3 Safe Digging Month; and

(2) encourages all homeowners and excavators throughout the United States to call 811 before digging.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1132. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1133. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1134. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1135. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1136. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1137. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1138. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1139. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1140. Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1191, supra.

SA 1141. Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1142. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1143. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1144. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1145. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1146. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1147. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. RISCH, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1148. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1149. Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1150. Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1151. Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. COTTON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1152. Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1132. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 26, line 23, strike ''purpose.'' and insert the following: ''purpose; and

''(iii) the President determines Iran's leaders have publically accepted Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state.

SA 1133. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 30, strike line 15 and all that follows through page 34, line 11, and insert the following: ''any such sanctions or facilitate the release of funds or assets to Iran pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (a).

''(4) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING PRESIDENTIAL CONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in paragraph (6), if a joint resolution of disapproval described in subsection (c)(2)(B) passes the Congress, the President may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions or facilitate the release of funds or assets to Iran pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (a) for a period of 12 calendar days following the date of passage of the joint resolution of disapproval.

''(5) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING CONGRESSIONAL RECONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in paragraph (6), if a joint resolution of disapproval described in subsection (c)(2)(B) passes the Congress, and the President vetoes such joint resolution, the President may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions or facilitate the release of funds or assets to Iran pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (a) for a period of 10 calendar days following the date of the President's veto.

''(6) EXCEPTION.—The prohibitions under paragraphs (3) through (5) do not apply to any new deferral, waiver, or other suspension of statutory sanctions pursuant to the Joint Plan of Action if that deferral, waiver, or other suspension is made—

''(A) consistent with the law in effect on the date of the enactment of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015; and

''(B) not later than 45 calendar days before the transmission by the President of an agreement, assessment report, and certification under subsection (a).

''(c) EFFECT OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTION WITH RESPECT TO NUCLEAR AGREEMENTS WITH IRAN.—

''(1) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

''(A) the sanctions regime imposed on Iran by Congress is primarily responsible for bringing Iran to the table to negotiate on its nuclear program;

''(B) these negotiations are a critically important matter of national security and foreign policy for the United States and its closest allies;

''(C) this section does not require a vote by Congress for the agreement to commence;

''(D) this section provides for congressional review, including, as appropriate, for approval, disapproval, or no action on statutory sanctions relief under an agreement; and

''(E) even though the agreement may commence, because the sanctions regime was imposed by Congress and only Congress can permanently modify or eliminate that regime, it is critically important that Congress have the opportunity, in an orderly and deliberative manner, to consider and, as appropriate, take action affecting the statutory sanctions regime imposed by Congress.

''(2) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, action involving any measure of statutory sanctions relief by the United States pursuant to an agreement subject to subsection (a) or the Joint Plan of Action—

''(A) may be taken, consistent with existing statutory requirements for such action, if, during the period for review provided in subsection (b), the Congress adopts, and there is enacted, a joint resolution stating in substance that the Congress does favor the agreement;

''(B) may not be taken if, during the period for review provided in subsection (b), the Congress adopts, and there is enacted, a joint resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not favor the agreement; or

''(C) may be taken, consistent with existing statutory requirements for such action, if, following the period for review provided in subsection (b), there is not enacted any such joint resolution.

''(3) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of this subsection, the phrase ''action involving any measure of statutory sanctions relief by the United States'' shall include waiver, suspension, reduction, or other effort to provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to, Iran or to facilitate the release of funds or assets to Iran under

---

SA 1134. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 26, line 23, strike ''purpose.'' and insert the following: ''purpose; and

''(iii) all United States citizens unjustly detained by Iran, including Jason Rezaian, Amir Hekmati, and Saeed Abedini, have been released from Iranian custody, and the Government of Iran is fully cooperating in efforts to locate Robert Levinson.

SA 1135. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 51, line 2, insert ''and any related agreements, including draft United Nations Security Council resolutions or agreed parameters for such resolutions'' after ''parties''.

SA 1136. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 42, line 7, insert '', and pursuing United Nations consideration of an agreement prior to Congress would undermine the appropriate role of Congress'' after ''Congress''.

SA 1137. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 26, line 23, strike ''purpose.'' and insert the following: ''purpose; and

''(iii) the President determines that no sanctions relief provided under the agreement will be provided from sanctions imposed by Congress or the Executive Branch due to Iran's support for terrorism, its ballistic missile programs, or its human rights abuses against the people of Iran or will undermine the effectiveness of such sanctions.''.

SA 1138. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 9, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

''(7) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS BASED ON DETENTION OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (a) until the Government of Iran releases to the United States the following United States citizens:

''(A) Saeed Abedini of Idaho, who has been detained in Iran on charges related to his religious beliefs since September 2012.

''(B) Amir Hekmati of Michigan, who has been imprisoned in Iran on false espionage charges since August 2011.

''(C) Jason Rezaian of California, who, as an Iranian government credentialed reporter for the Washington Post, has been unjustly held in Iran on vague charges since July 2014.

''(D) Robert Levinson of Florida, who was abducted on Kish Island in March 2007.

SA 1139. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 9, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

''(7) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS BASED ON DETENTION OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (a) until the Government of Iran releases to the United States the following United States citizens:

''(A) Saeed Abedini of Idaho, who has been detained in Iran on charges related to his religious beliefs since September 2012.

''(B) Amir Hekmati of Michigan, who has been imprisoned in Iran on false espionage charges since August 2011.

''(C) Jason Rezaian of California, who, as an Iranian government credentialed reporter for the Washington Post, has been unjustly held in Iran on vague charges since July 2014.

''(D) Robert Levinson of Florida, who was abducted on Kish Island in March 2007.

SA 1140. Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW AND OVERSIGHT OF AGREEMENTS WITH IRAN RELATING TO THE NUCLEAR PROGRAM OF IRAN.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 134 the following new section:

''SEC. 135. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW AND OVERSIGHT OF AGREEMENTS WITH IRAN.

''(a) TRANSMISSION TO CONGRESS OF NUCLEAR AGREEMENTS WITH IRAN AND VERIFICATION ASSESSMENT WITH RESPECT TO SUCH AGREEMENTS.—

''(1) TRANSMISSION OF AGREEMENTS.—Not later than 5 calendar days after reaching an agreement with Iran relating to the nuclear program of Iran, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership—

''(A) the agreement, as defined in subsection (h)(1), including all related materials and annexes;

''(B) a verification assessment report of the Secretary of State prepared under paragraph (2) with respect to the agreement; and

''(C) a certification that—

''(i) the agreement includes the appropriate terms, conditions, and duration of the agreement's requirements with respect to Iran's nuclear activities and provisions describing any sanctions to be waived, suspended, or otherwise reduced by the United States, and any other nation or entity, including the United Nations; and

''(ii) the President determines the agreement meets United States non-proliferation objectives, does not jeopardize the common defense and security, provides an adequate framework to ensure that Iran's nuclear activities permitted thereunder will not be inimical to or constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and ensures that Iran's nuclear activities permitted thereunder will not be used to further any nuclear-related military or nuclear explosive purpose, including for any research on or development of any nuclear explosive device or any other nuclear-related military purpose.

''(2) VERIFICATION ASSESSMENT REPORT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall prepare, with respect to an agreement described in paragraph (1), a report assessing—

''(i) the extent to which the Secretary will be able to verify that Iran is complying with its obligations and commitments under the agreement;

''(ii) the adequacy of the safeguards and other control mechanisms and other assurances contained in the agreement with respect to Iran's nuclear program to ensure Iran's activities permitted thereunder will not be used to further any nuclear-related military or nuclear explosive purpose, including for any research on or development of any nuclear explosive device or any other nuclear-related military purpose; and

''(iii) the capacity and capability of the International Atomic Energy Agency to effectively implement the verification regime required by or related to the agreement, including whether the International Atomic Energy Agency will have sufficient access to investigate suspicious sites or allegations of covert nuclear-related activities and whether it has the required funding, manpower, and authority to undertake the verification regime required by or related to the agreement.

''(B) ASSUMPTIONS.—In preparing a report under subparagraph (A) with respect to an agreement described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall assume that Iran could—

''(i) use all measures not expressly prohibited by the agreement to conceal activities that violate its obligations and commitments under the agreement; and

''(ii) alter or deviate from standard practices in order to impede efforts to verify that Iran is complying with those obligations and commitments.

''(C) CLASSIFIED ANNEX.—A report under subparagraph (A) shall be transmitted in unclassified form, but shall include a classified annex prepared in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, summarizing relevant classified information.

''(3) EXCEPTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Neither the requirements of subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (1), nor subsections (b) through (g) of this section, shall apply to an agreement described in subsection (h)(5) or to the EU–Iran Joint Statement made on April 2, 2015.

''(B) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), any agreement as defined in subsection (h)(1) and any related materials, whether concluded before or after the date of the enactment of this section, shall not be subject to the exception in subparagraph (A).

''(b) PERIOD FOR REVIEW BY CONGRESS OF NUCLEAR AGREEMENTS WITH IRAN.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—During the 30-calendar day period following transmittal by the President of an agreement pursuant to subsection (a), the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives shall, as appropriate, hold hearings and briefings and otherwise obtain information in order to fully review such agreement.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—The period for congressional review under paragraph (1) shall be 60 calendar days if an agreement, including all materials required to be transmitted to Congress pursuant to subsection (a)(1), is transmitted pursuant to subsection (a) between July 10, 2015, and September 7, 2015.

''(3) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING INITIAL CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW PERIOD.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in paragraph (6), prior to and during the period for transmission of an agreement in subsection (a)(1) and during the period for congressional review provided in paragraph (1), including any additional period as applicable under the exception provided in paragraph (2), the President may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (a).

''(4) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING PRESIDENTIAL CONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in paragraph (6), if a joint resolution of disapproval described in subsection (c)(2)(B) passes the Congress, the President may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (a) for a period of 12 calendar days following the date of passage of the joint resolution of disapproval.

''(5) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING CONGRESSIONAL RECONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in paragraph (6), if a joint resolution of disapproval described in subsection (c)(2)(B) passes the Congress, and the President vetoes such joint resolution, the President may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (a) for a period of 10 calendar days following the date of the President's veto.

''(6) EXCEPTION.—The prohibitions under paragraphs (3) through (5) do not apply to any new deferral, waiver, or other suspension of statutory sanctions pursuant to the Joint Plan of Action if that deferral, waiver, or other suspension is made—

''(A) consistent with the law in effect on the date of the enactment of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015; and

''(B) not later than 45 calendar days before the transmission by the President of an agreement, assessment report, and certification under subsection (a).

''(c) EFFECT OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTION WITH RESPECT TO NUCLEAR AGREEMENTS WITH IRAN.—

''(1) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

''(A) the sanctions regime imposed on Iran by Congress is primarily responsible for bringing Iran to the table to negotiate on its nuclear program;

''(B) these negotiations are a critically important matter of national security and foreign policy for the United States and its closest allies;

''(C) this section does not require a vote by Congress for the agreement to commence;

''(D) this section provides for congressional review, including, as appropriate, for approval, disapproval, or no action on statutory sanctions relief under an agreement; and

''(E) even though the agreement may commence, because the sanctions regime was imposed by Congress and only Congress can permanently modify or eliminate that regime, it is critically important that Congress have the opportunity, in an orderly and deliberative manner, to consider and, as appropriate, take action affecting the statutory sanctions regime imposed by Congress.

''(2) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, action involving any measure of statutory sanctions relief by the United States pursuant to an agreement subject to subsection (a) or the Joint Plan of Action—

''(A) may be taken, consistent with existing statutory requirements for such action, if, during the period for review provided in subsection (b), the Congress adopts, and there is enacted, a joint resolution stating in substance that the Congress does favor the agreement;

''(B) may not be taken if, during the period for review provided in subsection (b), the Congress adopts, and there is enacted, a joint

resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not favor the agreement; or

''(C) may be taken, consistent with existing statutory requirements for such action, if, following the period for review provided in subsection (b), there is not enacted any such joint resolution.

''(3) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of this subsection, the phrase 'action involving any measure of statutory sanctions relief by the United States' shall include waiver, suspension, reduction, or other effort to provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to, Iran under any provision of law or any other effort to refrain from applying any such sanctions.

''(d) CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF IRANIAN COMPLIANCE WITH NUCLEAR AGREEMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall keep the appropriate congressional committees and leadership fully and currently informed of all aspects of Iranian compliance with respect to an agreement subject to subsection (a).

''(2) POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT BREACHES AND COMPLIANCE INCIDENTS.—The President shall, within 10 calendar days of receiving credible and accurate information relating to a potentially significant breach or compliance incident by Iran with respect to an agreement subject to subsection (a), submit such information to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership.

''(3) MATERIAL BREACH REPORT.—Not later than 30 calendar days after submitting information about a potentially significant breach or compliance incident pursuant to paragraph (2), the President shall make a determination whether such potentially significant breach or compliance issue constitutes a material breach and, if there is such a material breach, whether Iran has cured such material breach, and shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership such determination, accompanied by, as appropriate, a report on the action or failure to act by Iran that led to the material breach, actions necessary for Iran to cure the breach, and the status of Iran's efforts to cure the breach.

''(4) SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 180 calendar days after entering into an agreement described in subsection (a), and not less frequently than once every 180 calendar days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership a report on Iran's nuclear program and the compliance of Iran with the agreement during the period covered by the report, including the following elements:

''(A) Any action or failure to act by Iran that breached the agreement or is in noncompliance with the terms of the agreement.

''(B) Any delay by Iran of more than one week in providing inspectors access to facilities, people, and documents in Iran as required by the agreement.

''(C) Any progress made by Iran to resolve concerns by the International Atomic Energy Agency about possible military dimensions of Iran's nuclear program.

''(D) Any procurement by Iran of materials in violation of the agreement or which could otherwise significantly advance Iran's ability to obtain a nuclear weapon.

''(E) Any centrifuge research and development conducted by Iran that—

''(i) is not in compliance with the agreement; or

''(ii) may substantially enhance the breakout time of acquisition of a nuclear weapon by Iran, if deployed.

''(F) Any diversion by Iran of uranium, carbon-fiber, or other materials for use in Iran's nuclear program in violation of the agreement.

''(G) Any covert nuclear activities undertaken by Iran, including any covert nuclear weapons-related or covert fissile material activities or research and development.

''(H) An assessment of whether any Iranian financial institutions are engaged in money laundering or terrorist finance activities, including names of specific financial institutions if applicable.

''(I) Iran's advances in its ballistic missile program, including developments related to its long-range and inter-continental ballistic missile programs.

''(J) An assessment of—

''(i) whether Iran directly supported, financed, planned, or carried out an act of terrorism against the United States or a United States person anywhere in the world;

''(ii) whether, and the extent to which, Iran supported acts of terrorism, including acts of terrorism against the United States or a United States person anywhere in the world;

''(iii) all actions, including in international fora, being taken by the United States to stop, counter, and condemn acts by Iran to directly or indirectly carry out acts of terrorism against the United States and United States persons;

''(iv) the impact on the national security of the United States and the safety of United States citizens as a result of any Iranian actions reported under this paragraph; and

''(v) all of the sanctions relief provided to Iran, pursuant to the agreement, and a description of the relationship between each sanction waived, suspended, or deferred and Iran's nuclear weapon's program.

''(K) An assessment of whether violations of internationally recognized human rights in Iran have changed, increased, or decreased, as compared to the prior 180-day period.

''(5) ADDITIONAL REPORTS AND INFORMATION.—

''(A) AGENCY REPORTS.—Following submission of an agreement pursuant to subsection (a) to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership, the Department of State, the Department of Energy, and the Department of Defense shall, upon the request of any of those committees or leadership, promptly furnish to those committees or leadership their views as to whether the safeguards and other controls contained in the agreement with respect to Iran's nuclear program provide an adequate framework to ensure that Iran's activities permitted thereunder will not be inimical to or constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

''(B) PROVISION OF INFORMATION ON NUCLEAR INITIATIVES WITH IRAN.—The President shall keep the appropriate congressional committees and leadership fully and currently informed of any initiative or negotiations with Iran relating to Iran's nuclear program, including any new or amended agreement.

''(6) COMPLIANCE CERTIFICATION.—After the review period provided in subsection (b), the President shall, not less than every 90 calendar days—

''(A) determine whether the President is able to certify that—

''(i) Iran is transparently, verifiably, and fully implementing the agreement, including all related technical or additional agreements;

''(ii) Iran has not committed a material breach with respect to the agreement or, if Iran has committed a material breach, Iran has cured the material breach;

''(iii) Iran has not taken any action, including covert action, that could significantly advance its nuclear weapons program; and

''(iv) suspension of sanctions related to Iran pursuant to the agreement is—

''(I) appropriate and proportionate to the specific and verifiable measures taken by Iran with respect to terminating its illicit nuclear program; and

''(II) vital to the national security interests of the United States; and

''(B) if the President determines he is able to make the certification described in subparagraph (A), make such certification to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership.

''(7) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

''(A) United States sanctions on Iran for terrorism, human rights abuses, and ballistic missiles will remain in place under an agreement, as defined in subsection (h)(1);

''(B) issues not addressed by an agreement on the nuclear program of Iran, including fair and appropriate compensation for Americans who were terrorized and subjected to torture while held in captivity for 444 days after the seizure of the United States Embassy in Tehran, Iran, in 1979 and their families, the freedom of Americans held in Iran, the human rights abuses of the Government of Iran against its own people, and the continued support of terrorism worldwide by the Government of Iran, are matters critical to ensure justice and the national security of the United States, and should be expeditiously addressed;

''(C) the President should determine the agreement in no way compromises the commitment of the United States to Israel's security, nor its support for Israel's right to exist; and

''(D) in order to responsibly implement any long-term agreement reached between the P5+1 countries and Iran, it is critically important that Congress have the opportunity to review any agreement and, as necessary, take action to modify the statutory sanctions regime imposed by Congress.

''(e) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the event the President does not submit a certification pursuant to subsection (d)(6) or has determined pursuant to subsection (d)(3) that Iran has materially breached an agreement subject to subsection (a) and the material breach has not been cured, Congress may initiate within 60 calendar days expedited consideration of qualifying legislation pursuant to this subsection.

''(2) QUALIFYING LEGISLATION DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'qualifying legislation' means only a bill of either House of Congress—

''(A) the title of which is as follows: 'A bill reinstating statutory sanctions imposed with respect to Iran.'; and

''(B) the matter after the enacting clause of which is: 'Any statutory sanctions imposed with respect to Iran pursuant to _____ that were waived, suspended, reduced, or otherwise relieved pursuant to an agreement submitted pursuant to section 135(a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 are hereby reinstated and any action by the United States Government to facilitate the release of funds or assets to Iran pursuant to such agreement, or provide any further waiver, suspension, reduction, or other relief pursuant to such agreement is hereby prohibited.', with the blank space being filled in with the law or laws under which sanctions are to be reinstated.

''(3) INTRODUCTION.—During the 60-calendar day period provided for in paragraph (1), qualifying legislation may be introduced—

''(A) in the House of Representatives, by the majority leader or the minority leader; and

''(B) in the Senate, by the majority leader (or the majority leader's designee) or the minority leader (or the minority leader's designee).

''(4) FLOOR CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

''(A) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—If a committee of the House to which qualifying legislation has been referred has not reported such qualifying legislation within 10 legislative days after the date of referral, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration thereof.

''(B) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—Beginning on the third legislative day after each committee to which qualifying legislation has been referred reports it to the House or has been discharged from further consideration thereof, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the qualifying legislation in the House. All points of order against the motion are waived. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed on the qualifying legislation with regard to the same agreement. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The motion shall not be debatable. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

''(C) CONSIDERATION.—The qualifying legislation shall be considered as read. All points of order against the qualifying legislation and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the qualifying legislation to final passage without intervening motion except two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the sponsor of the qualifying legislation (or a designee) and an opponent. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the qualifying legislation shall not be in order.

''(5) CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

''(A) COMMITTEE REFERRAL.—Qualifying legislation introduced in the Senate shall be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

''(B) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—If the Committee on Foreign Relations has not reported such qualifying legislation within 10 session days after the date of referral of such legislation, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of such legislation and the qualifying legislation shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

''(C) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—Notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order at any time after the committee authorized to consider qualifying legislation reports it to the Senate or has been discharged from its consideration (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of qualifying legislation, and all points of order against qualifying legislation (and against consideration of the qualifying legislation) are waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the qualifying legislation is agreed to, the qualifying legislation shall remain the unfinished business until disposed of.

''(D) DEBATE.—Debate on qualifying legislation, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between the majority and minority leaders or their designees. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the qualifying legislation is not in order.

''(E) VOTE ON PASSAGE.—The vote on passage shall occur immediately following the conclusion of the debate on the qualifying legislation and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate, if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

''(F) RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to qualifying legislation shall be decided without debate.

''(G) CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGES.—Debate in the Senate of any veto message with respect to qualifying legislation, including all debatable motions and appeals in connection with such qualifying legislation, shall be limited to 10 hours, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

''(6) RULES RELATING TO SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

''(A) COORDINATION WITH ACTION BY OTHER HOUSE.—If, before the passage by one House of qualifying legislation of that House, that House receives qualifying legislation from the other House, then the following procedures shall apply:

''(i) The qualifying legislation of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

''(ii) With respect to qualifying legislation of the House receiving the legislation—

''(I) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no qualifying legislation had been received from the other House; but

''(II) the vote on passage shall be on the qualifying legislation of the other House.

''(B) TREATMENT OF A BILL OF OTHER HOUSE.—If one House fails to introduce qualifying legislation under this section, the qualifying legislation of the other House shall be entitled to expedited floor procedures under this section.

''(C) TREATMENT OF COMPANION MEASURES.—If, following passage of the qualifying legislation in the Senate, the Senate then receives a companion measure from the House of Representatives, the companion measure shall not be debatable.

''(D) APPLICATION TO REVENUE MEASURES.—The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply in the House of Representatives to qualifying legislation which is a revenue measure.

''(f) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—Subsection (e) is enacted by Congress—

''(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such are deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of legislation described in those sections, and supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such rules; and

''(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

''(g) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in the section shall be construed as—

''(1) modifying, or having any other impact on, the President's authority to negotiate, enter into, or implement appropriate executive agreements, other than the restrictions on implementation of the agreements specifically covered by this section;

''(2) allowing any new waiver, suspension, reduction, or other relief from statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law, or allowing the President to refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (a) during the period for review provided in subsection (b);

''(3) revoking or terminating any statutory sanctions imposed on Iran; or

''(4) authorizing the use of military force against Iran.

''(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) AGREEMENT.—The term 'agreement' means an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran that includes the United States, commits the United States to take action, or pursuant to which the United States commits or otherwise agrees to take action, regardless of the form it takes, whether a political commitment or otherwise, and regardless of whether it is legally binding or not, including any joint comprehensive plan of action entered into or made between Iran and any other parties, and any additional materials related thereto, including annexes, appendices, codicils, side agreements, implementing materials, documents, and guidance, technical or other understandings, and any related agreements, whether entered into or implemented prior to the agreement or to be entered into or implemented in the future.

''(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term 'appropriate congressional committees' means the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Financial Services, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

''(3) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES AND LEADERSHIP.—The term 'appropriate congressional committees and leadership' means the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Financial Services, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Speaker, Majority Leader, and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives.

''(4) IRANIAN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term 'Iranian financial institution' has the meaning given the term in section 104A(d) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513b(d)).

''(5) JOINT PLAN OF ACTION.—The term 'Joint Plan of Action' means the Joint Plan of Action, signed at Geneva November 24, 2013, by Iran and by France, Germany, the Russian Federation, the People's Republic of China, the United Kingdom, and the United States, and all implementing materials and agreements related to the Joint Plan of Action, including the technical understandings reached on January 12, 2014, the extension thereto agreed to on July 18, 2014, the extension agreed to on November 24, 2014, and any materially identical extension that is agreed to on or after the date of the enactment of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015.

''(6) EU-IRAN JOINT STATEMENT.—The term 'EU-Iran Joint Statement' means only the Joint Statement by EU High Representative Federica Mogherini and Iranian Foreign Minister Javad Zarif made on April 2, 2015, at Lausanne, Switzerland.

''(7) MATERIAL BREACH.—The term 'material breach' means, with respect to an agreement described in subsection (a), any breach

of the agreement, or in the case of non-binding commitments, any failure to perform those commitments, that substantially—

''(A) benefits Iran's nuclear program;

''(B) decreases the amount of time required by Iran to achieve a nuclear weapon; or

''(C) deviates from or undermines the purposes of such agreement.

''(8) NONCOMPLIANCE DEFINED.—The term 'noncompliance' means any departure from the terms of an agreement described in subsection (a) that is not a material breach.

''(9) P5+1 COUNTRIES.—The term 'P5+1 countries' means the United States, France, the Russian Federation, the People's Republic of China, the United Kingdom, and Germany.

''(10) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term 'United States person' has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8511).''.

SA 1141. Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 15, strike ''purpose.'' and insert the following: ''purpose; and

''(iii) the President determines Iran's leaders have publically accepted Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state.

SA 1142. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 19, line 7, insert '', and pursuing United Nations consideration of an agreement prior to Congress would undermine the appropriate role of Congress'' after ''Congress''.

SA 1143. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 28, line 11, insert ''and any related agreements, including draft United Nations Security Council resolutions or agreed parameters for such resolutions'' after ''parties''.

SA 1144. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 7, line 10, strike ''any such sanctions'' and all that follows through ''under'' on page 11, line 7, and insert the following: ''any such sanctions or facilitate the release of funds or assets to Iran pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (a).

''(4) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING PRESIDENTIAL CONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in paragraph (6), if a joint resolution of disapproval described in subsection (c)(2)(B) passes the Congress, the President may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions or facilitate the release of funds or assets to Iran pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (a) for a period of 12 calendar days following the date of passage of the joint resolution of disapproval.

''(5) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING CONGRESSIONAL RECONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in paragraph (6), if a joint resolution of disapproval described in subsection (c)(2)(B) passes the Congress, and the President vetoes such joint resolution, the President may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions or facilitate the release of funds or assets to Iran pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (a) for a period of 10 calendar days following the date of the President's veto.

''(6) EXCEPTION.—The prohibitions under paragraphs (3) through (5) do not apply to any new deferral, waiver, or other suspension of statutory sanctions pursuant to the Joint Plan of Action if that deferral, waiver, or other suspension is made—

''(A) consistent with the law in effect on the date of the enactment of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015; and

''(B) not later than 45 calendar days before the transmission by the President of an agreement, assessment report, and certification under subsection (a).

''(c) EFFECT OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTION WITH RESPECT TO NUCLEAR AGREEMENTS WITH IRAN.—

''(1) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

''(A) the sanctions regime imposed on Iran by Congress is primarily responsible for bringing Iran to the table to negotiate on its nuclear program;

''(B) these negotiations are a critically important matter of national security and foreign policy for the United States and its closest allies;

''(C) this section does not require a vote by Congress for the agreement to commence;

''(D) this section provides for congressional review, including, as appropriate, for approval, disapproval, or no action on statutory sanctions relief under an agreement; and

''(E) even though the agreement may commence, because the sanctions regime was imposed by Congress and only Congress can permanently modify or eliminate that regime, it is critically important that Congress have the opportunity, in an orderly and deliberative manner, to consider and, as appropriate, take action affecting the statutory sanctions regime imposed by Congress.

''(2) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, action involving any measure of statutory sanctions relief by the United States pursuant to an agreement subject to subsection (a) or the Joint Plan of Action—

''(A) may be taken, consistent with existing statutory requirements for such action, if, during the period for review provided in subsection (b), the Congress adopts, and there is enacted, a joint resolution stating in substance that the Congress does favor the agreement;

''(B) may not be taken if, during the period for review provided in subsection (b), the Congress adopts, and there is enacted, a joint resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not favor the agreement; or

''(C) may be taken, consistent with existing statutory requirements for such action, if, following the period for review provided in subsection (b), there is not enacted any such joint resolution.

''(3) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of this subsection, the phrase ''action involving any measure of statutory sanctions relief by the United States'' shall include waiver, suspension, reduction, or other effort to provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to, Iran or to facilitate the release of funds or assets to Iran under

---

SA 1145. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 15, strike ''purpose.'' and insert the following: ''purpose; and

''(iii) all United States citizens unjustly detained by Iran, including Jason Rezaian, Amir Hekmati, and Saeed Abedini, have been released from Iranian custody, and the Government of Iran is fully cooperating in efforts to locate Robert Levinson.

SA 1146. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 15, strike ''purpose.'' and insert the following: ''purpose; and

''(iii) the President determines that no sanctions relief provided under the agreement will be provided from sanctions imposed by Congress or the Executive Branch due to Iran's support for terrorism, its ballistic missile programs, or its human rights abuses against the people of Iran or will undermine the effectiveness of such sanctions.''.

SA 1147. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. RISCH, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient

Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 17, between lines 21 and 22, insert the following:

''(v) Iran has not directly supported or carried out an act of terrorism against the United States or a United States person anywhere in the world; and

---

SA 1148. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON PROVIDING SANCTIONS RELIEF.

The President, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of State, and any other Executive branch officer or agency may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement described under section 135(a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as added by section 2 of this Act, until the President certifies to Congress that the Government of Iran has fully and verifiably—

(1) reduced by approximately two-thirds its installed centrifuges, with the remaining 6,104 centrifuges being IR-1s, Iran's first-generation centrifuge;

(2) halted any uranium enrichment over 3.67 percent and agreed to continue to do so for at least 15 years;

(3) reduced its stockpile of low-enriched uranium to 300 kilograms of 3.67 percent low-enriched uranium (LEU);

(4) placed all excess centrifuges and enrichment infrastructure in International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) monitored storage to be used only as replacements for operating centrifuges and equipment;

(5) agreed to not build any new facilities for the purpose of enriching uranium for 15 years;

(6) halted enrichment of uranium at the Fordow facility and agreed to continue this moratorium for 15 years;

(7) converted the Fordow facility into a nuclear, physics, technology, and research center for peaceful purposes only;

(8) halted research and development associated with uranium enrichment at Fordow and agreed to continue this moratorium for 15 years;

(9) removed almost two-thirds of Fordow's centrifuges and infrastructure, ensured that the remaining centrifuges are not enriching uranium, and placed all centrifuges and related infrastructure under IAEA monitoring;

(10) removed advanced centrifuges at Natanz, and is only enriching uranium using IR-1 models and has agreed to continue this arrangement for 10 years;

(11) removed the 1,000 IR-2M centrifuges currently installed at Natanz and placed them in IAEA-monitored storage and agreed to keep them there for 10 years;

(12) halted use of its IR-2, IR-4, IR-5, IR-6, or IR-8 models to produce enriched uranium and committed to continue this for at least ten years.

(13) begun to abide by the schedule and parameters for limited centrifuge research and development agreed to by the P5+1 countries;

(14) provided regular access to all of Iran's nuclear facilities, including to Iran's enrichment facility at Natanz and its former enrichment facility at Fordow, and is allowing the use of the most up-to-date, modern monitoring technologies;

(15) provided inspectors with access to the supply chain that supports Iran's nuclear program;

(16) provided access to uranium mines and continuous surveillance at uranium mills, where Iran produces yellowcake, and has committed to continue to do so for 25 years;

(17) provided inspectors with access to allow continuous surveillance of Iran's centrifuge rotors and bellows production and storage facilities, and has committed to continue to do so for 20 years;

(18) placed all centrifuges and enrichment infrastructure removed from Fordow and Natanz under continuous monitoring by the IAEA;

(19) begun to use only the dedicated procurement channel for Iran's nuclear program to monitor and approve, on a case by case basis, the supply, sale, or transfer to Iran of certain nuclear-related and dual use materials and technology;

(20) implemented the Additional Protocol of the IAEA and committed to adhere to the Additional Protocol permanently;

(21) committed to grant access to the IAEA to investigate any suspicious sites or allegations of a covert enrichment facility, conversion facility, centrifuge production facility, or yellowcake production facility anywhere in the country, including at military sites;

(22) implemented Modified Code 3.1 requiring early notification of construction of new facilities;

(23) redesigned and rebuilt the heavy water research reactor in Arak based on a design agreed to by the P5+1 countries and ensured that the reactor will not produce weapons grade plutonium;

(24) destroyed or removed from the country the original core of the Arak reactor;

(25) committed to ship all spent fuel from the Arak reactor out of the country;

(26) halted any reprocessing or reprocessing research and development on spent nuclear fuel;

(27) committed to not accumulate heavy water in excess of the needs of the modified Arak reactor, and to sell any remaining heavy water on the international market for 15 years; and

(28) halted building of any additional heavy water reactors and committed to continue this moratorium for 15 years.

SA 1149. Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE AGREEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any agreement with Iran relating to the nuclear program of Iran is a congressional-executive agreement to be considered under expedited procedure in both houses of Congress.

(b) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF JOINT RESOLUTION OF APPROVAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the event the President transmits to the appropriate congressional committees an agreement with Iran relating to the nuclear program of Iran, Congress may initiate within 60 days expedited consideration of a joint resolution of approval pursuant to this paragraph.

(2) JOINT RESOLUTION OF APPROVAL DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ''joint resolution of approval'' means only a joint resolution introduced after the date on which the President transmits to the appropriate congressional committees an agreement described in paragraph (1) the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ''That Congress approves the agreement submitted to Congress related to the nuclear program of Iran on _____.'', with the blank space being filled with the appropriate date.

(3) INTRODUCTION.—During the 60-day period provided for in paragraph (1), a joint resolution of approval may be introduced—

(A) in the House of Representatives, by any member of the House of Representatives; and

(B) in the Senate, by any member of the Senate.

(4) COMMITTEE REFERRAL.—A joint resolution of approval introduced in the Senate shall be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and in the House of Representatives to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

(5) DISCHARGE.—If the committee of either House to which a joint resolution of approval has been referred has not reported such resolution within 10 session days after the date of referral of such resolution, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of such resolution and the joint resolution of approval shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(6) FLOOR CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(A) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—After each committee authorized to consider a joint resolution of approval reports it to the House of Representatives or has been discharged from its consideration, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the joint resolution of approval in the House. All points of order against the motion are waived. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed on the joint resolution of approval. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The motion shall not be debatable. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(B) CONSIDERATION.—The joint resolution of approval shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint resolution of approval and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution of approval to its passage without intervening motion except 2 hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint resolution of approval shall not be in order. No amendment to, or motion to recommit, a joint resolution of approval shall be in order.

(C) APPEALS.—All appeals from the Chair relating to the application of the Rules of the House of Representatives to the procedure relating to the joint resolution of approval shall be decided without debate.

(7) FLOOR CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order at any time after the committee authorized to consider a joint resolution of approval reports it to the Senate or has been discharged from its consideration (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution of

approval, and all points of order against the joint resolution of approval (and against consideration of the joint resolution of approval) are waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution of approval is agreed to, the joint resolution of approval shall remain the unfinished business until disposed of.

(B) DEBATE.—Debate on a joint resolution of approval, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between the majority and minority leaders or their designees. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution of approval is not in order.

(C) VOTE ON PASSAGE.—The vote on passage shall occur immediately following the conclusion of the debate on the joint resolution of approval and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate, if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

(D) RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a joint resolution of approval shall be decided without debate.

(E) CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGES.—Debate in the Senate of any veto message with respect to a joint resolution of approval, including all debatable motions and appeals in connection with such joint resolution of approval, shall be limited to 10 hours, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

(8) RULES RELATING TO SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(A) COORDINATION WITH ACTION BY OTHER HOUSE.—If, before the passage by one House of a joint resolution of approval of that House, that House receives a joint resolution of approval from the other House, then the following procedures shall apply:

(i) The joint resolution of approval of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

(ii) With respect to a joint resolution of approval in of the House receiving the resolution—

(I) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution of approval had been received from the other House; but

(II) the vote on passage shall be on the joint resolution of approval of the other House.

(B) TREATMENT OF JOINT RESOLUTION OF OTHER HOUSE.—If one House fails to introduce or consider a joint resolution of approval under this paragraph, the joint resolution of approval of the other House shall be entitled to expedited floor procedures under this paragraph.

(C) TREATMENT OF COMPANION MEASURES.—If, following passage of the joint resolution of approval in the Senate, the Senate then receives a companion measure from the House of Representatives, the companion measure shall not be debatable.

(c) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—subsection (b) is enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such are deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of legislation described in those sections, and supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

SEC. 2. LIMITATION ON SANCTIONS RELIEF.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of sanctions imposed under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran that includes the United States, commits the United States to take action, or pursuant to which the United States commits or otherwise agrees to take action, regardless of the form it takes, whether a political commitment or otherwise, and regardless of whether it is legally binding or not, including any joint comprehensive plan of action entered into or made between Iran and any other parties, and any additional materials related thereto, including annexes, appendices, codicils, side agreements, implementing materials, documents, and guidance, technical or other understandings, and any related agreements, whether entered into or implemented prior to the agreement or to be entered into or implemented in the future, unless a joint resolution of approval is passed by Congress under section 1(b).

SA 1150. Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. TREATY SUBJECT TO ADVICE AND CONSENT OF THE SENATE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any agreement reached by the President with Iran relating to the nuclear program of Iran is deemed to be a treaty that is subject to the requirements of article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States requiring that the treaty is subject to the advice and consent of the Senate, with two-thirds of Senators concurring.

SEC. 2. LIMITATION ON SANCTIONS RELIEF.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of sanctions under any other provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran that includes the United States, commits the United States to take action, or pursuant to which the United States commits or otherwise agrees to take action, regardless of the form it takes, whether a political commitment or otherwise, and regardless of whether it is legally binding or not, including any joint comprehensive plan of action entered into or made between Iran and any other parties, and any additional materials related thereto, including annexes, appendices, codicils, side agreements, implementing materials, documents, and guidance, technical or other understandings, and any related agreements, whether entered into or implemented prior to the agreement or to be entered into or implemented in the future, subject to the advice and consent of the Senate as a treaty, receives the concurrence of two thirds of the Senators.

SA 1151. Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. COTTON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 17, between lines 21 and 22, insert the following:

''(v) the Government of Iran and the Government of North Korea are not sharing or transferring any information or technology related to ballistic missile development or nuclear weapons capability; and

---

SA 1152. Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 6, strike line 6 and all that follows through page 27, line 21, and insert the following:

''(b) REVIEW BY CONGRESS OF NUCLEAR AGREEMENTS WITH IRAN.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—After the President transmits an agreement pursuant to subsection (a), the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives shall, as appropriate, hold hearings and briefings and otherwise obtain information in order to fully review such agreement.

''(2) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in paragraph (3) and subsection (c), the President may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (a).

''(3) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition under paragraph (2) does not apply to any deferral, waiver, or other suspension of statutory sanctions pursuant to the Joint Plan of Action if that deferral, waiver, or other suspension is made—

''(A) consistent with the law in effect on the date of the enactment of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015; and

''(B) not later than 45 days before the transmission by the President of an agreement, assessment report, and certification under subsection (a).

''(c) EFFECT OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTION WITH RESPECT TO NUCLEAR AGREEMENTS WITH IRAN.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, action involving any measure of statutory sanctions relief by the United States pursuant to an agreement subject to subsection (a) or the Joint Plan of Action may be taken, consistent with existing statutory requirements for such action, only if the Congress adopts, and there is enacted, a joint resolution stating in substance that the Congress does favor the agreement.

''(d) CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF IRANIAN COMPLIANCE WITH NUCLEAR AGREEMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall keep the appropriate congressional committees and leadership fully and currently informed of all aspects of Iranian compliance with respect to an agreement subject to subsection (a).

''(2) POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT BREACHES AND COMPLIANCE INCIDENTS.—The President shall, within 10 calendar days of receiving credible and accurate information relating to a potentially significant breach or compliance incident by Iran with respect to an agreement subject to subsection (a), submit such information to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership.

''(3) MATERIAL BREACH REPORT.—Not later than 30 calendar days after submitting information about a potentially significant breach or compliance incident pursuant to paragraph (2), the President shall make a determination whether such potentially significant breach or compliance issue constitutes a material breach and, if there is such a material breach, whether Iran has cured such material breach, and shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership such determination, accompanied by, as appropriate, a report on the action or failure to act by Iran that led to the material breach, actions necessary for Iran to cure the breach, and the status of Iran's efforts to cure the breach.

''(4) SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 180 calendar days after entering into an agreement described in subsection (a), and not less frequently than once every 180 calendar days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership a report on Iran's nuclear program and the compliance of Iran with the agreement during the period covered by the report, including the following elements:

''(A) Any action or failure to act by Iran that breached the agreement or is in noncompliance with the terms of the agreement.

''(B) Any delay by Iran of more than one week in providing inspectors access to facilities, people, and documents in Iran as required by the agreement.

''(C) Any progress made by Iran to resolve concerns by the International Atomic Energy Agency about possible military dimensions of Iran's nuclear program.

''(D) Any procurement by Iran of materials in violation of the agreement or which could otherwise significantly advance Iran's ability to obtain a nuclear weapon.

''(E) Any centrifuge research and development conducted by Iran that—

''(i) is not in compliance with the agreement; or

''(ii) may substantially enhance the breakout time of acquisition of a nuclear weapon by Iran, if deployed.

''(F) Any diversion by Iran of uranium, carbon-fiber, or other materials for use in Iran's nuclear program in violation of the agreement.

''(G) Any covert nuclear activities undertaken by Iran, including any covert nuclear weapons-related or covert fissile material activities or research and development.

''(H) An assessment of whether any Iranian financial institutions are engaged in money laundering or terrorist finance activities, including names of specific financial institutions if applicable.

''(I) Iran's advances in its ballistic missile program, including developments related to its long-range and inter-continental ballistic missile programs.

''(J) An assessment of—

''(i) whether Iran directly supported, financed, planned, or carried out an act of terrorism against the United States or a United States person anywhere in the world;

''(ii) whether, and the extent to which, Iran supported acts of terrorism, including acts of terrorism against the United States or a United States person anywhere in the world;

''(iii) all actions, including in international fora, being taken by the United States to stop, counter, and condemn acts by Iran to directly or indirectly carry out acts of terrorism against the United States and United States persons;

''(iv) the impact on the national security of the United States and the safety of United States citizens as a result of any Iranian actions reported under this paragraph; and

''(v) all of the sanctions relief provided to Iran, pursuant to the agreement, and a description of the relationship between each sanction waived, suspended, or deferred and Iran's nuclear weapon's program.

''(K) An assessment of whether violations of internationally recognized human rights in Iran have changed, increased, or decreased, as compared to the prior 180-day period.

''(5) ADDITIONAL REPORTS AND INFORMATION.—

''(A) AGENCY REPORTS.—Following submission of an agreement pursuant to subsection (a) to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership, the Department of State, the Department of Energy, and the Department of Defense shall, upon the request of any of those committees or leadership, promptly furnish to those committees or leadership their views as to whether the safeguards and other controls contained in the agreement with respect to Iran's nuclear program provide an adequate framework to ensure that Iran's activities permitted thereunder will not be inimical to or constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

''(B) PROVISION OF INFORMATION ON NUCLEAR INITIATIVES WITH IRAN.—The President shall keep the appropriate congressional committees and leadership fully and currently informed of any initiative or negotiations with Iran relating to Iran's nuclear program, including any new or amended agreement.

''(6) COMPLIANCE CERTIFICATION.—After the President transmits an agreement pursuant to subsection (a), the President shall, not less than every 90 calendar days—

''(A) determine whether the President is able to certify that—

''(i) Iran is transparently, verifiably, and fully implementing the agreement, including all related technical or additional agreements;

''(ii) Iran has not committed a material breach with respect to the agreement or, if Iran has committed a material breach, Iran has cured the material breach;

''(iii) Iran has not taken any action, including covert action, that could significantly advance its nuclear weapons program; and

''(iv) suspension of sanctions related to Iran pursuant to the agreement is—

''(I) appropriate and proportionate to the specific and verifiable measures taken by Iran with respect to terminating its illicit nuclear program; and

''(II) vital to the national security interests of the United States; and

''(B) if the President determines he is able to make the certification described in subparagraph (A), make such certification to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership.

''(7) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

''(A) United States sanctions on Iran for terrorism, human rights abuses, and ballistic missiles will remain in place under an agreement, as defined in subsection (h)(1);

''(B) issues not addressed by an agreement on the nuclear program of Iran, including fair and appropriate compensation for Americans who were terrorized and subjected to torture while held in captivity for 444 days after the seizure of the United States Embassy in Tehran, Iran, in 1979 and their families, the freedom of Americans held in Iran, the human rights abuses of the Government of Iran against its own people, and the continued support of terrorism worldwide by the Government of Iran, are matters critical to ensure justice and the national security of the United States, and should be expeditiously addressed;

''(C) the President should determine the agreement in no way compromises the commitment of the United States to Israel's security, nor its support for Israel's right to exist; and

''(D) in order to responsibly implement any long-term agreement reached between the P5+1 countries and Iran, it is critically important that Congress have the opportunity to review any agreement and, as necessary, take action to modify the statutory sanctions regime imposed by Congress.

''(e) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the event the President does not submit a certification pursuant to subsection (d)(6) or has determined pursuant to subsection (d)(3) that Iran has materially breached an agreement subject to subsection (a) and the material breach has not been cured, Congress may initiate within 60 calendar days expedited consideration of qualifying legislation pursuant to this subsection.

''(2) QUALIFYING LEGISLATION DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ''qualifying legislation'' means only a bill of either House of Congress—

''(A) the title of which is as follows: ''A bill reinstating statutory sanctions imposed with respect to Iran.''; and

''(B) the matter after the enacting clause of which is: ''Any statutory sanctions imposed with respect to Iran pursuant to _____ that were waived, suspended, reduced, or otherwise relieved pursuant to an agreement submitted pursuant to section 135(a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 are hereby reinstated and any action by the United States Government to facilitate the release of funds or assets to Iran pursuant to such agreement, or provide any further waiver, suspension, reduction, or other relief pursuant to such agreement is hereby prohibited.'', with the blank space being filled in with the law or laws under which sanctions are to be reinstated.

''(3) INTRODUCTION.—During the 60-calendar day period provided for in paragraph (1), qualifying legislation may be introduced—

''(A) in the House of Representatives, by the majority leader or the minority leader; and

''(B) in the Senate, by the majority leader (or the majority leader's designee) or the minority leader (or the minority leader's designee).

''(4) FLOOR CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

''(A) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—If a committee of the House to which qualifying legislation has been referred has not reported such qualifying legislation within 10 legislative days after the date of referral, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration thereof.

''(B) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—Beginning on the third legislative day after each committee to which qualifying legislation has been referred reports it to the House

or has been discharged from further consideration thereof, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the qualifying legislation in the House. All points of order against the motion are waived. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed on the qualifying legislation with regard to the same agreement. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The motion shall not be debatable. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

''(C) CONSIDERATION.—The qualifying legislation shall be considered as read. All points of order against the qualifying legislation and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the qualifying legislation to final passage without intervening motion except two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the sponsor of the qualifying legislation (or a designee) and an opponent. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the qualifying legislation shall not be in order.

''(5) CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

''(A) COMMITTEE REFERRAL.—Qualifying legislation introduced in the Senate shall be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

''(B) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—If the Committee on Foreign Relations has not reported such qualifying legislation within 10 session days after the date of referral of such legislation, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of such legislation and the qualifying legislation shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

''(C) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—Notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order at any time after the committee authorized to consider qualifying legislation reports it to the Senate or has been discharged from its consideration (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of qualifying legislation, and all points of order against qualifying legislation (and against consideration of the qualifying legislation) are waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the qualifying legislation is agreed to, the qualifying legislation shall remain the unfinished business until disposed of.

''(D) DEBATE.—Debate on qualifying legislation, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between the majority and minority leaders or their designees. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the qualifying legislation is not in order.

''(E) VOTE ON PASSAGE.—The vote on passage shall occur immediately following the conclusion of the debate on the qualifying legislation and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate, if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

''(F) RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to qualifying legislation shall be decided without debate.

''(G) CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGES.—Debate in the Senate of any veto message with respect to qualifying legislation, including all debatable motions and appeals in connection with such qualifying legislation, shall be limited to 10 hours, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

''(6) RULES RELATING TO SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

''(A) COORDINATION WITH ACTION BY OTHER HOUSE.—If, before the passage by one House of qualifying legislation of that House, that House receives qualifying legislation from the other House, then the following procedures shall apply:

''(i) The qualifying legislation of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

''(ii) With respect to qualifying legislation of the House receiving the legislation—

''(I) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no qualifying legislation had been received from the other House; but

''(II) the vote on passage shall be on the qualifying legislation of the other House.

''(B) TREATMENT OF A BILL OF OTHER HOUSE.—If one House fails to introduce qualifying legislation under this section, the qualifying legislation of the other House shall be entitled to expedited floor procedures under this section.

''(C) TREATMENT OF COMPANION MEASURES.—If, following passage of the qualifying legislation in the Senate, the Senate then receives a companion measure from the House of Representatives, the companion measure shall not be debatable.

''(D) APPLICATION TO REVENUE MEASURES.—The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply in the House of Representatives to qualifying legislation which is a revenue measure.

''(f) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—Subsection (e) is enacted by Congress—

''(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such are deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of legislation described in those sections, and supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such rules; and

''(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

''(g) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in the section shall be construed as—

''(1) modifying, or having any other impact on, the President's authority to negotiate, enter into, or implement appropriate executive agreements, other than the restrictions on implementation of the agreements specifically covered by this section;

''(2) allowing any new waiver, suspension, reduction, or other relief from statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law, or allowing the President to refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (a);

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 23, 2015, at 11 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 23, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Surface Transportation Reauthorization: Building on the Successes of MAP–21 To Deliver Safe, Efficient and Effective Public Transportation Services and Projects.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 23, 2015, at 9:45 a.m., in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a Subcommittee hearing entitled ''FAA Reauthorization: Airport Issues and Infrastructure Financing.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 23, 2015, at 2 p.m., in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 23, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 23, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room 428A of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 23, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICA AND GLOBAL HEALTH POLICY

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health Policy be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 23,

2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''The Africa Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA).''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH CARE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Health Care of the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 23, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''A Fresh Look at the Impact of the Medical Device Tax on Jobs, Innovation, and Patients.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONAL INTEREST

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Immigration and the National Interest, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 23, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Eroding the Law and Diverting Taxpayer Resources: An Examination of the Administration's Central American Minors Refugee/Parole Program.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Destiny Whitehead, an intern in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the session today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, April 27, at 5 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Executive Calendar No. 75; that there be 30 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nomination, and that following disposition of the nomination, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that no further motion 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.

AUTHORIZING USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 21, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 21) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 21) was agreed to.

AUTHORIZING USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 25, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers Memorial Service and the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) was agreed to.

AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be discharged from further consideration of S. Con. Res. 3 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3) was agreed to.

(The concurrent resolution is printed in the RECORD of February 5, 2015, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 149, Hubble Space Telescope; S. Res. 150, Civic and Government Education; and S. Res. 151, National Safe Digging Month.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, APRIL 27, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, April 27; 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 then resume consideration of H.R. 1191 for debate only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, APRIL 27, 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 5:48 p.m., adjourned until Monday, April 27, 2015, at 3 p.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 23, 2015:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LORETTA E. LYNCH, OF NEW YORK, TO BE ATTORNEY GENERAL.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSFORMATION: TIER RANKINGS IN THE FIGHT AGAINST HUMAN TRAFFICKING

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I recently held a hearing on the importance of accountability in the annual Trafficking in Persons Report—the State Department's biggest opportunity of the year to prod countries to fight human trafficking with greater effect, greater efficiency and greater effort.

There are some twenty plus million people around the globe who live in sex or labor slavery today.

When one hears such a figure—over twenty million people—one's eyes begin to glaze over, as a number of such magnitude becomes an abstraction. There is a cynical saying, attributed to Soviet dictator Josef Stalin, that ''the death of one man is a tragedy. The death of millions is a statistic.'' Stalin knew that many would shrug their shoulders and avert their gaze.

But we must never allow such cynicism to obscure the fact that each of those twenty million persons is a human being with inherent, God-given dignity. Each one is a child that suffers from beatings and abuse, a woman raped, a man who labors in the field as a slave—all for the commercial gain of others.

The annual Trafficking in Persons Report, required by the landmark Trafficking Victims Protection Action of 2000 (TVPA)—legislation which I authored—ensures that countries making anti-trafficking efforts a priority are praised and supported, while countries that ignore the cries of the enslaved are justly shamed, and considered for sanctions.

The success of the TIP Report and rankings is beyond anything we could have hoped for. From presidential suites and the halls of parliaments, to police stations in remote corners of the world, this report focuses anti-trafficking work in 187 countries on the pivotal principles of prevention of trafficking, prosecution of the traffickers, and protection of the victims.

Each year the trafficking office at the Department of State evaluates whether a government of a country is fully compliant with the minimum standards for the elimination of human trafficking or, if not, whether the government is making significant efforts to do so. The record is laid bare for the world to see and summarized in a tier rankings narrative. Tier 1 countries fully meet the minimum standards. Tier 2 countries do not meet the minimum standards, but are making significant efforts to do so. Tier 3 countries do not meet the standards and are not making significant efforts to do so—and, indeed, may be subject to sanctions.

Over the last 14 years, more than 100 countries have enacted anti-trafficking laws, and many countries have taken other steps required to significantly raise their tier rankings. Some countries openly credit the TIP Report for their increased and effective anti-trafficking response and look to us for examples of how to do even better. Last year, for example, I was invited by the speaker of Peru's unicameral congress to address legislators on how to protect victims of trafficking, meeting also with prosecutors, members of a multi-agency task force, victims and those who provide for victims.

The Tier 2 Watch List was created in the 2003 TVPA reauthorization and I also authored to encourage good-faith anti-trafficking progress in a country that may have taken positive anti-trafficking steps late in the evaluation year. Unfortunately, some countries made a habit of last-minute efforts and failed to follow through year-after-year, effectively gaming the system.

To protect the integrity of the tier system and ensure it works properly to inspire progress, Congress in 2008 created an automatic downgrade for any country that had been on a Tier 2 Watch List for 2 years but had not taken significant effort enough to move up a tier.

The President can waive the automatic downgrade for an additional 2 years if he has certified ''credible evidence'' that the country has a written and sufficiently resourced plan that, if implemented, would constitute significant efforts to meet the minimum standards.

In 2013, the first test of the new system, China, Russia, and Uzbekistan ran out of waivers and moved to Tier 3, which accurately reflected their records.

In the 2014 reporting cycle, only Thailand and Malaysia were auto-downgraded, out of six countries. Russia and Uzbekistan retained their Tier 3 downgrades from the previous year—but China was upgraded from Tier 3 to the Tier 2 Watch List.

I am very concerned that China fooled the State Department, which seemed to believe that China was abolishing its re-education through labor camps rather than simply renaming the camps and continuing the practice. The Congressional-Executive Commission on China reported that in 2013, Chinese authorities increasingly used ''other forms of arbitrary and administrative detention such as Legal Education Centers, Custody and Education Centers, 'black jails,' and compulsory drug detoxification centers.''

Moreover, the Commission reported that in November 2014, the Deputy Director of China's Ministry of Justice said at a press conference that the ''vast majority'' of China's [re-education through labor] facilities have been converted to compulsory drug detox centers. The China Commission believes that these compulsory drug detox centers force detainees to do labor, as do the Custody and Education Centers.

If true—and I believe it is—then the Chinese government is directly involved in human trafficking and profiting from it.

The Chinese Government also continues, through its one-child birth limitation policy, to decimate the female population, creating a vacuum for sex and bride trafficking in China as males confronted with a sentence of lifetime bachelorhood seek to obtain a mate.

And despite a much-ballyhooed November 2013 government announcement of a relaxation of the one-child policy that affects only a small subset of the population, this fig leaf will not do enough to correct the gender imbalance in China.

Last summer, a local official at the Mid-Year Family Planning Work Meeting in Chongqing municipality noted that ''the intensity of family planning work has not diminished.'' And the evidence of coercive enforcement continues to emerge.

The U.N. Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, following its May 2014 review of China, noted that it was ''seriously concerned about reported instances of the use of coercive measures, including forced abortion and forced sterilization, with a view to limiting births.''

This is unacceptable.

Approximately 40 million women and girls are missing from the population—and China's birth limitation policy continues to increase that number—making China a regional magnet for sex and bride trafficking of women from neighboring countries such as Burma, Cambodia, Vietnam, Laos, and North Korea.

Indeed, an estimated 90 percent of North Korean women seeking asylum in China are trafficked as brides. And yet China does not take responsibility for the government-made disaster and provide these women with aid. Rather, China denies these women refugee status and sends them back to punishment in North Korea—punishments that far too often include execution.

Yet we gave China a pass, turning our backs on these suffering women.

But Asia is not the only place where there are victims of trafficking. The hearing also looked at three African countries that must be automatically downgraded unless they significantly improved efforts to fight human trafficking in 2014: Burundi, Comoros, and Angola.

The shared tragedy of these countries is that it is their children who are being trafficked. Chinese nationals in Angola exploit the Angolan children in construction, rice farming, and brick making.

In Comoros, poor families place their children with wealthy relatives, who then exploit them in domestic servitude.

Similarly, in Burundi, family members sometimes profit from the prostitution of children with tourists or, according to the State Department, ''teachers, police officers, and gendarme, military and prison officials.''

In 2013, as automatic downgrade loomed, the President of Comoros finally admitted his country had a trafficking issue and the National Assembly changed the penal code. Angola and Burundi have also amended their penal codes while on the Watch List.

Aggressive implementation of these anti-trafficking laws would keep them off Tier 3, as

well as protect children from trafficking. I earnestly hope implementation has been a priority.

The Southeast Asia region continues to struggle with particularly acute and entrenched human trafficking. Thailand and Malaysia were downgraded to Tier 3 last year. Burma must receive a presidential waiver this year to avoid Tier 3.

One of the key drivers of intense human trafficking in the region is the vulnerability and desperation of the Muslim minority Rohingya people. Squalid living conditions in displacement camps, discrimination, child limitation, and violence are pushing the Rohingya out of Buddhist-dominated Burma into the hands of human traffickers who claim to have jobs for them in Muslim-majority Malaysia.

However, according to reports by Reuters last year, many Rohingya never make it to Malaysia, and instead end up in tropical gulags in the jungles of Thailand, where they are held for ransom. Many die from abuse and disease. Those who cannot pay the ransom are sold into sex slavery or forced labor, often in the fishing industry.

Thai General Prayuth Chan-ocha has vowed to crack down on any Thai authorities involved and to bring an end to the practice. While we have seen an impressive number and variety of anti-trafficking efforts in Thailand during the last year—including a new law in March that heightened penalties to life imprisonment for traffickers—prosecutions have significantly diminished in the last year. Prosecutions regarding trafficking of Rohingya migrants seem particularly low.

Nevertheless, over the last year, Thailand has taken concrete steps to register nearly 100,000 migrants, amend laws related to the fishing sector, raise the minimum age for labor at sea to 18 years old, set mandatory rest periods and employment contract requirements, and inspect hundreds of boats. And we also need to look at ourselves, and ask too whether we are complicit in abetting trafficking, perhaps unwittingly.

Last month, for example, the Associated Press documented Thai boats picking up seafood in Indonesia caught by Burmese slaves who, when not at sea, are kept in cages on remote Indonesian islands. The seafood was taken back to Thai ports and processed by the company that owns Chicken of the Sea. Much of the tainted seafood may have entered the supply chain to reach the shelves of American grocery stores and, through vendors such as Sysco, have landed on the plates of our service men and women.

There are nevertheless success stories, and Thailand has been a stalwart partner with the United States in fighting the sex tourism that drives sex trafficking. The Philippines also has worked with us in fighting sex tourists and helping the victims of trafficking—indeed, one of the witnesses we will hear from is a priest whose faith-based organization has helped thousands heal from the horrors of human trafficking.

Finally, a word to those who think that our TIP report embarrasses allies and undercuts our efforts to cultivate friendly ties around the globe.

I will never forget two of our closest allies, Israel and South Korea, at one point were both on Tier 3, the worst rank. I remember meeting with their Ambassadors who had files demonstrating to all of us and anyone who would listen the measures they were taking to mitigate this terrible crime. And both of those countries got off Tier 3 when they backed words with substantive action.

Rather than alienating them, the exercise underscored that friends watch out for each other, and that we must call upon our friends to live up to the high ideals they profess. Ultimately, countries that do live up to their ideals show they value and treasure their citizens—their greatest resource—and in the long run will benefit the most.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, due to an event with the President in my home state, I was unable to vote during Roll Call 154, the motion on ordering the previous question for the rule H. Res. 200, as well as Roll Call 155, passage of H. Res. 200.

I was also unable to vote on Roll Call 156, final passage of H.R. 1562, the Contracting and Tax Accountability Act, as well as Roll Call 157, final passage of H.R. 1563, the Federal Employee Tax Accountability Act.

Had I been present, I would have voted against the motion ordering the previous question on the rule H. Res. 200 and against final passage of the rule. Also, I would have voted in favor of H.R. 1562 and opposed H.R. 1563.

IN HONOR OF CRYSTAL BERTHEAU

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the House's attention the outstanding public service work of Crystal Bertheau on the occasion of her retirement from the Santa Cruz County Elections Department following a long and distinguished career.

In Ms. Bertheau's professional career, she embodied the fundamental principal that should guide American democracy across our great nation: that every voter should have easy access to the ballot and that every vote cast should be counted. It is an example that stands as a beacon even now in the 21st Century.

Crystal started her professional career in San Mateo County in 1972 where she and her co-workers created an annual program for Court Room Clerks at Stanford University. From 1981 to 1996, Crystal worked for Judge Clarence B. Knight. In 1996, Crystal transferred to the San Mateo County Elections Department. In 1997, she and her husband, David, moved to Scotts Valley, California. In 1998, the Santa Cruz County Elections Department hired her as the poll worker training and recruitment coordinator for the county. She was instrumental in launching and implementing the county Inspector Hotline, a dedicated phone number for poll workers to call in questions on Election Day.

In 2002, she took on the duties of Program Coordinator in charge of candidate filing. Crystal quickly became known as the knowledgeable and friendly face who helped thousands of candidates navigate their way through the candidate filing process. Crystal also served as a Passport Acceptance Agent and a Deputy Commissioner for Civil Marriage for the County of Santa Cruz. She and her co-workers earned the 2013 Employee Recognition Gold Award for successfully facilitating the start of same sex marriages in Santa Cruz County.

Crystal's passion for elections and community service is unsurpassed. She has worked 20 hour Election Days, spent many weekends serving her community on Passport Saturdays and Weekend Voting, and conducted weddings near the midnight hour on Valentine's Day. Crystal has enjoyed sailing in the San Francisco Bay, has run 2 half marathons and dozens of 10ks, has backpacked in the High Sierras, and enjoyed scuba diving in Cozumel, Bonaire, and the Monterey Bay. In retirement Crystal hopes to continue to enjoy her hobbies of golf, gardening, hiking, playing the piano, reading, and spending time with family and friends, especially her son Mark.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak on behalf of the entire House in thanking Crystal for her 42 years of public service and outstanding leadership, showing one person can impact the lives of many. I wish her the very best in the next chapter of her life.

TRIBUTE TO DEPUTY CHIEF DAVID C. BARRETTE

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of First Deputy Chief David C. Barrette. Deputy Chief Barrette served our nation in the United States Air Force and, subsequently, has bravely served the 24th District of New York for over 40 years in the Syracuse Police Department. As Deputy Chief Barrette retires from the Syracuse Police Department, it is my honor to recognize such a distinguished citizen and civil servant.

Deputy Chief Barrette served in the United States Air Force during the Vietnam War as a Staff Sergeant from 1969 to 1973. Following his military career, Deputy Chief Barrette began his career with the Syracuse Police Department. For 41 years, he has progressed through the ranks of the Syracuse Police Department, serving as a Police Officer, Sergeant, Lieutenant, and Captain before being promoted to Deputy Chief of the Uniform Bureau in 2005 and Deputy Chief of Police in 2009.

Throughout his career, Deputy Chief Barrette has received numerous commendations for his service to our nation and the 24th District, including: a Certificate of Appreciation from the Viet Nam Veterans of America, CNY Chapter #103, the Officer Appreciation Award from the Neighborhood Watch Groups of Syracuse, an Outstanding Partner Award from the SU Community Partnership, a Certificate of Appreciation from the Southeast University Neighborhood Association and the Eastside Neighbors in Partnership, and an Outstanding Achievement Award from Syracuse United Neighbors.

Deputy Chief Barrette has remained an active member of the Syracuse community while on and off-duty through his role as a Member of the Board of Directors of the Syracuse Model Neighborhood Corporation, President of the Syracuse Police Scholarship Foundation Board of Directors, and Vice-Chair of the Onondaga County Chiefs of Police Association.

Deputy Chief Barrette holds a Bachelor of Science degree in Industrial Relations and Human Resource Management from LeMoyne College and a Master of Criminal Justice degree from the University of Alabama. He is supported by his wife, Patty.

Deputy Chief Barrette has proudly served our nation and Central New York, reflecting the courage and loyalty ubiquitous in Central New York law enforcement. I wish Deputy Chief Barrette well in his retirement and would like to thank him for his years of hard work, dedication, and service to our community.

HONORING EDWARD GARDNER HALEY

HON. STEPHEN LEE FINCHER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate my friend, Mr. Ed Haley for an outstanding career of public service that has spanned over 30 years, encompassed numerous roles, and helped countless lives. An advisor to the powerful, a mentor to the many, and smiling face for those he served, Ed Haley's life has exemplified what it means to be a servant leader.

Following graduation from Millington Central High School, Mr. Haley joined the Air Force and served as a radioman for four years before he was honorably discharged. Then, he embarked on a 15 year career with the DuPont Company before joining the Shelby County Government in 1973. During the next 27 years, Mr. Haley worked for the citizens of Shelby County, Tennessee as the Assistant Director of Safety, the Administrator for the Shelby County Automotive Facility, and ultimately the Director of the Shelby County Road Department. While most people would be looking forward to retirement, Mr. Haley energetically signed on to help the small town of Arlington as Town Superintendent and managed Arlington's explosive growth over the last 15 years until his well-deserved retirement on March 1, 2015.

Of course, knowing only Mr. Haley's public work contributions would be to miss the massive impact he has had through volunteer service during his tenure. Growing up in Millington, Tennessee and returning after the Air Force, Mr. Haley won a seat to the Board of Alderman in 1972. Throughout the 1970's and 80's he was active in the Jaycees, Optimist Club, Rotary Club, PTSA, Scottish Rite, and Gideon International. In 1990, he was elected to the Tennessee General Assembly as a State Representative serving north Shelby County until 1998.

In Matthew's Parable of the Talents, each servant has been entrusted with resources for which they are held accountable. Mr. Haley has used his life's work for the betterment of others and truly deserves to hear his Master say, "Well done, good and faithful servant." On behalf of Tennessee's 8th Congressional District, I would like to congratulate and wish the best of luck in retirement and for all future endeavors to the family and friends of Mr. Ed Haley.

HONORING MR. H. DWIGHT WEAVER FOR RECEIVING A MISSOURI HUMANITIES AWARD

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a constituent of mine, Mr. H. Dwight Weaver. Mr. Weaver will be receiving one of the Missouri Humanities Awards, Exemplary Community Achievement—Lake of the Ozarks Preservation, on Saturday, May 2, 2015. Mr. Weaver has contributed to the betterment of the state of Missouri for many years.

H. Dwight Weaver worked for 15 years at the Missouri Department of Natural Resources. During his time there, he wrote about Missouri's air, land and water quality resources and these writings aided in policymaking. Mr. Weaver was awarded with two regional and two national awards for his article contributions to the Missouri Department of Natural Resources magazine, Missouri Resources.

During his 50 years living in the Lake of the Ozarks region, Mr. Weaver, has developed a passion for Missouri caves and a profound interest in the history of that region. From his time exploring and working at caves, he gained the knowledge to publish six books. H. Dwight Weaver treasures the various places of mystery and beauty that caves offer.

For a period of 40 years, H. Dwight Weaver has assembled a rare collection of vintage images and memorabilia that is reflective of the cultural heritage of the Lake of the Ozarks region. This collection has contributed to his ability to publish seven books and ultimately be the most prolific and best-selling author of the Lake of the Ozarks. Mr. Weaver contributes his time to the Miller and Camden County historical societies and serves as a source of historical information for anyone who requests information about the Lake of the Ozarks region.

I ask you in joining me in recognizing Mr. H. Dwight Weaver on receiving this award for his dedication to the Lake of the Ozarks region and the entire state of Missouri!

HONORING PEOPLES' SELF-HELP HOUSING

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Peoples' Self-Help Housing, which has served my constituents on the Central Coast of California since its incorporation on August 6, 1970. Since its inception Peoples' Self-Help Housing has provided vital affordable housing and self-sufficiency programs for low-income families, seniors, and other special needs groups in our local community.

Over the past 45 years, Peoples' Self-Help Housing has developed nearly 1,600 affordable rental units at 45 properties throughout San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties.

Their home building program utilizes a collaborative group method known as "sweat equity" to build homes for limited income families. This valuable program has resulted in over 1,200 new homes constructed by individuals as owner-builders under the supervision of Peoples' Self-Help Housing.

Furthermore, Peoples' Self-Help Housing provides safe and attractive shelter for 4,400 residents throughout the Tri-Counties. The organization has also received numerous national, state and local awards in recognition of their significant contributions to revitalizing our neighborhoods and communities, ensuring stable housing for veterans and those who were formerly homeless, and for their innovative work in educating our youth population.

I congratulate and offer my sincerest thanks to Peoples' Self-Help Housing for 45 years of successfully providing affordable housing and vital community services to the people of the Central Coast.

COMMEMORATING THE 67TH ANNIVERSARY OF ISRAEL'S INDEPENDENCE

HON. KATHLEEN M. RICE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 67th anniversary of Israel's independence. On this day, Yom Ha'atzmaut, we celebrate Israel's establishment as a sovereign state and as a homeland for the Jewish people.

Rising from the ashes of the Holocaust, Israel has come to embody the true meaning of perseverance and resilience. Since it's declaration of independence in 1948, Israel has overcome seemingly insurmountable challenges, defending itself time and again against enemies seeking to destroy it. Today, Israel stands proudly alongside the world's most developed nations and as the Middle East's sole true democracy—one rooted in equality and freedom of speech and religion.

However, this prosperity has come at a high price, as over 20,000 brave Israeli men and women have given their lives in service to their country. That is why this week we also observe Yom Hazikaron, to pay tribute to the Israeli service members who made the ultimate sacrifice and to thousands of Israeli civilians who lost their lives in senseless acts of terror.

Sadly, in the post-9/11 world, the United States has also grown familiar with the threat of terrorism and we have watched our own men and women give their lives to defeat it. This common struggle has created yet another bond between our nations, as we both understand the indiscriminant, unjustifiable evil of terrorism, the irreparable pain it causes, and the swift, unequivocal response necessary to destroy it.

So today, we celebrate more than just 67 years of Israeli independence—we celebrate 67 years of strong and unwavering U.S.-Israeli relations.

I am proud to have visited Israel as a citizen of the United States, and I look forward to returning this summer as a member of Congress representing New York's fourth district, which is home to many people of the Jewish faith and has a special bond with the State of Israel and the Israeli people. During my time in Israel, I saw firsthand the prosperity that this great nation has built, as well as the fear that accompanies the daily threat of terrorism. On Israel's 67th year of independence, I want to congratulate the Israeli people and assure them that the U.S. will forever remain committed to their security, their survival and their prosperity.

THE AGING OUT CRISIS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to Autism Awareness Month and a huge yet largely invisible crisis that begs serious focus and a concerted national effort.

Every year, 50,000 young people on the autism spectrum transition into adulthood and are in the process of losing access to the vital educational, therapeutic and other services which enable them to live full, independent and successful lives.

Individuals with autism in the aging out generation find themselves entering into a system unprepared to meet their needs, and as a result face shrinking opportunities—and in many cases even regression.

As co-chairs of the Congressional Coalition on Autism Research and Education, Congressman MIKE DOYLE and I hosted a briefing called ''Autism and the Aging Out Crisis.'' We brought together prominent researchers, parents of autistic children and self-advocates to discuss how to best respond to the needs of this growing demographic.

Jonathan Kratchman, a 17-year-old with Asperger's from New Jersey, spoke and stated that ''many people with autism can be contributing, tax paying citizens of society. We just all need some level of funding for the support services that we were entitled to before graduation.''

High school students are given services and supports to help prepare them for young adulthood. However, when they graduate, they face a support cliff—their services end and limited options remain available to continue development.

Many of us view high school graduation as a proud accomplishment—when hard work pays off and we become participants in an adult society. For adolescents on the autism spectrum like Jonathan, a diploma can represent the end of an era without a new beginning. The support that allowed them to continue their development and remain in the community is quickly and dramatically reduced. The challenges ahead can seem overwhelming.

According to a report released this week from Drexel University researcher Dr. Paul Shattuck—who participated in the briefing and whose work was prompted by my recent law—40% of autistic youths do not receive mental health therapy, speech counseling, case management, or even medical services related to their disability once they reach early adulthood.

26% of young adults on the autism spectrum received no services whatsoever to help them become employed, continue their education, or live more independently.

Further, the consequences of the cliff are tangible and profound. One third of young adults with autism did not continue their education or get a job in their early 20s, compared to less than 8% of young adults with other disabilities. Individuals with autism from low-income households were almost twice as likely not to continue their education or find meaningful employment.

The study found individuals with autism who transition into adulthood continue to struggle with communication, social skills, and decision making; confront behavioral challenges; and face co-morbid medical conditions and co-occurring mental health disorders related to their diagnosis. When the services which help them to address these challenges evaporate, not only do these individuals fail to progress in these areas, they are profoundly impacted by the loss of their routine, and many regress.

Mr. Speaker, autism does not end when a person reaches adulthood—and our commitment shouldn't either. Support should transition along with the individuals, bolstering the promise and realization of self-sufficiency.

My Autism Collaboration, Accountability, Research, Education, and Support Act of 2014 or the ''Autism CARES Act'' (Public Law 113–157) began this conversation by tasking multiple federal agencies with producing a comprehensive study on the special needs of autistic young adults and transitioning youth.

As researchers, parents, and advocates indicated in the briefing today, we need a holistic approach—one that looks at healthcare, housing, employment, education and public safety, among other needs. With the assistance of Chairmen FRED UPTON and JOE PITTS, last year I also requested a Government Accountability Office (GAO) report evaluating existing programs for effectiveness and making recommendations—in consultation with key stakeholders—on how the public and private sectors can advance initiatives to ensure a better transition.

The briefing is the first in a series the Caucus will host—building on my recent hearing ''The Global Challenge of Autism''—to highlight the aging out crisis and explore remedial action. In addition to the importance of transition planning, there is evidence that with specialized support, employment is feasible even among individuals with high levels of impairment.

At my hearing, Jose Velasco, Vice President of Product Management at software giant SAP discussed their process of actively recruiting and hiring over 700 young adults on the autism spectrum. Management at SAP has recently told me that SAP's diligent young employees with autism are extraordinarily effective workers, and the corporation and the employees mutually benefit through this innovative alliance.

We have an obligation to help individuals with disabilities grow into adulthood. It is not only the right thing to do; it's a smart investment of taxpayer dollars that lower costs in the long run. The University Centers for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities estimates that: ''Diverting just one young person into living-wage employment could save an average of $150,000 in SSI benefits over their lifetime. According to the Social Security Administration, transitioning just one half of one percent of current SSDI and SSI beneficiaries from benefits to self-sustaining employment would save $3.5 billion in cash benefits over the work-life of those individuals.''

By investing in and harnessing the potential of young adults with autism, we as a society will benefit from the unique skills, abilities, and perspectives of the aging out generation.

HONORING THE SIMON RIVERA EARLY COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL RAIDERS, THE 2015 6A BOYS SOCCER UIL STATE CHAMPIONS FROM BROWNSVILLE, TEXAS

HON. FILEMON VELA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in honor of the Simon Rivera Early College High School Raiders—the 2015 6A Boys Soccer UIL State Champions from Brownsville, Texas. Their undefeated 28 game season proved that the Rio Grande Valley is home to the best soccer team in the State of Texas, and one of the best in the nation.

On Saturday, April 18, 2015, the Rivera Raiders beat Katy Cinco Ranch 2 to 0 in Georgetown, Texas. The win cemented their state title and brought a third statewide championship to the Brownsville Independent School District.

From the onset of the 2015 soccer season, Coach Salvador Garcia knew the Rivera Raiders were a ''Team of Destiny,'' and would rally the support of an entire community. Coach Garcia's dedication, tenacity and years of experience would transform the Rivera Raiders into an undefeated powerhouse. He knew the hours of practice and commitment would yield only one outcome—a chance to prove what he already knew—that the Rivera Raiders would be the best soccer team in Texas.

Their historic championship season serves as a reminder that through teamwork and perseverance, we are all capable of achieving great things. The entire team of dedicated student-athletes set an example to be emulated. Their accomplishments have earned them a place in the history of Rivera High School, and the legacy of their state championship will live on through the precedent set by an undefeated season.

To all those who supported the players, your efforts were critical to the strength of the Rivera Raiders. You drove them to practices early in the morning and picked them up late into the evening. On game days, you prepared them the nutritious meals that would give them stamina. You helped them balance the demands of athletics, studies, and home life, and you instilled the values of humility, sportsmanship and perseverance.

To the faculty and staff at Rivera High School: teachers, assistant coaches, counselors, principals, support staff and personnel, thank you for all that you do to help our children accomplish their goals. Your commitment to educating all students is vital as we prepare the next generation of Americans to lead our nation in the future. Keep doing the excellent job you do.

The coaches and players who inspired a community and cemented their place in Rivera High School history by winning the 2015 6A Boys Soccer UIL State Championship are Head Coach Salvador Garcia; Assistant Coaches Jose Dominguez, Andres Macias and Jimmy Montalvo; Athletic Coordinator Tom Chavez; and Principal Aimee Garza-Limon.

The 2015 Rivera Raiders are Isidro Martinez (named Most Valuable Player); Eliezer Acero; Israel Acero; David Alexander; Erik A. Alonso; Carlos I. Alvarez; Jose R. Alvarez, Jr.; Francisco Cardenas, Jr.; Roberto C. Castro; Jorge A. Cordova; Abdon Cruz; Hernan A. Cruz; Ivan L. Cruz; Julian Espinoza; Marcos A. Hernandez, Jr.; Alexis Herrera; Lee R. Martinez; Roberto J. Melendez; Eliseo F. Ortiz; Edward M. Rojas; Eduardo A. Salinas; Sergio Soto-Ramirez; Jesus A. Torres II; Jose A. Muniz Velazquez; Jose M. Villanueva, Jr.; Alfredo G. Villarreal; and Jesus R. Zaragoza.

These students from Rivera High School represented the Brownsville Independent School District and the City of Brownsville in a manner that brings great credit and distinction to our region, and I am proud that they set an example for us all to follow. I wish each of them the best in their future endeavors, and I join with my colleagues in Congress in congratulating them on an undefeated championship season.

IN HONOR OF RAYMOND FRANK FRESCHI

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mourn the passing of a wonderful human being, good friend, and a great American. Raymond Frank Freschi died earlier this month at the age of 89. Ray will always be remembered for his very kind and generous heart and lively spirit. He loved his family, his many friends and his life. He will be greatly missed.

Ray was born in Clifton, New Jersey on June 16, 1925. Ray joined the Navy after graduating from high school and served as a medic-corpsman in Norfolk, Virginia and later aboard the U.S. *Wakefield* on a mission to China. Upon leaving the Navy, he attended Fairleigh Dickinson College in Rutherford, New Jersey and then transferred to University of Southern California. At USC he met his beloved wife Shirley, to whom he was married for 65 years—they are an example of a beautiful couple actively involved in their community. They had two children, daughter, Susan Elaine, who sadly preceded Ray in death, and son Raymond Sandy Freschi Jr. Ray and Shirley lived in La Canada-Flintridge in Southern California for 25 years before moving to Pebble Beach for the next 25 years, and then on to Carmel Valley Manor.

Everybody who knew Ray remarked on what a joyous person he was. He radiated happiness. He loved and respected people; always taking a genuine interest in others. Among other things, this helped him become a successful real estate entrepreneur. Ray studied and taught real estate, and quickly established, what was then, the largest real estate office in Glendale, California. Among Ray's many accomplishments was purchasing the Chevy Chase country club in Glendale, and transforming it into a thriving successful golf community. He also developed a three story office building and condominium complex on the Golden State Freeway in Glendale. Ray even made a run for a House seat here in Congress. Later, during his retirement, Ray built several beautiful houses in Pebble Beach.

For many years, Ray had enjoyed spending time at his Green Glen ranch property in Gilroy. Ray's hobby was driving horses and collecting antique carriages and wagons. While in Pebble Beach, Ray could often be seen on the weekends driving a pair of his Welsh Cobbs, Concord & Taffy, or his French Percheron draft horses, Peter & Oliver with a newlywed couple in the carriage. His appearance brought joy to everyone, especially my daughter who has followed his professional love of horses.

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for the whole House in offering our condolences to Ray's friends and family, including his wife Shirley, son Sandy, grandchildren Peter McLean Freschi, Brooke Susan Freschi., sister Beverly Vivenetto, as well as many nieces and nephews.

TRIBUTE TO VICTIMS OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to submit these additional names of Armenians who lost their lives in the Armenian Genocide from 1915 to 1923. We will never forget their names and their stories and we will continue to speak the truth in the face of denial.

Shahinian Family, Melkonian Family, Nalbandian Family, Kharmandarian Family, Kasbarian Family, Eksoozian Family, Garabedian Family, Hairabedian Family, Etyemezian Family, Barsoumian Family, K. Vartanian, Levonian Family, Gugasian Family, A. Arakelian, the parents and family of Simon Samsonian, Arakelian Family, Harutune Dadourian and 41 members of Dadourian and Arsenian Families, Hunazant Alexanian and 49 members of Alexanian and Abkarian Families, First daughter of Goolezar Nercesian, Second daughter of Goolezar Nercesian, Rev. Fr. Mashdots Abajian, Rev. Fr. Garabed Adomian, Rev. Fr. Mesrob Afarian, Rev. Fr. Kiud Aghayekian, Rev. Fr. Sahag Aghinian, Rev. Fr. Samuel Ajemian, Rev. Fr. Yeghish Alamasharian, Rev. Fr. Alexan Alexanian, Rev. Fr. Krikor Alexanian, Rev. Fr. Yeghish Amirkhanian, Rev. Fr. Hagop Ananian, Rev. Fr. Atam Anchigian, Rev. Fr. Tatoul Andnonian, Rev. Fr. Krikor Andonian, Rev. Fr. Kevork Apkarian, Rev. Fr. Housig Aprahamian, Rev. Fr. Melidos Aprahamian, Rev. Fr. Pilibbos Aprahamian, Rev. Fr. Pilibbos Arakelian, V. Rev. Fr. Garabed Arakelian, Archpriest Fr. Yeghish Aramian, Rev. Fr. Hamazasb Aramian, V. Rev. Fr. Gomidas Ardzrouni, Rev. Fr. Karekin Arekian, Rev. Fr. Yeznag Arevigian, Rev. Fr. Krikor Arisian, Rev. Fr. Arsen Armaghanian, Rev. Fr. Hemayag Aroyan, Rev. Fr. Arsen Arshagouni, Rev. Fr. Avedis Arslanian, Rev. Fr. Vartan Arslanian, Rev. Fr. Yeremia Asarian, Rev. Fr. Parnapas Asdikian, Rev. Fr. Sarkis Asdourian, Rev. Fr. Nahabed Asdvadzadourian, Rev. Fr. Nerses Asdvadzadourian, Rev. Fr. Yeghish Asdvadzadourian, Rev. Fr. Yeghish Asdvadzadourian, Rev. Fr. Housig Ashjian, Rev. Fr. Madteos Atamian, V. Rev. Fr. Mikael Atchabahian, Rev. Fr. Inknadios Avakian, Rev. Fr. Keteon Avakian, Rev. Fr. Ashod Avedian, Rev. Fr. Kapriel Avedissian, Rev. Fr. Kasbar Aveidsian, Rev. Fr. Hagop Ayvazian, Rev. Fr. Iravapar Ayvazian, Rev. Fr. Sarkis Ayvazian, Rev. Fr. Yeghish Ayvazian, Rev. Fr. Marouk Babian, Rev. Fr. Andon Baghdassarian, Rev. Fr. Hagop Baghdassarian, Rev. Fr. Haroutiun Baghdassarian, Rev. Fr. Khatchadour Baghdassarian, V. Rev. Fr. Sdepan Baghdassarian, Rev. Fr. Agepsimos Bahlavouni, Rev. Fr. Ghevont Bahlavouni, Rev. Fr. Sempad Bahlavouni, Rev. Fr. Vaghinag Bahlavouni, Rev. Fr. Pakrad Balemian, Rev. Fr. Nerses Balian, Rev. Fr. Movses Baligian, Rev. Fr. Yeghiazar Baligian, V. Rev. Fr. Yeghish Balouni, Rev. Fr. Shigha Bantekhdian, Rev. Fr. Ghevont Barigian, Rev. Fr. Keteon Baronian, Rev. Fr. Vahan Baronian, Rev. Fr. Nerses Bayian, Rev. Fr. Armenag Bedigian, Rev. Fr. Arshen Bedrossian, Rev. Fr. Asdvadzadour Bedrossian, Rev. Fr. Boghos Bedrossian, Rev. Fr. Megerditch Bedrossian, Rev. Fr. Vahan Bedrossian, V. Rev. Fr. Yeghiazar Bedrossian, Rev. Fr. Kapriel Begian, Rev. Fr. Taniel Begian, Rev. Fr. Garabed Behrigian, Rev. Fr. Magar Bekhozian, Rev. Fr. Garabed Benneyan, Rev. Fr. Hagop Berberian, Rev. Fr. Yeghish Beylerian, Rev. Fr. Kerovp Biberian, Bishop Sempad Saadetian, Rev. Fr. Arisdages Bodossian, Rev. Fr. Vahram Bodossian, Rev. Fr. Aram Boghossian, Rev. Fr. Vaghinag Bordigian, Rev. Fr. Krisdapor Bosdigian, V. Rev. Fr. Haroutiun Bouroujian, Rev. Fr. Hagop Boyajian, Rev. Fr. Krikor Boyajian, Rev. Fr. Mesrob Boyajian, V. Rev. Fr. Kevork Boyapian, Rev. Fr. Sahag Chamashourian, Rev. Fr. Nershabouh Charchian, Rev. Fr. Arsen Chekmezian, Rev. Fr. Souren Chengelian, Rev. Fr. Sdepanos Cheorugian, Rev. Fr. Garabed Chitchekian, Rev. Fr. Toros Chitcjian, Rev. Fr. Vosgian Cholakian, V. Rev. Fr. Sahag Cholakian, Rev. Fr. Arshavir Choloyan, Rev. Fr. Garabed Daderian, Rev. Fr. Natan Dadian, Rev. Fr. Hovhannes Dadigian, Rev. Fr. Khoren Daghlian, Rev. Fr. Ghevont Dayan, Rev. Fr. Neshan Der Antreassian, Rev. Fr. Bedros Der Bedrossian, Rev. Fr. Haroutiun Der Bedrossian, Rev. Fr. Hmayag Der Bedrossian, Rev. Fr. Melkon Der Bedrossian, Rev. Fr. Boghos Der Boghossian, Rev. Fr. Moushegh Der Boghossian, Rev. Fr. Yeremia Der Boghossian, Rev. Fr. Gorun Der Garabedian, Rev. Fr. Hagop Der Garabedian, Rev. Fr. Hamazasb Der Garabedian, Rev. Fr. Haroutiun Der Garabedian, Rev. Fr. Kevork Der Garabedian, Rev. Fr. Kevork Der Garabedian, Rev. Fr. Khoren Der Garabedian, Rev. Fr. Khosrov Der Garabedian, Rev. Fr. Tatoul Der Garabedian, Rev. Fr. Zareh Der Garabedian, Archpriest Ghevont Der Ghevontian, Rev. Fr. Gournelios Der Gureghian, Rev. Fr. Hagop Der Hagopian, Rev. Fr. Hagop Der Hagopian, Rev. Fr. Hagop Der Hagopian, Rev. Fr. Hagop Der Hagopian, Rev. Fr. Khatchadour Der Hagopian, Rev. Fr. Nerses Der Hagopian, Rev. Fr. Zenop Der Hagopian, Rev. Fr. Hamazasb Der Hamazasbian, Rev. Fr. Arisdages Der

Haroutiunian, Rev. Fr. Hagop Der Haroutiunian, Rev. Fr. Sdepan Der Haroutiunian, Rev. Fr. Vrtanes Der Haroutiunian, Rev. Fr. Arsen Der Housigian, Rev. Fr. Asdvadzadour Der Housigian, Rev. Fr. Apraham Der Hovhannessian, Rev. Fr. Atanas Der Hovhannessian, Rev. Fr. Boghos Der Hovhannessian, Rev. Fr. Garabed Der Hovhannessian, Rev. Fr. Gosdantianos Der Hovhannessian, Rev. Fr. Hovasap Der Hovhannessian, Rev. Fr. Hovhannes Der Hovhannessian, Rev. Fr. Hovhannes Der Hovhannessian, Rev. Fr. Hovhannes Der Hovhannessian, Rev. Fr. Pilibbos Der Hovhannessian, V. Rev. Fr. Magar Der Hovhannessian, V. Rev. Fr. Sdepanos Der Hovhannessian, Rev. Fr. Sahag Der Hovsepian, Rev. Fr. Arakel Der Katchian, Rev. Fr. Anania Der Kevorkian, Rev. Fr. Boghos Der Kevorkian, Rev. Fr. Kevork Der Kevorkian, Rev. Fr. Megerditch Der Kevorkian, Rev. Fr. Yeznig Der Kevorkian, Rev. Fr. Arsen Der Khatchadourian, Rev. Fr. Khatchadour Der Khatchadourian, Rev. Fr. Vartan Der Khatchadourian, Rev. Fr. Sahag Der Khatian, V. Rev. Fr. Bsag Der Khorenian, Rev. Fr. Hagop Der Krikorian, Rev. Fr. Karekin Der Krikorian, Rev. Fr. Krikor Der Krikorian, Rev. Fr. Krikor Der Krikorian, Rev. Fr. Moushegh Der Madteossian, Rev. Fr. Ashod Der Manuelian, Rev. Fr. Kerovpe Der Manuelian, Rev. Fr. Krikor Der Manuelian, Rev. Fr. Haroutiun Der Mardirossian, Rev. Fr. Hovhannes Der Mardirossian, Rev. Fr. Papken Der Mardirossian, Rev. Fr. Margos Der Margossian, Rev. Fr. Sahag Der Margossian, Rev. Fr. Garabed Der Markarian, Rev. Fr. Ghevont Der Markarian, Rev. Fr. Khatchadour Der Markarian, Rev. Fr. Bedros Der Megerditchian, Rev. Fr. Boghos Der Megerditchian, Rev. Fr. Garabed Der Megerditchian, Rev. Fr. Kalousd Der Megerditchian, Rev. Fr. Megerditch Der Megerditchian, Rev. Fr. Parnag Der Megerditchian, Rev. Fr. Mekhitar Der Mekhitarian, Rev. Fr. Bsag Der Melidossian, Rev. Fr. Haroutiun Der Melkonian, Rev. Fr. Samuel Der Mesrobian, Rev. Fr. Avedis Der Mikaelian, Rev. Fr. Kapriel Der Mikaelian, Rev. Fr. Moushegh Der Mousheghian, Movses Der Movsessian, Movses Der Movsessian, Rev. Fr. Sahag Der Sahagian, Rev. Fr. Aharon Der Sarkissian, Rev. Fr. Knel Der Sarkissian, Rev. Fr. Sarkis Der Sarkissian, Rev. Fr. Sarkis Der Sarkissian, Rev. Fr. Sarkis Der Sarkissian, V. Rev. Fr. Nerses Der Sarkissian, Rev. Fr. Bedros Der Sdepanian.

ROME CITY HALL 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. TOM GRAVES

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 100th Anniversary of the City Hall in Rome, Georgia.

Over a century ago, leaders of this fine community had a vision for the city to build a municipal building not like many of its time.

Today the building still serves as one of Rome's central landmarks, located in the center of downtown on Broad Street.

Construction began on this site one hundred years ago this month, after residents—"Romans"—agreed to allow city issued bonds to be sold to fund the project.

The building's auditorium has served as the venue for a variety of significant events and hosted a long list of notable public officials, including former U.S. Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan, and popular musicians like the Allman Brothers Band.

I cannot imagine a drive through downtown Rome without seeing City Hall.

Happy centennial anniversary.

H.R. 1560 AND H.R. 1731

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I voted against H.R. 1560, the Protecting Cyber Networks Act and H.R. 1731, National Cybersecurity Protection Advancement Act.

H.R. 1560 was an overly broad intrusion into civil liberties. While H.R. 1730 was more narrowly tailored and represented progress from previous cybersecurity bills that the House has considered, I continue to have reservations, particularly with the liability provisions in the bill.

Protecting ourselves against cyber-attacks is critical for national security and for a robust economy, and I strongly support taking actions to ensure that we have the best mechanisms in place to defend against cybersecurity threats. In working toward this goal, however, we cannot sacrifice important civil liberties or the privacy of American citizens. We must also ensure that companies can be held accountable if they fail to protect personal information or fail to act on cybersecurity threat information.

I will work to help these proposals to evolve so that we will consider an improved solution in the future.

HONORING NEW HAVEN NATIVE FRED PARRIS

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure today that I rise to join Mayor Toni Harp and the City of New Haven as they pay tribute to New Haven native Fred Parris at the City's 377th Anniversary celebration. Today, community leaders and residents will gather to plant five trees, one for each century during which the City of New Haven has been incorporated. As they do so, they will pay homage to the City's "deep roots" by recognizing one of our civic icons, Fred Parris.

Founder and lead singer of The Five Satins, Fred's extraordinary story began in 1953 when he started singing as a student at Hillhouse High School in a group called the Scarlets. The group disbanded when its members joined the army in 1956 and Fred Parris found himself stationed at Philadelphia's Navy Yard. On weekends, Fred would often return to New Haven and sing for fun with a few friends from the neighborhood. In fact, they could often be found singing on street corners along bustling Dixwell Avenue. At the insistence of a local record company owner, Fred got together with Jim Freeman, Lou Peebles, Eddie Martin and Stanley Dortch to form the Five Satins—the era of Doo-Wop music was born.

One night, while on guard duty at 4 am, Fred penned "In The Still of the Night" bringing a musical gift to the world. It has been over 50 years since they recorded "In the Still of the Night" in the basement of St. Bernadette's church in New Haven. Just weeks later, Fred was shipped out by the time the record made the national charts, he was stationed in Japan and had to be replaced by Bill Baker. When Fred returned from the army, he again became the group's lead, recording songs like "Shadows" and "I'll Be Seeing You."

"In the Still of the Night" has sold millions of copies and is still one of the most requested "golden oldies" on almost every Top-40 radio station in the country. In fact, when Rolling Stone magazine released its list of "The 500 Greatest Songs of All Time" a few years ago, "In the Still of the Night " was right up there at #90—in between #89 "California Dreamin" by The Mamas & The Papas and #91 "Suspicious Minds" by Elvis Presley. Fred and his Five Satins continued recording well into the 1980's and in 2003 were inducted into the Vocal Group Hall of Fame.

Fred, along with his wife, Emma, continues to make the Greater New Haven community their home today and Fred continues to perform. He is true community treasure and I am honored to join Mayor Harp and all of those gathered today in paying him tribute.

TRIBUTE TO VICTIMS OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to submit these additional names of Armenians who lost their lives in the Armenian Genocide from 1915 to 1923. We will never forget their names and their stories and we will continue to speak the truth in the face of denial.

Rev. Fr. Ghevont Der Sdepanian, Rev. Fr. Vahan Der Sdepanian, Rev. Fr. Hagop Der Seropian, Rev. Fr. Khatchadour Der Seropian, Rev. Fr. Bedros Der Simonian, Rev. Fr. Shmavon Der Simonian, Rev. Fr. Kevork Der Tavitian, Rev. Fr. Vrtanes Der Torossian, Rev. Fr. Bimen Der Vartanian, Rev. Fr. Kakig Der Vartanian, Rev. Fr. Vartan Der Vartanian, Archpriest Yeghia Der Yeghiayan, Rev. Fr. Karnig Der Yezegielian, Rev. Fr. Zakaria Der Zakarian, Rev. Fr. Zakaria Der Zakarian, Rev. Fr. Yeprem Der-Alexanian, Rev. Fr. Bedros Der-Aprahamian, Rev. Fr. Hovhannes Der-Aprahamian, Rev. Fr. Hovhannes Der-Asdvadzadourian, Rev. Fr. Kapriel Der-Atamian, Rev. Fr. Avedis Der-Avedissian, Rev. Fr. Ghevont Der-Avedissian, Rev. Fr. Hagop Der-Avedissian, Rev. Fr. Knel Der-Azarian, Rev. Fr. Iravapar Derbabian, Rev. Fr. Atam Derderian, Rev. Fr. Garabed Derderian, Rev. Fr. Haroutiun Derderian, Rev. Fr. Hovhannes Derderian, Rev. Fr. Kalousd Derderian, Rev. Fr. Kevork Derderian, Rev. Fr. Khatchadour Derderian, Rev. Fr. Vahan Derderian, Rev. Fr. Vartan Derderian, Rev. Fr. Avedis Der-

Kalousdian, Rev. Fr. Kalousd Der-Kalousdian, Rev. Fr. Khoren Der-Kalousdian, Rev. Fr. Megerditch Der-Kalousdian, Rev. Fr. Vartan Der-Kalousdian, Rev. Fr. Serovpe Der-Kasbarian, Rev. Fr. Khoren Dermenjian, Rev. Fr. Souren Deroyan, Rev. Fr. Boghos Der-Parseghian, Rev. Fr. Hemayag Der-Parseghian, Rev. Fr. Parsegh Der-Parseghian, Rev. Fr. Karekin Der-Partoghimeossian, V. Rev. Fr. Vrtanes Devgants, Rev. Fr. Sdepan Deyirmenjian, Rev. Fr. Ghevont Dilegian, Rev. Fr. Hetoum Diradourian, Rev. Fr. Garabed Dishlian, Rev. Fr. Ghevont Djanikian, Rev. Fr. Khosrov Djeghikian, Rev. Fr. Movses Djenezian, Rev. Fr. Arsen Djeranian, Rev. Fr. Nerses Dobrashian, Rev. Fr. Donabed , Rev. Fr. Armenag Donatossian, Archpriest Madteos Donigian, Rev. Fr. Hovhannes Donoyan, Rev. Fr. Krikor Dosdourian, Rev. Fr. Souren Durgerian, Rev. Fr. Kiud Dzadourian, Rev. Fr. Kourken Dzaghighian, Rev. Fr. Yevkineos Dzaghigian, Rev. Fr. Teopile Dzerougian, V. Rev. Fr. Hovhannes Dzerouni, Rev. Fr. Movses Dzotsigian, Rev. Fr. Torkom Ehramjian, Rev. Fr. Sahag Elbegian, Rev. Fr. Adovm Elmasdian, Rev. Fr. Apkar Englian, Rev. Fr. Norayr Eozelian, Rev. Fr. Samuel Ermoyan, Rev. Fr. Geghemes Etyemezian, Rev. Fr. Mampre Fakhirian, Rev. Fr. Arsen Ferhadian, Rev. Fr. Tornig Gaboudigian, V. Rev. Fr. Madteos Gadarian, V. Rev. Fr. Arisdages Gadegjian, Rev. Fr. Krikor Gananian, Archpriest Fr. Yezegiel Garabedian, Rev. Fr. Alexianos Garabedian, Rev. Fr. Garabed Garabedian, Rev. Fr. Haroutiun Garabedian, Rev. Fr. Krikor Garabedian, Rev. Fr. Mamigon Garabedian, Rev. Fr. Yeghiazar Garabedian, Rev. Fr. Yeghishe Garabedian, V. Rev. Fr. Boghos Garabedian, V. Rev. Fr. Yeghishe Garabedian, Rev. Fr. Soukias Gargarian, Rev. Fr. Soponia Garinian, Rev. Fr. Mardiros Gedigian, Rev. Fr. Sdepan Gedjadian, Rev. Fr. Ghevont Gemijian, Rev. Fr. Movses Geogjian, Rev. Fr. Madteos Gergerian, Rev. Fr. Mikael Ghamparian, Rev. Fr. Yeghia Gharibshahian, Rev. Fr. Kourken Ghazarian, Rev. Fr. Krikor Ghazarian, Rev. Fr. Movses Ghazarian, V. Rev. Fr. Bedros Ghazarian, Rev. Fr. Arisdages Ghougassian, Rev. Fr. Garabed Ghougassian, Rev. Fr. Khosrov Ghougassian, Rev. Fr. Avedis Giragossian, Rev. Fr. Magar Giragossian, Rev. Fr. Partoughimeos Gobalian, Rev. Fr. Madteos Gogoyan, Rev. Fr. Gorun , Rev. Fr. Movses Gulgezian, Rev. Fr. Apel Gureghian, Rev. Fr. Sebouh Gureghian, Rev. Fr. Avak Hagopian, Rev. Fr. Garabed Hagopian, Rev. Fr. Garabed Hagopian, Rev. Fr. Krikor Hagopian, V. Rev. Fr. Boghos Hagopian, V. Rev. Fr. Hagop Hagopian, V. Rev. Fr. Taniel Hagopian, V. Rev. Fr. Vartan Hagopian, Rev. Fr. Sahag Hairabedian, V. Rev. Fr. Hamazasb, Rev. Fr. Khoren Hampartsoumian, Rev. Fr. Krikor Hampartsoumian, Rev. Fr. Adom Haroutiunian, Rev. Fr. Arisdages Haroutiunian, Rev. Fr. Arsen Haroutiunian, Rev. Fr. Avedis Haroutiunian, Rev. Fr. Guregh Haroutiunian, Rev. Fr. Khatchadour Haroutiunian, Rev. Fr. Taniel Haroutiunian, V. Rev. Fr. Arsen Haroutiunian, V. Rev. Fr. Anania Hazarabedian, Rev. Fr. Zaven Hazarian, V. Rev. Fr. Garabed Hazarshahian, Rev. Fr. Krikor Hekimian, Rev. Fr. Roupen Hekimian, Rev. Fr. Sempad Helhelian, Rev. Fr. Garabed Hendeyan, Rev. Fr. Kourken Hovagimian, Rev. Fr. Ghevont Hovhannessian, Rev. Fr. Hamazasb Hovhannessian, Rev. Fr. Megerditch Hovhannessian, Rev. Fr. Vahan Hovhannessian, Rev. Fr. Hovhannes Hovhannessian, Rev. Fr. Hovhannes Hovhannessian, Rev. Fr. Margos Hovhannessian, Rev. Fr. Sdepan Hovhannessian, Rev. Fr. Yeprem Hovhannessian, V. Rev. Fr. Melkiseteg Hovivian, Rev. Fr. Pakrad Isakian, Rev. Fr. Garabed Jamgotchian, Rev. Fr. Ghevont Jamgotchian, Rev. Fr. Krikor Kalayjian, Rev. Fr. Yevakr Kalayjian, V. Rev. Fr. Souren Kalemian, V. Rev. Fr. Ardavazt Kalenderian, Archpriest Fr. Megerditch Kaleonjian, Rev. Fr. Haroutiun Kalousdian, Bishop Yeznig Kalpakjian, Rev. Fr. Arisdages Kaprielian, Rev. Fr. Krikor Karagueozian, Rev. Fr. Vahram Karaguiavourian, Rev. Fr. Garabed Karakashian, Rev. Fr. Yervant Karamanougian, Rev. Fr. Agepsimos Kasbarian, Rev. Fr. Mampre Kasbarian, Rev. Fr. Mesrob Kasbarian, Rev. Fr. Moushegh Kasbarian, Rev. Fr. Parnapas Kasbarian, V. Rev. Fr. Megerditch Kasbarian, Archpriest Fr. Bedros Kassian, Rev. Fr. Housig Kavafian, Rev. Fr. Bedros Kebabjian, Rev. Fr. Parnag Kehiayan, Rev. Fr. Hovagim Keomurjian, Rev. Fr. Madatia Keondukian, Rev. Fr. Hagop Keoroghlian, Rev. Fr. Ghevont Keremian, Rev. Fr. Bedros Keshishian, Rev. Fr. Dadjad Keshishian, Rev. Fr. Ghevont Keshishian, Rev. Fr. Ghougas Keshishian, Rev. Fr. Hagop Keshishian, Rev. Fr. Hovhannes Keshishian, Rev. Fr. Bedros Kevorkian, Rev. Fr. Haroutiun Kevorkian, Rev. Fr. Maghakia Kevorkian, Rev. Fr. Mekhitar Kevorkian, Rev. Fr. Movses Kevorkian, Rev. Fr. Zakaria Kevorkian, Rev. Fr. Zarmayr Kevorkian, Rev. Fr. Haroutiun Keyhiayan, Rev. Fr. Garabed Khanjian, Bishop Nerses Kharakhanian, Rev. Fr. Pakrad Kharpoutlian, Rev. Fr. Khatchadour , Rev. Fr. Arshag Khatchadourian, Rev. Fr. Hagop Khatchadourian, Rev. Fr. Khatchadour Khatchadourian, Rev. Fr. Oksendios Khatchadourian, Rev. Fr. Yeghishe Khatchadourian, V. Rev. Fr. Yeremia Khatchadourian, Rev. Fr. Hovhannes Khatchaoudrian, Rev. Fr. Dzamitos Khatchigian, Rev. Fr. Nerses Khatchoyan, Rev. Fr. Parnapas Khojian, Rev. Fr. Haroutiun Khojoyan, V. Rev. Fr. Sdepan Khorkhorounian, Rev. Fr. Yeprem Kibritjian, Rev. Fr. Khosrof Kirkorian, Rev. Fr. Hiusikos Kojadeolian, Rev. Fr. Yebipan Kojayan, Rev. Fr. Vahan Koltoukian, Rev. Fr. Stepan Kopoushian, Rev. Fr. Kakig Kossian, Rev. Fr. Yeghishe Koulaksezian, Rev. Fr. Hagop Koushoghlian, Rev. Fr. Armenag Kouyoumjian, Rev. Fr. Hagop Kouyoumjian, Rev. Fr. Hovsep Krikorian, Rev. Fr. Sarkis Krikorian, V. Rev. Fr. Bedros Krikorian, Rev. Fr. Hagop Kulkanjian, Rev. Fr. Adom Kurkjian, Rev. Fr. Housig Kurkjian.

IN COMMEMORATION OF 1890S DAY

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in proud recognition of 1890s Day, which commemorates an influential piece of legislation that took effect 125 years ago yet is still very relevant today.

In 1862, President Abraham Lincoln signed the Morrill Act into law with the intention of giving federal land grants to states so that they would in turn sell them to establish ''land-grant'' universities with the funds. Academically, these institutions were to specialize in fields such as agriculture, military strategy, and engineering, initiatives that would have a distinct impact on local economies and technological developments in years to come.

Twenty-eight years later, the second Morrill Act of 1890 was enacted and we celebrate that moment today. It was significant because it specifically addressed the former Confederate States. In order to combat extensive racial discrimination faced by African Americans in the post-Civil War South, the Act required that States wishing to receive federal support must either omit entry restrictions based on skin color at their universities entirely, or else establish separate institutions specifically designed to accommodate African Americans. Many historically black colleges and universities came into existence as a result of this rule.

Prior to the Civil War, there were few opportunities for African Americans to receive a higher education. Those African Americans who did receive such schooling studied at home or in informal settings. In fact, during the era of slavery, it had been a crime to instruct an African American in anything except the most rudimentary skills.

Within the Second Congressional District of Georgia, one concrete outcome of this landmark legislation was the 1895 founding of Fort Valley High and Industrial School, which would later become Fort Valley State College and, finally, Fort Valley State University. This historically African-American institution remains Georgia's only 1890 land-grant university.

Proving itself over decades of scholastic distinction and educating thousands of students in the sciences as well as the arts, this renowned establishment is still alive and flourishing today. It was all made possible through that groundbreaking decision made more than a century ago. Since the 1890 Act directly addressed concerns of discrimination against African Americans, it has served to provide opportunities for all students, regardless of their race.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed my privilege to bring attention to this important day, and to recognize the changes the Morrill Act of 1890 has brought to our communities and to our nation. For it is through the diversity and the inspiration of our youth that we are able to grow as a society, in innovation and in hope. Let us celebrate these developments today and anticipate a bright future to come tomorrow.

THE 67TH ANNIVERSARY OF ISRAEL'S INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, today, I join the Israeli people in celebrating 67 years of independence and more than six decades of steadfast support by the United States.

Israel remains unquestionably our strongest ally in the region—a key supporter in our fight against terrorism and the only country in the region in which the voice of its citizens is regularly heard through the ballot box.

Not only are our security interests inextricably linked, but the U.S.-Israeli relationship is firmly rooted in democratic values, common goals, and the unbreakable bond between our people.

As the former Chairwoman and current Ranking Member on the Appropriations Subcommittee on State and Foreign Operations, I will continue to advocate for U.S. assistance to Israel, which helps our ally secure its borders and protect its citizens, as well as unequivocally support efforts to stand with Israel in international fora.

This year's Yom Ha'atzmaut is an opportunity to celebrate the ties that unite us and recommit ourselves to working together on the many challenges currently facing both our great countries.

HONORING THE MOTHERS TRUST FOUNDATION

HON. ROBERT J. DOLD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Mothers Trust Foundation of Lake County. Founded by Barbara Monsor, the Mothers Trust Foundation's mission is to provide immediate assistance during times of crisis to low-income children.

Mr. Speaker, the Mothers Trust Foundation works to connect children in desperate situations with those who want to provide assistance where it truly makes a difference. Each request is specific to the child's financial needs. For example, the organization helps fund the cost of school supplies, a class field trip fee or even a college application payment.

By assisting in these times of need, the Mothers Trust Foundation strives to build confidence and make a positive difference in young people's lives. Thank you to Jody Ortiz, Jeanette Lincoln, Wendy Feldhaus, Daria Andrews, Jane Rubin, Terri Karst, Tina Mascari and Mary Claire Sparrow for dedicating your time to a special cause. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize these selfless, inspiring leaders and the Mothers Trust Foundation.

TRIBUTE TO VICTIMS OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to submit these additional names of Armenians who lost their lives in the Armenian Genocide from 1915 to 1923. We will never forget their names and their stories and we will continue to speak the truth in the face of denial.

Rev. Fr. Krikor Mansouian, Rev. Fr. Sdepan Mansouirn, Rev. Fr. Boghos Maranian, Rev. Fr. Ardag Mardirossian, Rev. Fr. Arshen Mardirossian, Rev. Fr. Bedros Mardirossian, Rev. Fr. Hovsep Mardirossian, Rev. Fr. Khoren Mardirossian, Rev. Fr. Michael Mardirossian, Rev. Fr. Sarkis Mardirossian, Rev. Fr. Ghevont Margossian, Rev. Fr. Dzamitos Markarian, Rev. Fr. Gorun Markarian, V. Rev. Fr. Hovhannes Mavian, Rev. Fr. Tatoul Mazmanian, Rev. Fr. Israel Medjigian, Rev. Fr. Gorun Megerditchian, V. Rev. Fr. Nerses Megerditchian, Rev. Fr. Garabed Melikian, Rev. Fr. Dadjad Melkonian, Rev. Fr. Haroutiun Melkonian, Rev. Fr. Khatchadour Melkonian, Rev. Fr. Souren Melkonian, Rev. Fr. Hagop Messerlian, Rev. Fr. Apkar Mghdessian, Rev. Fr. Mikael, Rev. Fr. Khoren Mikaelian, Rev. Fr. Moushegh Mikaelian, V. Rev. Fr. Sarkis Mikaelian, Rev. Fr. Mergerios Minassian, Rev. Fr. Minas Minassian, Rev. Fr. Tateos Minassian, Rev. Fr. Haroutiun Miroyan, Rev. Fr. Garabed Mkhalian, Rev. Fr. Partogh Mkhalian, V. Rev. Fr. Yeghishe Mogatsian, Rev. Fr. Garabed Moughalian, Rev. Fr. Zadig Moumigian, Rev. Fr. Hayrabed Mouradian, Rev. Fr. Krikor Mouradian, Rev. Fr. Oksendios Mouradian, Rev. Fr. Ovresdes Mouradian, Rev. Fr. Ovresdes Mouradian, Rev. Fr. Souren Mouradian, Rev. Fr. Yeghishe Mouradian, Rev. Fr. Khatchadour Mouradian, V. Rev. Fr. Hovhannes Mouradian, Rev. Fr. Hemayag Mouradkhanian, Rev. Fr. Melkiseteg Moushmoulian, Rev. Fr. Hagop Najarian, Rev. Fr. Hagop Nalbandian, Rev. Fr. Yeghia Nazaretian, V. Rev. Fr. Yeznig Nergararian, Rev. Fr. Soukias Nersesian, Rev. Fr. Levon Nigoghossian, Rev. Fr. Bedros Nonoyan, Rev. Fr. Partoghimeos Noradoungian, Rev. Fr. Minas Noraznian, Rev. Fr. Vramshabouh Norhadian, Rev. Fr. Michael Norigian, Rev. Fr. Ashod Noroyan, Rev. Fr. Teopile Odabashian, V. Rev. Fr. Sahag Odabashian, V. Rev. Fr. Ohan, Rev. Fr. Krikoris Otsetsian, Rev. Fr. Arisdage Otsnetsi, Rev. Fr. Israel Padigian, Archpriest Fr. Boghos Paghian, V. Rev. Fr. Taniel Paghoumian, Rev. Fr. Nahabed Paghoyan, Rev. Fr. Avedik Palouyan, Bishop Hagop Ashod Papazian, Rev. Fr. Ardash Papazian, Rev. Fr. Ardashes Papazian, Rev. Fr. Baghdasar Papazian, Rev. Fr. Hagop Papazian, V. Rev. Fr. Mashdots Papazian, Rev. Fr. Yezras Papelian, Rev. Fr. Mardiros Paraghamian, Rev. Fr. Simon Parkhalian, Rev. Fr. Adom Parseghian, Rev. Fr. Garabed Parseghian, Rev. Fr. Khoren Parseghian, Rev. Fr. Parshegh Parseghian, V. Rev. Fr. Nerses Partoughimiosian, Rev. Fr. Yeghia Patrian, Rev. Fr. Kourken Pehlivanian, Rev. Fr. Sebouh Pertchigian, V. Rev. Fr. Hovhan Peshdimaljian, Rev. Fr. Hagop Pirlian, Rev. Fr. Mardiros Piroumian, Rev. Fr. Parsegh Pogharian, Rev. Fr. Bsag Posigian, Rev. Fr. Jirayr Posoyan, Rev. Fr. Sahag Postoyan, Rev. Fr. Serovpe Pregian, Rev. Fr. Parnapas Proudian, Rev. Fr. Sdepanos Proudian, Rev. Fr. Parnapas Rapounian, Rev. Fr. Dadjad Reyissian, Rev. Fr. Garabed Rouhbanian, Rev. Fr. Vahan Roushanian, Rev. Fr. Kalousd Sahagian, Rev. Fr. Neshan Sahagian, Rev. Fr. Rapael Sahagian, Rev. Fr. Vahan Sahagian, V. Rev. Fr. Shavarsh Sahagian, Rev. Fr. Yerevoum Sandekian, Rev. Fr. Kenarios Sarafian, Rev. Fr. Hovhannes Sarajian, Rev. Fr. Sarkis, Rev. Fr. Avedis Sarkissian, Rev. Fr. Bsag Sarkissian, Rev. Fr. Hemayag Sarkissian, Rev. Fr. Hovhannes Sarkissian, Rev. Fr. Kourken Sarkissian, Rev. Fr. Megerditch Sarkissian, Rev. Fr. Nerses Sarkissian, V. Rev. Fr. Sahag Sarkissian, Rev. Fr. Karekin Savayan, Rev. Fr. Sdepan, Archpriest Karekin Seferian, Rev. Fr. Yeghishe Seferian, Rev. Fr. Yeprem Seferian, Rev. Fr. Oksen Semerjian, Rev. Fr. Sempad, Rev. Fr. Khoren Senekerimian, V. Rev. Fr. Gorun Serabian, Rev. Fr. Sahag Serginian, Rev. Fr. Kervope Seropian, Rev. Fr. Tatoul Seropian, Rev. Fr. Serovpe, V. Rev. Fr. Avedis Setrakian, Rev. Fr. Mesrob Shahbazian, Rev. Fr. Garabed Shahinian, Rev. Fr. Oshin Shahnazarian, Rev. Fr. Kevork Shakarian, Rev. Fr. Kourken Shaljian, Rev. Fr. Teopile Sharounagian, Rev. Fr. Vartan Sharoyan, Rev. Fr. Yeznig Sheperdigian, Rev. Fr. Garabed Shiranian, Rev. Fr. Zareh Shisheyan, Rev. Fr. Krikor Simigian, Rev. Fr. Diradour Simonian, Rev. Fr. Ghevont Simonian, Rev. Fr. Reteos Simonian, Rev. Fr. Apraham Sinabian, Rev. Fr. Hovhannes Sinoyan, Rev. Fr. Kourken Sivaslian, Rev. Fr. Soghomon, Rev. Fr. Nerses Soghomonian, V. Rev. Fr. Hovsep Soghomonian, Rev. Fr. Arisdages Soughoubatian, Rev. Fr. Arisdages Soukiassian, Rev. Fr. Hrayr Soukiassian, Rev. Fr. Apraham Sourenian, Rev. Fr. Vahan Sumenian, V. Rev. Fr. Nerses Takavorian, Rev. Fr. Mekhitar Tamezian, Bishop Nerses Tanielian, Rev. Fr. Markar Tanielian, V. Rev. Fr. Barkev Tanielian, Rev. Fr. Gomidas Tapinian, Rev. Fr. Khoren Tarpinian, Rev. Fr. Sempad Tarpinian, Rev. Fr. Vartan Tarpinian, Rev. Fr. Krikor Tashjian, Rev. Fr. Hovhannes Tatarian, Archpriest Fr. Vartan Tateossian, Rev. Fr. Kevork Tateossian, Rev. Fr. Mampre Tateossian, Rev. Fr. Hovsep Tavitian, Archpriest Hagop Tchaghatsbanian, V. Rev. Fr. Megerditch Tchelghadian, V. Rev. Fr. Yeghishe Tehanoyan, Rev. Fr. Garabed Telalian, Rev. Fr. Ghevont Tellerian, Rev. Fr. Arisdages Temourian, Archpriest Fr. Mampre Tepigian, Rev. Fr. Apraham Tertsagian, Rev. Fr. Avedis Terzian, V. Rev. Fr. Kegham Tevekelian, Bishop Khoren Timaksian, Rev. Fr. Hamazasb Tinarian, Rev. Fr. Asoghig Toghakian, Rev. Fr. Bedros Topalian, Rev. Fr. Nerses Topalian, V. Rev. Fr. Vaghinag Torigian, Archpriest Fr. Yeprem Torkomian, Rev. Fr. Garabed Torossian, Rev. Fr. Mesrob Torossian, Rev. Fr. Medropanos Tosoyan, Rev. Fr. Garabed Toukhighian, V. Rev. Fr. Kevork Tourian, Rev. Fr. Yeznig Toursarkissian, Rev. Fr. Housig Tovmassian, Rev. Fr. Hovhannes Tovmassian, Rev. Fr. Sarkis Tovmassian, Rev. Fr. Tovmas Tovmassian, V. Rev. Fr. Hovsep Tovmassian, Rev. Fr. Hovhannes Tovmayan, V. Rev. Fr. Hovhannes, V. Rev. Fr. Apraham, V. Rev. Fr. Karekin, V. Rev. Fr. Khatchadour, V. Rev. Fr. Khatchadour, V. Rev. Fr. Vahan, Archpriest Nerses Vahanian, V. Rev. Fr. Hovhannes Vahradian, Rev. Fr. Moushegh Varjabedian, Rev. Fr. Penig Varjabedian, Rev. Fr. Hesou Vartabedian, Rev. Fr. Arsen Vartanian, Rev. Fr. Avedis Vartanian, Rev. Fr. Karekin Vartanian, Rev. Fr. Khat Vartanian, Rev. Fr. Kourken Vartanian, V. Rev. Fr. Hamazasb Vartanian, Rev. Fr. Ghevont Vassilian, Rev. Fr. Haroutiun Vassilian, Rev. Fr. Krikor Vatabedian, Rev. Fr. Karekin Vemian, Rev. Fr. Garabed Vosganian, Rev. Fr. Sahag Yaghoubian, Rev. Fr. Melkiseteg Yardemian, Rev. Fr. Vagharshag Yegavian, V. Rev. Fr. Hamazasb Yeghiseyan, Rev. Fr. Gorun Yeramian, Rev. Fr. Mampre Yeranossian, Archpriest Boghos Yeretsian, Archpriest Fr. Moushegh Yeretsian, Rev. Fr. Bedros Yeretsian, Rev. Fr. Hemayag Yeretsian, Rev. Fr. Megerditch Yeretsian, Rev. Fr. Ashod Yergatian, Rev. Fr. Dadjad Yessayan, Rev. Fr. Hemayag Yeterian, V. Rev. Fr. Apkar Yotnaghperian, Rev. Fr. Nerses Zadourian, Archpriest Fr. Vartan Zakarian, Rev. Fr. Hovhannes Zakarian, Rev. Fr. Shemavon Zakarian, Rev. Fr. Sighvanos Zakarian, Rev. Fr. Yeghishe Zakarian, Rev. Fr. Sarkis

Zakoyan, Tshxun Karoyan, Krikor Zohrab, Haroutiun Shahrigian (Adom), Karekin Khajag (Chakalian), E. Agnuni (Khachadour Maloomian), Dikran Kelegian, Siamanto (Adom Yarjanian), Herand (Melkon Gurjian), Taniel Varoujan (Chibookirarian), Roupen Zartarian, Roupen Sevag (Dr. R. Chilinguirian).

RECOGNIZING THE 67TH ANNIVERSARY OF ISRAEL'S INDEPENDENCE

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 67th anniversary of the founding of the modern State of Israel and to reaffirm the bonds of friendship and cooperation between the United States and Israel.

Israel was created in 1948; it took President Truman only 11 minutes to recognize the new Jewish State.

Since then, Israel has come to exist as the only true democracy in the Middle East.

Israel and the United States have many of the same foundations of government: freedom of religion, free speech, basic human rights, the rule of law and being a nation of immigration and diversity.

In addition, it is a home to many religious sites which are sacred to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam and attracts multitudes of visitors every year.

Israel provided a refuge to Jews who survived the horrors of the Holocaust and the evils committed by the Nazis which were unprecedented in human history.

The people of Israel have established a unique, pluralistic democracy which includes the freedoms cherished by the people of the United States, including freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of association, freedom of the press, and government by the consent of the governed.

Israel continues to serve as an example of democratic values by regularly holding free and fair elections, promoting the free exchange of ideas, and vigorously exercising in its Parliament, the Knesset, a democratic government that is fully representative of its citizens.

I applaud the Government of Israel for successfully working with the neighboring Governments of Egypt and Jordan to establish peaceful, bilateral relations.

I have had the privilege of visiting Israel many times, and observing firsthand her great achievements in the areas of medical research, technology, business, and the arts.

Mr. Speaker, the 67th anniversary of the founding of the modern State of Israel is an occasion for us to reflect and reaffirm the bonds of friendship and cooperation between the United States and Israel.

The United States and Israel enjoy a strategic partnership based on shared mutual democratic values, friendship, and respect.

The people of the United States share affinity with the people of Israel and view Israel as a strong and trusted ally.

I hope this friendship continues to grow and blossom for decades to come.

THE INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO ENSURE THAT THE METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON AIRPORTS AUTHORITY COMPLIES WITH FEDERAL AUDITING STANDARDS

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill to prohibit federal funds from the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) from being disbursed to the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority (MWAA) unless DOT certifies that MWAA is complying with audit standards. There have been some improvements at MWAA, but significant failures in MWAA's contracting, auditing, and hiring policies and practices pointed to a need for systemic reform in MWAA's acquisition, auditing, and hiring processes. Despite being created by Congress, leasing federally owned land, and benefiting from significant federal taxpayer funds, MWAA is not subject to federal procurement, auditing or nepotism laws. However, MWAA has been taking steps to address these shortcomings.

MWAA is an independent public body created by Congress under the Metropolitan Washington Airports Act of 1986 (Airports Act). MWAA, with 1,400 employees, leases Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport and Washington Dulles International Airport from the federal government. In addition to managing the airports, MWAA is responsible for the Dulles Corridor Metrorail Project, which has an estimated cost of $5.8 billion, including $977 million in federal funds. In 2012, DOT appointed a Federal Accountability Officer, who reports directly to the Secretary, to ensure MWAA follows the DOT Inspector General's (IG) recommendations.

A 2012 DOT IG report, "MWAA's Weak Policies and Procedures Have Led to Questionable Procurement Practices, Mismanagement, and a Lack of Overall Accountability" (Report Number: AV–2013–006) (IG Report), found that "MWAA's contracting policies and practices are insufficient to ensure compliance with the Airports Act and the lease agreement between DOT and MWAA." For example, the Airports Act and lease agreement require MWAA to award contracts over $200,000 competitively to the maximum extent practicable. However, the IG Report found that MWAA had recently awarded two-thirds of its contracts exceeding $200,000 with limited competition. The IG Report also noted that MWAA awarded many contracts with no formal solicitation. After the IG Report, MWAA immediately took action and has closed out 10 of 12 recommendations and MWAA has adopted as much of the Federal Acquisition Regulations as are applicable to MWAA. Still, there are significant issues sighted in a recent draft DOT IG report on the Office of Audits that virtually mandates greater monitoring.

A January 15, 2013, Washington Post article reported that at least 10 percent of MWAA employees have family members working there, including spouses and children. The IG report also noted that MWAA lacked "sufficient controls to detect and prevent nepotism." It is clear that changes were imperative and overdue. The lack of transparency and competition on MWAA's contracts and hiring were inconsistent with continued ownership of the airports by the federal government, MWAA's creation by Congress, and the significant federal taxpayer dollars MWAA receives. The IG Report's conclusion that procurement procedures and hiring policies in place were inadequate required a response that definitively fixed these issues. MWAA has updated its policies, and nepotism appears to no longer be a problem.

A current draft DOT IG report on the Office of Audits raises a number of questions regarding MWAA's internal auditing procedures. It finds that there have been no outside reviews of the Office of Audits and that the office has not adopted standards and lacked sufficient oversight. MWAA has responded to this draft report by taking initial steps to restructure the office. MWAA has updated its regulations so that the head of the Office of Audits will now report directly to the Board of Directors as well as the President & CEO. MWAA has also adopted the Institute of Internal Auditors standards, and it is undergoing a national search for a new internal auditor and external auditor.

The steps MWAA has taken to address the findings of the DOT IG are commendable. However, considering the outstanding issues, continuous oversight is essential. To further assist MWAA, I am offering this bill so that DOT will continue to have direct oversight over MWAA and access to audit materials.

I urge support of this bill.

ISRAEL'S 67TH INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the people of Israel as Israel celebrates its 67th anniversary.

Since its establishment on May 14, 1948, Israel has proven itself to be a vibrant democracy, one that prioritizes innovation, liberal values and freedom. It is these shared principles that have created the unbreakable bond between the United States and Israel.

Throughout its existence, the Israeli people have faced grave threats from hostile neighbors, defending themselves bravely against repeated terrorist and military attacks. Despite these hardships the Israeli people have not wavered in their commitment to democracy and freedom and have thrived economically, politically, culturally.

The recent growth in anti-Semitic acts, including the attacks this year in Paris and Copenhagen, are a powerful reminder of why the world needs a safe haven for the Jewish people. Such threats to the Jewish Diaspora underscore the importance of Israel as its own protector, and the moral imperative for the United States to stand by her right to self-defense.

As we celebrate Israel's Independence Day, we also remember those who have fallen in service to their country. I am proud to stand here in celebration of the freedoms that Israel stands for and will continue to ensure that the U.S.-Israel relationship remains strong and bipartisan.

TRIBUTE TO VICTIMS OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to submit these additional names of Armenians who lost their lives in the Armenian Genocide from 1915 to 1923. We will never forget their names and their stories and we will continue to speak the truth in the face of denial.

Sarkis Minassian, Dr. Nazaret Daghavarian, Dr. Garabed Pashalian Khan, Levon Larents (Kirishjian), Sumpad Purad (Derghazarents), Hampartsoom Hampartsoomian, Parsegh Shahbaz, Ardashes Haroutiunian, Jack Sayabalian (Paylag), Krikor Torosian, Kegham Parseghian, Dikran Cheogurian, Shavarsh Kurisian, Krikor Yesayan, Armen Doryan (Hurchya Soorenian), Aris Israyelian, Mihran Tabakian, Hagop Terzian, Hampartsoom Boyajian (Moorad), Vartkes (Hovhannes Serengulian), Marzbed (Ghazar Ghazarian), Arisdages Kasbarian, Haroutiun G. Jangulian, Sarkis Parseghian (Shameel), Bedros Kalfayan, Haroutiun Kalfayan, Sarkis Suvin (Sungujian), Edwar Beyazian, Hurach (Haig Tirakian), Adom Shahen (Yeritsants), Yenovk Shahen, Nerses Papazian, Nerses Zakarian, Dr. Sdepan Miskjian, Ardzruni (Hagop Avedisian), Sako, Dr. Levon Bardizbanian, Ardashes Semerjian (Torkom), Vramshabooh Arabian, Nerses Shahnoor, Serovpe Noradoongian, Karekin Husian, Mardiros H. Koondakjian, Krikor Armooni, Boghos Tanielian, Megerdich Garabedian, Apraham Hayrigian, Levon Aghababian, Kevork Terjimanian, Dikran Ashkharooni, Kevork Diratsooyan, Mihrtad Haygazn, Rosdom Rosdomian, Vramshabooh Samuelian, Arshag Khazkhazian, Mrgrrdich Sdepanian, Levon Shashian, Paroonag Feroukhan, Onnig Maghazajian, Teodor Mendzigian, Varteres Atanasian, Apig Jambaz, Vahram Altoonian, Yerchanig Aram, Nerses D. Kevorkian, Onnig Srabian, Partogh Zorian, Akrig Kerestejian, Melkon Piosian, Pilibbos Chilinguirian, Haroutiun Konialian, Vahan Jamjian, Haroutiun Kalfaian, Hovhannes Kelejian, Sdepan Kurkjian, Dikran Sarkisian, Barooyr Arzoomanian, Haig Derderian, Mirijan Artinian, Hampartsum Balasan, Vahan Kehiaian, Ardashes Ferahian, Artin Meserlian, Armenag Arakelian, Mihran Pasdurmajian, Neshan Nahabedian, Yeghia Suzigian, Bedros Kurdian, Diran Yerganian, Asadoor Madteosian, Yervant Chavooshian, Hagop Shahbaz, Sarkis Kaligian, Garabed Reyisian, Kevork Kopooshian, Krikor Ohnigian, Aram Ohnigian, Karekin Ohnigian, Hovhannes Keoleian, Dikran Baghdigian, Hovhannes Cheogurian, Paramaz, Dr. Benne Torosian, Aram Achukbashian, Kegham Vanigian, Yervant Topoozian, Roupen Garabedian, Hovhannes Der Ghazarian, Tovmas Tovmasian, Hagop Basmajian, Moorad Zakarian, Megerdich Yeretsian, Karekin Boghosian, Armenag Hampartsoumian, Yeremia Manoogian, Apraham Mooradian, Minas Keshishian, Sumpad Kulujian, Karnig Boyajian, Herand Yegavian, Boghos Boghosian, Herand Aghajanian, Garabed Patoogian, Khoren Khorenian, Amasiatsi Krikor Kayian, Ishkhan Nighoghayos Boghosian with his 4 friends, Vramian Onnig Tertsagian, Ardashes Solakian, Dikran Odian (Asso), A. Proodian, Garabed Dantlian, Haygag Yeremishian, Yerookhan (Yervant Srmakeshkhanlian), Tulgadintsi, Prof. Garabed Soghigian, Prof. Megerdich Vorperian, Prof. Hovhannes Boujikanian, Prof. Nigoghos Tenekejian, Prof. Khachadour Nahigian, Prof. Donabed Lulejian, Jirair Hagopian, Hovhannes Dingilian, Hovhannes Aghanigian, Aram Srabian, Armen Onanian, Hovsep Malemezian, Kegham Samuelian, Kapriel Tanielian, Karnig Gosdanian, Hagop Dinjian, Armen Hovagimian, Asadour Jamgochian, Mouradian, Hovhannes Zartarian, Kevork Keleshian, Hagop Shoushanian, Setrag Dulgerian, Aram Dabaghian, Haroutiun Semerjian, Hagop, Hapet, Sarkis Eljanian, Mihran Isbirian, Senekerim Kalyonjian, Moorad Derderian, Garabed Barsamian, Karnig Toughlajian, Manuel Dedeian, Levon Kantarian, Aram Hagopian, Khachadour Grdodian, Michael Frengulian, Roupen Rakoubian, Hampartsoom Blejian, Vahan Husisian, Nazaret Husisian, Bidza, Hemayag Karageozian, Israel Ozanian, Dajad Chebookjian, Levon Karageozian, Hmayag Margosian, Hmaiag Karibian, Ardashig Boornazian, Hagop Boornazian, M. Paroonag Sarksian, Arshag Kizirian, Hovhannes Boghosian, K. Vosgerichian, Antranig Bozajian, Aram Adrouni, Aram Shesheian, Hurach Loosparonian, Megerdich Asdourian, Pilos, Tsitoghtsi Setrag Varjabed, Partogh Odabashian, Kaloosd Garabedian, Vahan Kasbarian, Kevork Zooloomian, Hagop Garabedian, Peniamin Chulghatian, Haroutiun Boshosian, Gorun (Gomsetsi Iso), Megerdich Polaian (Mejo), Vartan Dikran, Armenag Yokhigian, Garabed Jamjian, Karnig Kouyoumjian, Garabed Nevroozian, Hagop Khayelian, Hago Merdinian, Parsegh Mootafian, Krikor Kouyoumjian, Sarkis Aghartmajian, Hovhannes Boyajian, Mardiros Zoornajian, Mirijan Yoghourdlashian, Haroutiun Yoghourdlashian, Hagop Sudjian, Garabed Mooradian, Hovhannes Nevshehirlian, Avedis Elmajian, Kevork Turkujian, Hovhannes Boyajian, Hagop Oorganjian, Hagop Yesaian, Hagop Balekjian, Garabed Oozoonoghlian, Ghazer Mayisian, Hagop Kazezian, Hovhannes Zeytoontsian, Hovhannes Tavitian, Sarkis Tooloomjian, Garabed Chiydemian, Vahan Amadouni, Krikor Moumjihanian, Krikor Khacheroogian, Haroutiun Dayian, Asdoor Minasian, Haroutiun Keoleyian, Garabed Aghcharian, Manoog Buchakjian, Hagop Chubookjian, Mihran Guzeian, L. Varzhabedian, Misak Bahanjian, Sarkis Karakezian, Setrag Chechenian, Karnig Shemshian, Hagop Berberian, Sahag Kayserlian, Kevork Vishabian, Vahan Kurkjian, Minas Minassian, Minas Bedrosian, Kevork Jamjian, Vahan Jamjian, Kapriel Kurkjian, Markar Yazejian, Parsegh Kilimlian, Vahan Kehiayan, Krikor Gerekmezian, Hagop Yousoufian, Garabed Yousoufian, Karnig Kavjian, Dedeyan Brothers, Aram Dabanian, Yervant Varteresian, Mardiros Lusararian, Nushan Halajian, Garabed Zambakjian, Hovhannes Ekmekjian, Haroutiun Beojekian, Vahan Chapoutian, Garabed Matosian, Varteres Varteresian, Hagop Bostanjian, Hovhannes Tufenkjian, Dikran Kasabian, Haroutiun Der Megerdichian, Karnig Balekjian, Prof. Arakel Sivaslian, Prof. Hovhannes Hagopian, Gagig Ozanian, Prof. Arshag Daghlian, Prof. Hovhannes Arozian, Garabed Kojaian, Parsegh Endelebian, Nushan Yenijelian, Hovhannes Momjian, Ardem Gorgodian, Prof. Jessy Matossian, Prof. Lootfi Babigian, Hovhannes Hasurjian, Prof. Arshag Roomian, Hovhannes Kazanjian, Dikran Temurian, Avedis Khudurian, Noorijan Noorijanian, Yegho, Hagop Aghaser, Tovmas Jelalian, Senekerim Bonjooklian, Minas Ipekjian, Manoog Tanielian, N. Evranian, G. Churakian, Kar Gozigian, Arshag Papazian, Vahakn Datevian, Ashoogh Shahnazar, Kerovpe Gulbengian, Sdepan Nalbandian, Dr. Hagop Hovhannesian, Ardashes Der Sdepanian, Vartan Misirian, Arakel Abroyan, Garabed Taniel, Berj Taniel, Melki Khanzetian, Sooren Harootyiunian, Garabed Sivrisarian, Zinvor Mardig, Siragan Papazian, Alexan Haroutiunian, Sdepan Akchaian, N. Markarian, M. Bartunlian, S. Lazian, K. Paplian, Sarkis Khozaian, Hovhannes Khosaian, Nazaret Tashjian, Mihran Tashjian, Garabed Zadigian, Hayotsian, Garabed, Shmavon, Mihran Kiremidjian, Bedros, Minas, Krikor Sumpadian, Bedros Genjian, Boghos Gegenozian, Hovhannes Mooradian, Khachig Mardigosian, Hampartsoom Isheian, Siragan Stamboltsian, Iskender Tasamkian, Hagop Bijoyan, Garabed Lezian, Hayrabed Balukjian, Hovhannes Varjabedian, Simonig Seferian, Misak Semerian, A. Khanjian, Onnig Baltayan, A. Nalbandian, H. Kapoojian, Karnig Pekmezian, Toros Pekmezian, S. Dingilian, L. Dingilian, L. Lootfiyan.

IN HONOR OF COMMISSIONER PETE WHEELER

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and solemn remembrance that I pay tribute to an outstanding civic leader and public servant of Georgia, Commissioner Pete Wheeler, longtime leader of the Georgia Department of Veterans Service (GDVS). Commissioner Wheeler passed away on Tuesday, April 21, 2015. A funeral service will be held on Sunday, April 26, 2015 at 2:00 p.m. at Decatur First United Methodist Church in Decatur, Georgia.

A Georgia man through and through, Pete Wheeler was a proud graduate of the University of Georgia and an attorney, admitted to the State Bar of Georgia in 1949. He served our nation with honor and distinction in the U.S. Army during World War II. In 1950, he joined the Georgia National Guard. He retired in 1978 with the rank of Brigadier General.

Pete Wheeler joined the Georgia Department of Veterans Service in 1949 as Director of the Education Division. In 1951, he was named Assistant Director of the Department. In 1954, he was appointed as the department's director but the title was later changed to Georgia Commissioner of Veterans Service. His strong and effective leadership was widely noted, for he was reappointed fifteen times and remained in charge up to his passing.

For 66 years, Commissioner Wheeler acted as a voice for Georgia veterans and worked tirelessly to advocate on behalf of these national heroes who sacrificed so much to safeguard our cherished liberties.

Shortly after his appointment as director of the GDVS, Commissioner Wheeler joined the

effort to recognize Veterans Day as a new federal holiday. He was named Georgia Chairman of the National Veterans Day Committee and partnered with then-Governor of Georgia, Herman Talmadge, to arrange a formal ceremony for the signing of the proclamation declaring the new holiday in Georgia. This ceremony became a tradition in the state that is still honored today. Due to a decline in health, 2014 marked the first year that Commissioner Wheeler was unable to attend but he certainly was there in spirit.

In 1966, in response to the needs of the first veterans returning from the Vietnam War, as well as those of their families and survivors, Commissioner Wheeler created the Supermarket of Veterans Benefits, a one-day informational event aiming to gather local, state, and federal agencies that provide services to veterans. The event was so successful that it became an annual signature event of the GDVS and has been replicated throughout the country.

In 1994, Commissioner Wheeler was appointed Chairman of the National World War II Memorial Advisory Board by President Bill Clinton, serving until the memorial's dedication by President George W. Bush in 2004. He served as a past president of the National Association of State Directors of Veterans Affairs and was a life member of the American Legion, DAV, and AMVETS.

The Georgia General Assembly issued a resolution in 1998 renaming the state's war veterans memorial complex in Atlanta, Georgia as the ''Pete Wheeler Georgia War Veterans Memorial Complex.'' The complex includes memorials to Georgia veterans from the Spanish-American War through Desert Storm/Desert Shield. Earlier this year, Commissioner Wheeler approved the design for the next addition, a memorial honoring those killed in Iraq and Afghanistan, which will be dedicated on May 20, 2015.

On a personal note, Commissioner Pete Wheeler was a close friend of mine. I have truly been blessed by his friendship, counsel and inspiration throughout the years.

Commissioner Wheeler has accomplished much in his life but none of this would have been possible without the love and support of his family. His wife of 59 years, Geraldine, and one daughter, Jane, preceded him in death. Mourning his memory and rejoicing his life are his daughter, Francis and son-in-law, Mark; son, Peter and daughter-in-law, Debbie; son-in-law, John; and six grandchildren, Matthew, Joshua, Joanna, Alex, Charles, and Jonathan.

Mr. Speaker, my wife Vivian and I, along with the more than 730,000 residents of the Second Congressional District and veterans all across Georgia, salute Commissioner Pete Wheeler for his outstanding public service and his everlasting commitment to improving the quality of life for our veterans. I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join us in extending our deepest condolences to Commissioner Wheeler's family and friends during this difficult time. We pray that they will be consoled and comforted by an abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks and months ahead.

HONORING HAROLD W. McGRAW III

HON. CHRISTOPHER P. GIBSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Harold W. McGraw III on his upcoming retirement from the board of directors of McGraw Hill Financial, the company that his great-grandfather founded in 1888.

Known to his friends as Terry, he joined the company in 1980, holding a number of leadership positions before being named chief executive officer in 1998—the third McGraw to hold that position.

During his tenure as CEO, Terry led the company's transformation from education and publishing into a credit ratings, benchmarks and portfolio-based company, with best-in-class brands that include Standard & Poor's, Platts and J.D. Power.

Though he retired as CEO in 2013, Terry remains active in the global business community and is a well-known voice in various key economic fields. In addition to chairing the International Chamber of Commerce, the U.S. Trade Representatives' Advisory Committee for Trade Policy and Negotiations, and the U.S. Council for International Business and the Emergency Committee for American Trade, Terry also is a former Chairman of the Business Roundtable and the U.S.-India Business Council. He serves as a member of the board of directors of United Technologies and of Phillips 66, chairman of the Emergency Committee for American Trade (ECAT), and a member of the Business Council.

The company has always been a fixture in the New York City philanthropic community and, under Terry's leadership, employees have donated countless volunteer hours for causes and programs around the city. This has included everything from park clean-ups with the New York Restoration Project to reading to underserved elementary school children as part of the Read Ahead partnership. The company has provided scores of grants to arts and cultural venues as well.

Terry has devoted himself personally to several programs with which he has particularly deep relationships. He greatly increased corporate support—and personal contributions—to the New York Public Library, where he also serves as a Trustee. He continued the long tradition of McGraw family and company support for Hartley House, a nonprofit community center serving the Hell's Kitchen neighborhood of New York City. Terry also initiated the company's partnership with the South Bronx-based Morris High School Educational Campus, taking an active personal interest in the school by meeting and mentoring its students, speaking at events and launching an annual scholarship program.

Mr. Speaker, Terry McGraw has distinguished himself throughout his career as a skilled and savvy businessman, as well as a generous and civic-minded philanthropist. I ask my colleagues to support me in congratulating him on his countless achievements during a remarkable career.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide.

This year marks one hundred years since the tragedy of the Armenian Genocide. A systematic campaign of genocide against the Armenian people at the hands of the Ottoman Empire. What began with the killing of 300 Armenian leaders resulted in the deaths of one and a half million people and the forced exile of another 500,000.

It is often said that those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it, which is why each year I call on the President to officially acknowledge this terrible chapter of history by using the word ''genocide.'' In a recent Detroit News article, a local resident said this, ''The fact that 100 years later you still have to explain and prove that what happened to your ancestors was a premeditated crime on a massive scale really incurs a lot of pain for all Armenians.''

In my home state of Michigan, 11,000 people of Armenian descent reside and may leading organizations have organized commemorative events leading up to April 24th. I have had the honor to attend many events at St. John's Armenian Church in Southfield where there stands a memorial which contains the remains of a genocide victim. We are also proud that the only Armenian research center attached to an American university is at the University of Michigan-Dearborn where the Center documents the Armenian genocide and current Armenian issues.

I am always pleased to co-sponsor Congressional resolutions that shed light on the true nature of this ethnic extermination, and honor its victims and survivors. On the 100th Anniversary, I recall with deep sorrow the stories passed down through families of death marches, labor camps, entire families wiped out, years of slavery, massacre, and starvation.

I respectfully request that all my colleagues join me today in honoring the victims and survivors of the Armenian Genocide.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of the start of the Armenian Genocide.

In 1915, the Ottoman Empire orchestrated a murderous campaign that resulted in the death of 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children, and forced hundreds of thousands into exile. Growing up in the land of William Saroyan, I learned the stories of this tragic time from the sons and daughters of survivors time and time again. Refusal to accurately recognize this crime against humanity as genocide

hurts both the Armenian people and the American people.

In the Central Valley, Fresno State University has designated April 24 as Armenian Genocide Remembrance Day. The unveiling of the Armenian Genocide Monument, the first of its kind on a U.S. college campus, will take place later today at my alma mater and I know that this memorial will serve as a somber reminder of the devastating violence committed against the Armenian people for generations to come.

Achieving peace today requires recognizing the dark parts of our history and moving forward to find a place of understanding and cooperation. It is my hope that Turkey grasps what President Obama has referred to as the burden of unresolved history and takes this important first step in recognizing what is widely referred to as the first genocide of the twentieth century.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the 100th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide. Acknowledging this atrocity would finally allow a fair, just, and comprehensive international resolution of this crime against humanity. It is time for Congress to end the silence and stand up for the Armenian people.

TRIBUTE TO VICTIMS OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to submit these additional names of Armenians who lost their lives in the Armenian Genocide from 1915 to 1923. We will never forget their names and their stories and we will continue to speak the truth in the face of denial.

Minas Keoleyan, Herand Arabian, Azniv & Onnig Filipelian, Kapriel Mozigian, Lapajian father & son, Sinem Shamamian and son Bedros, Minas Fendeklian, H. Oozoonian, Mihran Lootfian, H. Yazejian, S. Hisian, M. Khanjian, Aram Kamboorian, G. Ebeyian, K. Andonian, S. Mechigian, Puzand Morookian, Karnig Pachajian, Garabed Pachajian, Sarim Kulujian, Eduar Beyazian, H. Lootfian, Armenag Lootfian, Tevonian, Sukias Dulgerian, Herand Asdvadzadoorian, Hagop Garakian, Melkon Hovsepian, Zareh Kochian, Dr. Maksood Apigian, Dr. Azadian, Dr. Sarkis Azoyan, Dr. Nushan Ajemian, Dr. Surdash Arslanian, Dr. Levon Arslanian, Dr. Levon Torkom Partoghian, Dr. Vahan Kavajian, Dr. Mike Karageozian, Dr. Minas Yarmaian, Dr. Elmasian, Dr. Eminian, Dr. Hagop Tajirian, Dr. Minas Tulbendjian, Dr. H. Terzian, Dr. Vosgan Topalian, Dr. Norayr Khachadourian, Dr. Karekin Ipranosian, Dr. Esgi Denek Madentsi, Dr. Krikor Gulbenkian, Dr. Dikran Halajian, Dr. Levon Lootfi Halebian, Dr. Haroutiun Halvajian, Dr. A. Hayranian, Dr. Boghos Hisarlian, Dr. Vahan Ghazarian, Dr. Ghazaros Kharpertzi, Dr. Jeljelian, Dr. Manuelian, Dr. Melkisetegian, Dr. Sarkis Momjian, Dr. Hagop, Dr. Toros Nazlian, Dr. Nushan Nahigian, Dr. H. Nazlian, Dr. Souren Nushanian, Dr. Nerses Shahbazlian, Dr. Anigdos Chobanian, Dr. Misak Baghdasarian, Dr. B. Baghdasarian, Dr. Toros Babigian, Dr. Nushan Bakalian, Dr. Sarkis Sertelian, Dr. Armenag Seraydarian, Dr. Baghdasar Vartanian, Dr. Haroutiun Vezneian, Dr. Khachig Der Manuelian, Dr. Nushan Der Vahramian, Dr. H. Donigian, Dr. Boghos Palabuyukian, Dr. Misak Panossian, Dr. H. Keshishian, Dr. Mihran Altunian, Dr. M. Albertian, Dr. H. Achbahian, Dr. Peniamin, Dr. Haigazoon Tabibian, Dr. Levon Yegavian, Dr. Nushan Ghonchegulian, Dr. Manoog, Dr. Nushan Mughigian, Dr. Sumpad, Dr. Paroonag Ajemian, Dr. Armenag, Dr. Proodian, Dr. H. Kooyoomjian, Dr. Kratlian, Dr. Simon Koyoonian, Dr. Yetvart Tashjian, Dr. Khachadoor Torkomian, Dr. Haroutiun Lootfian, Dr. Norayr Khachadourian, Dr. Karekin Gurjian, Dr. Kevork Gurjian, Dr. Yeghiazar Mesiaian, Dr. Vahan Shidanian, Dr. Khachig Saraydarian, Dr. Dikran Saraydarian, Dr. Sarkis, Dr. Hagop Sarigian, Dr. Sebooh, Dr. Kasbar Srabian, Dr. Vahan Vartanian, Dr. Puzand Derbabian, Dr. M. Der Sdepanian, Dr. Levon Panossian, Dr. Yeghishe Papanian, Dr. Khachig Pasdermajian, Dr. Hagop Kenderian, Dr. Khosrov Keshishian, Maldjian Family, Aintablian Family, Zarouhi Magarian, Rahel Demirjian, Raffael Der-Tovmasyan, Levon Aharonian, Aharon Aharonian, Altoon Aharonian, Haygaz Simonian, Hagop Beloian, Hagop Beloian, Yetvart Jamgochian, Vergeen Tashjian, Verone Bedrosian, Smbat Byurat DerGhazarian, Zumgroot DerGhazarian, Zartar Arakelian, Maryam Kazarian, Hovanness Yeretzian, Marian Shekerdemian, Vartan Yeretzian, Kevork Vichabian, Simon Simonyan, Zmrookht Simonyan, Mariam Simonyan, Haroutyun Papazian, Zakaria Minassian, Garabed Jingozian, Zakaria Minassian, Krikor Papazian, Baghdassar Karibian, Mary Meuguerditchian-Apelian, Zakar Ovoian, Hambardzum Khulyan, Suren Hakobyan, Azatuhi Hakobyan, Vostan Baghallian, Simon Hovhannesi Achikgiozian, Hripsime Aghvinian, Hovhanes Aghvinian, Ester Maghakian, Boghos Maghakian, Maghak Maghakian, Mkhoyan Asatur, Hripsime Maghakian, Srpuhi Mkrtchyan, Assadour Assadourian, Yeva Hovhannessian, Ghazaros Medzoian, Sargsian Tigran, Loosatsin Medzoian, Araxi Fundukian, Zaven Fundukian, Mariam Aroushian, Sarkis Aroushian, Gadarine Fundukian, Anahid Fundukian, Elmast Medzigian, Khachig Fundukian, Hagop Fundukian, Khassig Fundukian, Eva Fundukian, Melkon Medzigian, Ludwig Medzigian, Verjin Medzigian, Ara Medzigian, Hovannes Altibarmakian, Horop Anoushian, Zakaryan Nerses, Grigor Zohrap, Movses Deirmendjian, Hovaness Toutikian, Maritsa Kyulehyan, Tadevos Karapetyan, Khatchador Boyajian, Shimavon Donoyan, Anna Donoyan, Avedis Chaparian, Sirak Keshishian, Mardiros Toutikian, Abraham Toutikian, Hovannes Knajian, Armenouhi Toutikian, Harout Knajian, Lucya Knajian, Christeen Ter Stepanian, Avak Mouradian, Papken Toumaian, Hagop Kalbakian, Aram Jermakyan, Garabed Kaloustian, Sarkis Dadoyan, Elisabeth Partamian, Nazareth Partamian, Ovsanna Kayayan, Marna Banerian, Onnig Khachigian, Elmonig Khachigian, Onnig Khachaturian, Stepan Khachigian, Elize Avakian, Zabel Avakian, Arousiag Avakian, Setrag Avakian, Mgrditch Tashjian, Boghos Mkhitarian, Iskouhi Gabrielian, Aregnaz Markaryan, Missak Mozian, Haroutyun Sarkissian, Santoukht Mozian Ansoorian, Mikael Ansoorian, Yeghia Sarkissian, Khazaros Charchian, Mihran Berberian, Haganoush Tarpinian, Megerdich Sarafian, George Chelabian, Hakop Ter-Saakyan, Tatos Moloian, Mikael Khachetoorian, Hamparsoum Borzakian, Mesrob Der Mesrobian, Marta Avakian, Karnig Tomassian, Gayane Kazarian, Dikran Kazarian, Ararat Kazarian, Shoushanig Donegian, Haroutune Oknayan, Hagop Parsaghian, Niko Zakarian, Mariam Kouyoumjian, Kevork Mardirossian, Hripsime Mardirossian, Kevork Mardirossian, Makrouhie Oknayan, Khachik Oknayan, Hagop Oknayan, Mihran Oknayan, Manuk Oknayan, Asvadzadour Oknayan, Marie Oknayan, Mousheg Khodjhumyan, Jovannes Kabbendjian, Krakow Ouzounian, Edward Bozajian, Manouk Gasparian, Gazaros Tombulyan, Sarkis Gasparian, Ibrahim Louseian, Ann Gasparian, Ibrahim Lousean, Davit Gezalian, Yegisabet Gezalian, Hrand Mikoyan, Minas Chatalian, Mariam Chatalian, Yestare Bedrossian, Rosa Jeboghlian, Marie Balian, Mikael Tarkanian, Alton Derderian, Esksa. Derderian, Mihran Tarkanian, Vartan Dakessian, Levon Guevoghlanian, Boghos Grikorian, Hovanes Minasyan, Gevorg Minasyan, Matevos Matilyan, Simon Kelian, Hovannes Terterian, Haji Teyrekian, Ahavni Biricikyan, Avetis Martirosyan, Ocean Movsesian, Krikor Gureghian, Paul DerBoghosian, Sahag DerBoghosian, Tigran Trchunyan, Tirhouhi Kara-Sarkissian, Gevork Kara-Sarkissian, Armen Kara-Sarkissian, Aram Kara-Sarkissian, Alexan Tavitian, Armine Pagoumian, Vartan Balikian, Margaret Madoian, Miriam Madoian, Hatchig Madoian, Pusant Madoian, Maghta Gevorgian, Barsegh Karapetyan, Osanna Madoian, Atoyan Maria-Magdalena, Stepan Arvanyan, Haroutune Bozghourdian, Ghazaros Baldjian, Sanasar Hovhannisyan, Eriya Amirian, Armenag Zeytounsian, Toros Agha Chaghlassian, Hovsep Najarian, Stephen Minasian, Haykandukht Mheryan, Hagop Melkonian, Christaphor Mheryhan, Nerses Mheryhan, Serop Manjikian, Sarkis Kurkdjian Senior, Tigran Zarookian, Zarouhi Alachanian, Mardiros Djambazian, Anahid Der Parseghian, Zaruhi Caroglanian, Asadour Daldabanian, Krikor Daldabanian, Arshagul Artinian, Krikor Artinian, Vaxho Simonyan, Haroutyun Tatikyan, Kurken Parseghian, Mihran Sabonjian, Vahan Kazezian, Mariam Kazezian, Yebrakseh Kazezian, Krikor Sabonjian, Nazar Guyujyan, Razmik Palandjyan, Mari Guyujyan, Krikor Gokpanossian, Panos Trashian, Goar Akopova, Anoush Kulafian, Vartouhy Kulafian, Ohannes Hagopian, Hagop Hagopian, Jirair Demirjian, Suqias Nuroyan, Matevos Sachyan, Hnazand Sachyan, Samson Khachatryan, Mariam Khachatryan.

IN HONOR OF ISRAELI INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JUAN VARGAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the State of Israel in celebration of the 67th anniversary of the declaration of its independence. Israel was founded and declared an independent state on April 14, 1948, moments before the British Mandate was due to end. From that point on in history, Israel has

had to face many challenges that threaten the free and democratic nation. Under the administration of President Harry Truman and minutes after its independence, the United States found in Israel a friend and an ally.

From the beginning of its history as an independent state, Israel has had to face and overcome constant challenges to its freedom of speech, religion, press, and to its democracy. Israelis have had to fight for the strengthening of their independence and their advancement as a global state. Despite constantly being threatened by turmoil from bordering regions, Israel has been able to flourish and become a global leader in scientific research and medical advancements, and a model to the world for its economic stability.

Today, we celebrate the 67th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the State of Israel. We celebrate that Israel has been able to stand strong and thrive against all adversity. For this, I would like to commend the State of Israel for its tremendous accomplishments while fighting for the peace and freedom of an independent state.

RECOGNIZING KAREN RATZOW

HON. ROBERT B. ADERHOLT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the tremendous work of Karen Ratzow who has been on detail with the House Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee for the past year. Karen has been detailed to the Subcommittee from the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service's Budget Office. Karen has not only been invaluable to the Subcommittee's work this past year, but she has been diligent, had a tremendous work ethic, and very knowledgeable of the budget process. Karen is always eager to volunteer and lend a hand to whatever task may be needed. She quickly became an integral part of the team and she will certainly be missed.

I want to thank Karen for her outstanding work and for her dedication to agriculture in the United States of America. She is a great example of the kind of public servant we should all strive to be.

As her detail comes to a close, we want to wish her well. We look forward to working with her when she returns to her previous role at USDA.

IN RECOGNITION OF QUINCY BROWN

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Quincy Brown, an outstanding actor, producer, photographer, director, singer, model, philanthropist, and co-founder of FourXample Productions. Quincy will be honored at the premiere of his new movie, Brotherly Love, on Friday, April 24, 2015 at Carmike Hollywood Connections Ritz 13 in Columbus, Georgia.

The son of actress and model, Kim Porter, and New Jack Swing singer, Al B. Sure, and the stepson of singer and producer, Sean ''Diddy'' Combs, Quincy grew up in Columbus, Georgia and was educated in the Muscogee County School District. He is the grandson of the late Sarah Porter and great-grandson of Ms. Lila Star, the owner of the renowned Royal Café in Columbus.

Notwithstanding his lineage, Quincy has made a name for himself in the entertainment industry. At just 23 years of age, Quincy is a mini-mogul himself. In 2012, Quincy released his debut single, ''Stay Awhile,'' featuring Kendre. In 2013, he followed up with another single, ''The First Thing,'' which he co-wrote. Now Quincy is both behind and in front of the camera with his FourXample Production crew, recently wrapping up his directorial debut of singer Elle Winter's music video, ''No Words,'' which features Quincy's brother, Christian Combs.

Moreover, Quincy just premiered his new single, ''Friends First,'' featuring rapper French Montana. The single has already hit number 1 on the Billboard ''Trending Social'' chart. Quincy's new album, 1948, is slated for release this year.

Even at his young age, Quincy recognizes the importance of giving back to the community. He coordinated the first annual Celebrity Kickball Charity Event and the First Annual Celebrity Flag Football Charity Event with singer Chris Brown, which brought together a host of entertainers and celebrities. Quincy has given much to his charity of choice, Best Buddies, an organization dedicated to creating employment opportunities and leadership development for individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities.

At 23, Quincy has already lived more than many people two or three times his age. He pursues each and every idea and passion, striving to connect with people from all walks of life and seeking to live life to the very fullest. Yet, as he achieves stardom, he never forgets the people, places, or comforts of his home—Columbus, Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I have long said that in our area of Middle and Southwest Georgia, we have some of the best, the brightest, the most creative, and the most talented young people anywhere in the world. And Quincy Brown proves that beyond the shadow of a doubt! His industrious perseverance and steadfast commitment to his goals set a magnificent example for the young men and women who look up to him as a role model. We are sure to see even more great things from Quincy Brown in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me, my wife Vivian, and the more than 730,000 residents of Georgia's Second Congressional District in recognizing Quincy Brown for his remarkable accomplishments as an entertainer and for his generous heart and humble spirit as a philanthropist.

ROHINGYA CRISIS CONTINUES IN BURMA

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues a new report about the perilous reality facing the daily lives of the Rohingya Muslim minority in Burma, also known as Myanmar. The report, The Rohingya Crisis and the Risk of Atrocities in Myanmar: An ASEAN Challenge and Call to Action, was published by the ASEAN Parliamentarians for Human Rights and describes the continuing persecution of the Rohingya in Burma. Along with my friend and colleague, Congressman JOE PITTS, in our positions as the Co-Chairs of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission, we sent a letter to the Chairman of the ASEAN parliamentarians for Human Rights, the Honorable Malaysian Member of Parliament Charles Santiago, expressing how we share their concerns regarding the continuing human rights abuses perpetrated against the Rohingya people of Burma. Last year, the 113th Congress passed H. Res. 418, ''urging the Government of Burma to end the persecution of the Rohingya people and to respect internationally recognized human rights for all ethnic and religious minority groups within Burma.''

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the letter to Chairman Santiago, the press release from the ASEAN Parliamentarians for Human Rights describing their report, and the Executive Summary and Call to Action of the report.

I urge all my colleagues to review this report and continue to advocate on behalf of the human rights and basic human dignity of the Rohingya people of Burma.

TOM LANTOS,
HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION,
April 21, 2015.

Hon. CHARLES SANTIAGO,
Member of Parliament, Malaysia, Chairman, ASEAN Parliamentarians for Human Rights, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SANTIAGO: As Co-Chairs of Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission of the United States Congress, we are writing to congratulate you on the release of your report, ''The Rohingya Crisis and the Risk of Atrocities in Myanmar''. We share your concerns with the situation in Burma (Myanmar) and appreciate the initiative of ASEAN Parliamentarians for Human Rights to shed light on these disturbing developments and call for action to address them. We are eager to review the report and bring it to the attention of the U.S. Congress and the American people by sharing it with our colleagues and formally entering it into the Congressional Record.

The Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission shares your vision of standing up for abuses of human rights wherever they may occur. We have held hearings and briefings in the U.S. Congress and have worked closely with civil society organizations to bring further attention to the particularly egregious abuses against minorities by the Government of Burma. Last year, we introduced and passed a Congressional Resolution, H. Res. 418 ''Urging the Government of Burma to end the persecution of the Rohingya people and respect internationally recognized human rights for all ethnic and religious minority groups within Burma.''

We appreciate your leadership on this important issue and your commitment to advancing human rights within ASEAN. We would be pleased to work with you and other elected officials who are committed to the advancement of human rights to address the escalating human rights crisis facing the Rohingya in Burma.

Sincerely,

JAMES P. MCGOVERN,
Member of Congress,
Co-Chair TLHRC.

JOSEPH R. PITTS,
Member of Congress,
Co-Chair TLHRC.

PARLIAMENTARIANS CALL ON ASEAN LEADERS TO ADDRESS THE ROHINGYA CRISIS AND THE ESCALATING RISK OF ATROCITY CRIMES IN MYANMAR

KUALA LUMPUR.—ASEAN leaders must urgently respond to the escalating crisis situation for Rohingya Muslims and other vulnerable minorities in Myanmar, ASEAN Parliamentarians for Human Rights (APHR) said today in a public call on regional governments on the eve of the 26th ASEAN Summit.

In an open letter to ASEAN heads of state, the collective of parliamentarians called for greater recognition of the serious threat the continued persecution of the Rohingya minority represents not only to Myanmar, but to all of ASEAN. APHR also called for an independent investigation into the growing crisis and the deployment of ASEAN monitors in the lead up to elections scheduled for later this year.

''The growing risk of atrocity crimes in Myanmar represents a direct threat to ASEAN nations, both because of the security risks and economic strains it poses for all ASEAN member states, and because it undermines our shared commitment to protecting all people from persecution and violence,'' said Charles Santiago, APHR's Chairperson and a member of the Malaysian Parliament.

''We are standing on the precipice of a great tragedy. ASEAN as a grouping as well as individual national leaders have the responsibility, both morally and under international law, to act to prevent atrocity crimes and crimes against humanity from taking place.''

APHR MPs travelled in early April to Myanmar to see the situation first hand and were alarmed by the proliferation of hate speech and extremist language that the state is turning a blind eye to.

The findings of that mission, combined with further long-term independent research by established human rights organizations, were compiled into the APHR report, The Rohingya Crisis and the Risk of Atrocities in Myanmar: An ASEAN Challenge and Call to Action, released today. The report highlights the deteriorating situation for Myanmar's already vulnerable minorities and the escalating risk of atrocity crimes.

''Our delegation identified several troubling signs of anti-Muslim rhetoric and broader incitement to violence, which are likely to increase in the lead up to elections,'' the parliamentarians wrote in their open letter to ASEAN leaders.

''There is no possible conclusion other than that the Myanmar government is at best allowing and at worst encouraging this very dangerous and systematic persecution of Rohingya and other religious and ethnic minorities, in direct contravention of international human rights laws,'' Santiago added.

APHR's report analyzes current dynamics based on indicators included in the UN Framework for Analysis of Atrocity Crimes, including specific indicators of the risk of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide.

Among the indicators in the case of Myanmar is the intense discrimination and persecution of Rohingya. As the report details, Rohingya face severe restrictions on all aspects of daily life in their native Rakhine State. Tens of thousands still live in IDP camps more than two years after deadly inter-communal violence, and thousands more have fled by sea—often at the mercy of human traffickers.

U Shwe Maung, a Rohingya member of Myanmar's parliament, declared that, ''the situation is already dire, and I fear what is coming may be much worse. The unwillingness of many in Myanmar to even recognize the word 'Rohingya' is particularly troubling.''

The report also highlights concerning indicators for other minority populations in the country, including widening anti-Muslim sentiment throughout Myanmar and persistent human rights abuses perpetrated by the Myanmar Army with impunity against ethnic minority groups in Kachin and northern Shan States.

The report and open letter represent a collective call to action for ASEAN leaders to prioritize the issue at the upcoming ASEAN Summit and future meetings and to take other measures to combat the crisis.

''ASEAN's leaders have a role to play in mitigating the risk of atrocity crimes in Myanmar,'' said Irine Yusiana Roba, a member of parliament from Indonesia. ''Working through existing regional mechanisms, including the ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights, they can strengthen their response. But it must begin with a recognition that the issue impacts all of us and deserves to be prioritized.''

In appreciation of the need for a coordinated international response, the co-chairs of the U.S. House of Representatives' Human Rights Commission sent a letter to APHR congratulating its members on the report's release and expressing interest in working with them to address the crisis facing Rohingya in Myanmar.

As the report concludes: ''APHR will remain focused on the escalating crisis and determined to draw the attention and action of ASEAN's leaders.'' Parliamentarians are committed to continuing their push for action, working with allies around the globe, including members of the U.S. Congress, to secure a robust response to the crisis.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The longstanding persecution of the Rohingya Muslim minority in Myanmar has led to the highest outflow of asylum seekers by sea since the U.S. war in Vietnam. Human rights violations against Rohingya have resulted in a regional human trafficking epidemic, and there have been further abuses against Rohingya upon their arrival in other Southeast Asian countries.

This protracted culture of abuse threatens Myanmar's political transition, puts strains on regional economies, and supports the rise of extremist ideologies that pose potential security threats throughout the region. Ongoing human rights abuses against Rohingya pose a threat to regional peace and security and must end.

Broader anti-Muslim rhetoric and violence has also flared up in locations across Myanmar in recent years. These incidents, as well as ongoing abuses against ethnic minority groups throughout the country pose similar risks for Myanmar and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN).

In April 2015, ASEAN Parliamentarians for Human Rights (APHR), an organization of members of parliament from several ASEAN countries, conducted a fact-finding mission in Myanmar. APHR is deeply concerned about the current dynamics there and how they affect the region and the broader global community. APHR is equally concerned with the failure of ASEAN nations to adequately respond.

Critical national elections in Myanmar are slated for the end of 2015. APHR has found an alarmingly high risk of atrocities against Rohingya, other Muslims, and other ethnic minority groups in the lead up to the election. These risks constitute a regional concern, not only due to potential cross-border spillover effects, but also because ASEAN member states share a moral responsibility to take all possible measures to prevent the commission of atrocities within ASEAN.

Despite these troubling realities, the Rohingya issue remains conspicuously absent from the agenda of the ASEAN Summit. ASEAN and other global leaders ignore these dynamics at their own peril. The Rohingya crisis and broader animosity toward other Muslims and ethnic minorities in Myanmar are not just a Myanmar problem—they are an ASEAN problem.

Nearly every common risk factor for atrocity crimes identified in the United Nations' Framework of Analysis for Atrocity Crimes is present in Myanmar today This report draws upon APHR's collective knowledge to analyze the situation in Myanmar within the context of this United Nations' Framework. Based on this analysis, it is clear that there is a high risk of ongoing atrocity crimes in Myanmar in 2015 and beyond.

CALL TO ACTION

The crises in Myanmar, including the persecution of Rohingya, anti-Muslim violence, and systematic abuses against other ethnic minorities, are not only a problem for Myanmar, they are a problem for all of ASEAN. The risk factors and specific indicators enumerated in this report, including those for war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide, demonstrate a high risk of atrocity crimes in Myanmar in the year ahead. Such crimes threaten to undermine the human rights standards and common dignity of ASEAN citizens. They also threaten to spill over borders and affect the economic and physical security of neighboring countries.

APHR will remain focused on the escalating crisis and determined to draw the attention and action of ASEAN's leaders. This report is more than a detailed listing of warning signs. It also represents a call to action to prevent the further escalation and perpetration of atrocity crimes that will affect Myanmar and the entire region.

We call upon ASEAN's leaders to take the following actions:

Recognize the escalating crisis in Rakhine State and the plight of Rohingya as a serious danger to both Myanmar and ASEAN by prioritizing the issue in Summit meetings.

Conduct an independent investigation of conditions and risks of increased violence and displacement in Myanmar, as well as associated risks to ASEAN, including greater refugee flows to countries like Malaysia and Thailand.

Expand the mandate of the ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights (AICHR) to include country visits, inquiries, complaints, and emergency protection mechanisms, and ensure adequate independence and staffing support for its members. Engage AICHR to conduct a follow-up investigation into the Rohingya crisis.

Deploy ASEAN monitors well ahead of the Myanmar elections to observe and report on the Rohingya crisis and broader anti-Muslim and ethnic minority dynamics.

Utilize existing mechanisms in ASEAN, such as the ASEAN Troika, AICHR, the office of the ASEAN Secretary General, and the role of the ASEAN Chair, to respond appropriately to humanitarian crises in member states in accordance with the principles of the ASEAN Charter and the ASEAN Declaration on Human Rights.

Commit to protecting those fleeing the crisis in Rakhine State, including by granting prima facie refugee status to Rohingya and providing the UN refugee agency with unfettered access to asylum seekers.

Ratify the 1951 Refugee Convention.

Strengthen and expand the mandate of the ASEAN Commission on the Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Women and Children (ACWC) to help combat threats to women's rights, including those presented by the ''Protection of Race and Religion Bills'' and other Myanmar government policies that restrict rights, particularly for ethnic and religious minority women.

Call upon the Myanmar government to adhere to regional and international human rights and humanitarian standards, including by rejecting the ''Protection of Race and Religion Bills.''

Call upon the Myanmar government to address the root causes of the Rohingya crisis by amending the 1982 Citizenship Law to provide Rohingya with equal access to full citizenship, promoting reconciliation initiatives, denouncing hate speech and propaganda, and holding perpetrators of violence, including government officials, accountable.

RECOGNIZING CHRISTIAN LANCE'S MISSOURI CLASS 4 HIGH SCHOOL WRESTLING STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Christian Lance, a Nixa High School senior, on capturing the 2015 Class 4 Wrestling State Championship.

Christian reached this impressive feat during the February 21 championship with a 56–1 record for the season. At 220 pounds, with this Class 4 championship win, Lance captured the eighth state title for the Nixa High School Eagles.

Though this may be his first state championship, Lance has been no stranger to high achievement during his six-year stint in wrestling. As a freshman, Christian weighed in at only 120 pounds. Since then, he has wrestled in almost every weight class, working his way up to the coveted State Champion position.

In the 2014 wrestling season, just one year before his impressive feat, Lance was a finalist in many conferences and, at 182 pounds, took fifth place in the Missouri High School Class 4 Championships.

Christian Lance's exemplary devotion and remarkable improvements during his time as a Nixa High School wrestler are testaments of his hard work and dedication. The Nixa community, I'm confident, is proud of Christian and his Class 4 State Championship. I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating him on his well-deserved victory.

HONORING NEW MEXICO HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor 23 high school students from Moriarty High School that will represent New Mexico this month in the We the People National Finals, a three day civics competition on the U.S. Constitution. During the competition these exceptional students will have the opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge of constitutional principles in simulated congressional hearings before panels of judges.

Since its inception in 1987, more than 30 million students have benefitted from participating in the We The People program of constitutional study. The program divides students into teams where they are able to learn together and challenge each other. Surveys have shown that these students are more civic minded, politically active and have a better understanding of how government functions.

Moriarty High School won the We the People New Mexico state competition to earn a spot in this month's National Finals. I commend these students, and their dedicated teachers and coaches for participating in this instructional program that helps students learn about participating in government as effective, responsible citizens.

School: Moriarty High School.

Teacher: Amy Page.

Students: Martin Andazola, Audrianna Aragon, Nicholas Arellano, April Arguello, Katherine Arnold, Joshua Berson, Robert Castle, Samantha Chavez, Ethan Delora, Sarah Elliott, Marion Gerhart, Shannon Goldrick, Christopher Gonzales, Haley Hamblin, Troy Jack, Frances Licon, Regina McCleave, Matthew Mink, Savanna Nelson, Logan Smyth, Melissa Summers, Alexandru West, Grant Windsor.

I congratulate these outstanding students and thank them for their contributions to New Mexico.

TRIBUTE TO VICTIMS OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to submit these additional names of Armenians who lost their lives in the Armenian Genocide from 1915 to 1923. We will never forget their names and their stories and we will continue to speak the truth in the face of denial.

Asadur Arabyan, Arax Arabyan, Zvart Kureghian, Deradour Harmandayan, Kveh Gasparian, Gohar Kirakosian, Vasilika Kirakosyan, Zabel Kirakosian, Karapet Gasparian, Mariam Yeritsyan, Arakel Arakelyan, Makartich Ter-Hakopian, Nicholas Chavshudian, Mary Chavshudian, Avedis Kilisian, Mari Shirinian, Arsen Pashgian, Haiganoush Mandjikian, Krikor Kaakedjian, Gadar Chaparian, Takouhi Baghoyan, Ani Hidirsah, Haygaz Baghoyan, Parsegh Baghoyan, Hagop Zilifian, Helen Manoyan, Boghos Manoyan, Krikor Zilifian, Jovannes Kabbendjian, Vahan Hakobyan, Haykaz Sarkissyan, Lucia Baghdasaryan, Sara Galtakian, Arutyun Gelejian, Tagvor Dadurian, Araxsi Dadurian, Alina Dadurian, Hmiyak Dadurian, Nishan Chaderjian, Nishan Chaderjian, Maritza Chaderjian, Martha Margosian, Gulenia Havounjian, Tonapet Yeritsyan, Hovsep Sarkissian, Armenuhi Balian, Vahram Ghiragossian, Hagop Kouyoumdjian, Mary Kouyoumdjian, Vartivar Berberian, Yaghsapet Berberian, Hagop Pessayan, Mary Pessayan, Armen Dedeyan, Simon Terzian, Satenik Lusparyan, Hripsime Lusparyan, Artavazd Tumanyan, Nikolaj Safrazbekyan, Levon Safrazbekyan, Rebecca Margossian, Toros Margossianmy, Sarkis Panpalian, Vartan Vartanian, Hanna Gulian, Haroutioun Kapralian, Ana Kapralian, Flore Kapralian, Baghdassar Avedikian, Ohaness Aslanian, Isgouhi Zhamgochian Derounian, Hagop Terzian, Nishan Chaderjian, Maritza Chaderjian, Hagop Chaparian, Artin Chaparian, Hampartsoum Piligian, Hovaness Piligian, Haroutune Piligian, Pilig Piligian, Kevork Chaparian, Movses Kavarian, Megerdich Kavarian, Khatoon Kavarian, Joseph Hanna, Danho Kavarian, Hagop Kradjian, Deekran Kradjian, Nazaret Oglou, Dikran Svazlian, Hagop Bodoorian, Garabed Chilingirian, Toukhman Zoroghlian, Touma Zoroghlian, Garabed Zoroghlian, Hovhanness Zoroghlian, Loucine Zoroghlian, Garabed Zoroghlian, Nshan Ter-Saakyan, Hovhannes Tngozian, Karapet Grigoryan, Parantzem Garavanian, Abkar Badalian, Karapet Grigoryan, Parantzem Garavanian, Abkar Badalian, Jeyran Badalian, Manuk Hamamchyan, Sarhad Kocharian, John Hovig Yeressian, Kerop Tsaxikyan, Tatos Ghazazian, Yervand Urghatbashian, Margaret Urghatbashian, Caspar Mardirossian, Sinam Yeranosian, Hovakim Ahramjian, Beghekia Ahramjian, Arsen Avedikian, Acabi Avedikian, Zarmandought Ahramjian, Yevkine Ahramjian, Arousiag Ahramjian, Khoren Aharonian, Raphael Bahde, Joseph Moukhtar, George Moukhtar, Francis Moukhtar, George Farra, Melcon Movsessian, Melcon Movsessian, Dr. Ovsia Hekimian, Tavit Tavitian, Antaram Hovanesian, Sarkis Hovanesian, Galust Jermakyan, Hamardzum Jermakyan, Vrej Jermakyan, Toros Jermakyan, Mania Jermakyan, Levon Jermakyan, Aram Jermakyan, Siranush Alexanian, Grigo Alexanian, Maqruhi Alexanian, Maqruhi Alexanian, Avak Der-Avakian, Hana Soghomonian, Malaka Soghomonian, Isahak Ekshian, Mariam Ekshian, Arsen Kostanyan, Yegish Grigoryan, Kriikor Shahinian, Khanum Nalbanian Shahinian, Anna Garabedian, Airapet Tumanyan, Lucine Maghakian Adanalian, Stepan Boyajian, Stepan Boyajian, Hossep Melkisetian, Parsegh Shahbaz, Ardashes Haroutiunian, Jack Sayabalian (Paylag), Krikor Torosian, Kegham Parseghian, Dikran Cheogurian, Shavarsh Kurisian, Krikor Yesayan, Aris Israyelian, Mihran Tabakian, Hagop Terzian, Arisdages Kasbarian, Haroutiun G. Jangulian, Bedros Kalfayan, Haroutiun Kalfayan, Edwar Beyazian, Yenovk Shahen, Nerses Papazian, Nerses Zakarian, Dr. Sdepan Miskjian, Dr. Levon Bardizbanian, Vramshabooh Arabian, Nerses Shahnoor, Serovpe Noradoongian, Karekin Husian, Mardiros H. Koondakjian, Krikor Armooni, Boghos Tanielian, Megerdich Garabedian, Apraham Hayrigian, Levon Aghababian, Kevork Terjimanian, Dikran Ashkharooni, Kevork Diratsooyan, Mihrtad Haygazn, Rosdom Rosdomian, Vramshabooh Samuelian, Arshag Khazkhazian, Mrgrrdich Sdepanian, Levon Shashian, Paroonag Feroukhan, Onnig Maghazajian, Teodor Mendzigian, Varteres Atanasian, Apig Jambaz, Vahram Altoonian, Yerchanig Aram, Nerses D. Kevorkian, Onnig Srabian, Partogh Zorian, Akrig Kerestejian, Melkon Piosian, Pilibbos Chilinguirian, Haroutiun Konialian, Vahan Jamjian, Haroutiun Kalfaian, Hovhannes Kelejian, Sdepan Kurkjian, Dikran Sarkisian, Barooyr Arzoomanian, Haig Derderian, Mirijan

Artinian, Hampartsum Balasan, Vahan Kehiaian, Ardashes Ferahian, Artin Meserlian, Armenag Arakelian, Mihran Pasdurmajian, Neshan Nahabedian, Yeghia Suzigian, Bedros Kurdian, Diran Yerganian, Asadoor Madteosian, Yervant Chavooshian, Hagop Shahbaz, Sarkis Kaligian, Garabed Reyisian, Kevork Kopooshian, Krikor Ohnigian, Aram Ohnigian, Karekin Ohnigian, Hovhannes Keoleian, Dikran Baghdigian, Hovhannes Cheogurian, Dr. Benne Torosian, Aram Achukbashian, Kegham Vanigian, Yervant Topoozian, Roupen Garabedian, Hovhannes Der Ghazarian, Tovmas Tovmasian, Hagop Basmajian, Moorad Zakarian, Megerdich Yeretsian, Karekin Boghosian, Armenag Hampartsoumian, Yeremia Manoogian, Apraham Mooradian, Minas Keshishian, Sumpad Kulujian, Karnig Boyajian, Herand Yegavian, Boghos Boghosian, Herand Aghajanian, Garabed Patoogian, Khoren Khorenian, Amasiatsi Krikor Kayian, Vramian Onnig Tertsagian, Ardashes Solakian, A. Proodian, Garabed Dantlian, Haygag Yeremishian, Tulgadintsi, Prof. Garabed Soghigian, Prof. Megerdich Vorperian, Prof. Hovhannes Boujikanian, Prof. Nigoghos Tenekejian, Prof. Khachadour Nahigian, Prof. Donabed Lulejian, Jirair Hagopian, Hovhannes Dingilian, Hovhannes Aghanigian, Aram Srabian, Armen Onanian, Hovsep Malemezian, Kegham Samuelian, Kapriel Tanielian, Karnig Gosdanian, Hagop Dinjian, Armen Hovagimian, Asadour Jamgochian, Hovhannes Zartarian, Kevork Keleshian, Hagop Shoushanian, Setrag Dulgerian, Aram Dabaghian, Haroutiun Semerjian, Sarkis Eljanian, Mihran Isbirian, Senekerim Kalyonjian, Moorad Derderian, Garabed Barsamian, Karnig Toughlajian, Manuel Dedeian, Levon Kantarian, Aram Hagopian, Khachadour Grdodian, Michael Frengulian, Roupen Rakoubian, Hampartsoom Blejian, Vahan Husisian, Nazaret Husisian, Hemayag Karageozian, Israel Ozanian, Dajad Chebookjian, Levon Karageozian, Hmayag Margosian, Hmaiag Karibian, Ardashig Boornazian, Hagop Boornazian, Arshag Kizirian, Hovhannes Boghosian, Antranig Bozajian, Aram Adrouni, Aram Shesheian, Hurach Loosparonian, Megerdich Asdourian, Tsitoghtsi Setrag Varjabed, Partogh Odabashian, Kaloosd Garabedian, Vahan Kasbarian, V. Rev. Fr. Garabed Lariyan, V. Rev. Fr. Yeprem Liforian, Rev. Fr. Garabed Lousararian, Rev. Fr. Yezras Lousararian, V. Rev. Fr. Movses Madoyan, Rev. Fr. Krikor Madteosian, Rev. Fr. Haroutiun Malkhassian, V. Rev. Fr. Parsegh Mangerian, Rev. Fr. Atte Manougian, Rev. Fr. Krisdapor Manougian, Rev. Fr. Madteos Manougian.

KAMELIA VICK

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Kamelia Vick for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Kamelia Vick is an 11th grader at Jefferson High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Kamelia Vick is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Kamelia Vick for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

ANNIVERSARY OF YOM HA'ATZMAUT, ISRAEL'S INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the anniversary of the creation of the State of Israel, known as Yom Ha'atzmaut, a day on which we celebrate its establishment and growth, and recognize the fortitude of the Israeli people.

For 67 years, Israel has stood as a shining example of freedom and democracy in a region plagued by violence and oppression. Since President Harry S. Truman famously recognized the nascent state only 11 minutes after its founding, our two nations have shared the common bonds of democracy, economic vitality, and cultural affinity, tied together in an unbreakable friendship based on religious kinships and mutual interests.

As a Member of Congress, I have been honored to travel to Israel 15 times and never cease to be impressed by the strength of Israel and its people. I will continue to do all that I can in Congress to ensure that Israelis have a secure and peaceful homeland. It is my sincere hope that through diplomatic efforts the future will bring a fair solution that enables both Israelis and Palestinians to live in peace and prosperity. I wish the people and government of Israel a Chag Sameach, a happy holiday.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RODNEY DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 23, 2015, I was attending an event with Vice President BIDEN to raise awareness and help prevent campus sexual assault. This event was part of the "It's On Us" campaign and was held on the campus of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign located in the 13th Congressional District which I am proud to represent.

As the father of a daughter who will be a college freshman next year, this issue is very personal to me. I am so proud of the students and faculty at the University of Illinois, as well as other campuses across the country, for stepping up and taking a stand against sexual assault.

Due to my participation in this important event with Vice President BIDEN and my constituents, I was unable to cast votes in the House on April 23, 2015.

JUSTYCELYNN BUCHANAN

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Justycelynn Buchanan for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Justycelynn Buchanan is an 8th grader at North Arvada Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Justycelynn Buchanan is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Justycelynn Buchanan for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ALICE TREGAY

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Alice Tregay.

Alice Tregay was not only a dear friend of mine; she was a role model and mentor to many over five decades. She poured her heart and soul into promoting social justice: advocating on behalf of poor people in Chicago, registering literally tens of thousands of voters over the years, managing high-profile political campaigns and more.

She began her activism in 1964 when she joined the protest against Chicago Public Schools Superintendent Ben Willis and his infamous "Willis Wagons", which perpetuated segregation and an inferior learning environment. In the end, not only were the wagons shut down, but Superintendent was also removed from his post. Alice also fought alongside well-known figures like Al Raby and Dick Gregory in this winning battle.

Alice marched with Dr. Martin Luther King for open housing in Chicago, and when Dr. King's Operation Breadbasket began operations in Chicago, Alice worked hand in hand with Rev. Jesse Jackson to put the organization together. She started the Political Education Division at Operation Breadbasket, training thousands of students over a five year period. Alice was an integral part of that organization, now called the Rainbow Push Coalition, each day since then.

She also served as an essential staff member of many campaigns including Congressman Abner Mikva, Jesse Jackson Sr., Congressman Jesse Jackson Jr., Mayor Harold Washington, and President Jimmy Carter.

The best words to describe Alice are "tireless" and "persistent." Alice impacted so many lives as an organizer, educator, and change-maker. She gave a voice to those who are too frequently ignored. She provided the tools to engage and equip generations of activists, including me. I owe much to my precious friend, Alice Tregay. My heartfelt prayers and thoughts are with her family. She will be sorely missed.

67TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and celebrate the 67th anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel. This anniversary represents 67 years in which there has been a strong, independent, and democratic State of Israel; 67 years of growth, advancement, and modernization. But, unfortunately, it also means that for 67 years the only Jewish state in the world has repeatedly had to defend itself from enemies who seek her annihilation.

Yesterday, Israel commemorated Yom Ha'zikaron, Israel's Memorial Day. For a country in which most of its citizens have served in the Israeli Defense Force and have proudly defended their country, this day is a personal reminder that their 67 years have not been without significant personal sacrifice. From the moment of its birth, Israel has endured attacks by state armies and terrorist organizations. More recently, these attacks have taken a new shape, in the form of economic boycotts, lawfare, and political de-legitimization campaigns.

But 67 years later, Israel remains standing, proudly, as the shining beacon of democracy in the Middle East.

This is an important day for the Israeli people and people all over the world to reflect on how far this country has come in such a short period. It has transformed desert into fertile land, developed one of the most innovative and vibrant technology sectors in the world, and stood steadfastly on a foundation of democratic principles and basic fundamental liberties.

I am proud to say that it was also 67 years ago, only minutes after David Ben-Gurion announced Israel's declaration of independence, that the United States recognized the nascent state. Since 1948, our two countries have shared a strong, unshakeable bond based on shared values and goals. And the United States and Israel will continue to stand together as Israel pursues peace, and as Israel confronts any threat to her people. It is my commitment as a Member of Congress to ensure that our partnership remains strong and unbreakable. As President Bill Clinton wrote, "We are proud of the strong bond we have forged with Israel, based on our shared values and ideals. That unique relationship will endure just as Israel has endured."

JORDAN GONZALEZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Jordan Gonzalez for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Jordan Gonzalez is an 8th grader at North Arvada Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Jordan Gonzalez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Jordan Gonzalez for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

IN HONOR OF DR. BEVERLY DANIEL TATUM

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Beverly Daniel Tatum, President of Spelman College, who will be retiring after thirteen years as distinguished leader of the school. She will be honored at a farewell reception on Friday, April 24, 2015, at 6:00 p.m. at The Spelman College Suites Dining Hall on campus.

Born on September 27, 1954, in Tallahassee, Florida, Dr. Tatum attended Wesleyan University, where she received a Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology. Afterward, she attended the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, for a Master of Arts degree and a Ph.D. in Clinical Psychology, and then Hartford Seminary for a Master of Arts degree in Religious Studies.

Dr. Tatum's professional involvement in higher education began in 1980 and spanned a number of prominent institutions. At the University of California at Santa Barbara, she lectured in the Department of Black Studies, and later held professorships in psychology at Westfield State College and Mount Holyoke College. Also during her time at Mount Holyoke, Dr. Tatum served as chair of the Department of Psychology and Education. In 1998, she became Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of the College and, in 2002, she was appointed acting president of the College.

In the meantime, she also advanced a career as a distinguished clinical psychologist with her own independent practice between 1988 and 1998. Focusing her studies on diversity in organizational development and racial identity, she is the author of Can We Talk About Race? And Other Conversations in an Era of School Resegregation; Assimilation Blues: Black Families in White Communities: Who Succeeds and Why?; and "Why Are All the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria?" And Other Conversations about Race, the latter of which was celebrated as the 1998 Multicultural Book of the Year by the National Association of Multicultural Education.

In 2002, she was appointed president of Spelman College. Through her steady and transformational leadership, the institution now ranks among the top 100 liberal arts colleges in the country. Faculty research has flourished, and funding for student scholarships has tripled since 2002. Alumnae contributions to the annual fund have also tripled and a generous gift donation in 2008 helped establish the Gordon-Zeto Fund for International Initiatives, providing critical resources for international students as well as travel support for faculty and students alike.

In addition to these successes, Dr. Tatum has overseen the expansion of on-campus housing capacity by more than 25 percent to provide opportunities for even more students, made possible in part by the construction of a "green" residence hall in 2008. As president, she also made the landmark decision to end the College's limited participation in NCAA intercollegiate sports, and instead pioneer a campus wellness initiative to encompass a wider range of students.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Tatum is not only an educator, she is an innovator. The developments she engineered serve as the foundation of Spelman College's Strategic Plan for 2015, which focuses on supporting leadership and service, enhancing an interdisciplinary curriculum, fostering undergraduate research and internships, strengthening alumnae-student connections, promoting sustainability, and advancing global initiatives.

Outside of this tremendous scholastic dedication, Dr. Tatum is also actively involved in the community. She has presided on a variety of boards and served with a number of organizations at the local, state, and national levels. Moreover, she was appointed by President Barack Obama to serve on the Advisory Board for the White House Initiative on Historically Black Colleges and Universities. She has received numerous awards and commendations, including the 2013 Carnegie Academic Leadership Award. Dr. Tatum shares her life and accomplishments with her husband, Dr. Travis Tatum, and their two sons, Travis Jonathan and David.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Dr. Beverly Daniel Tatum for her thirteen remarkable years as President of Spelman College. Her leadership is impressive in itself but more than structures, more than money, and more than rankings, she advanced the very character of the institution through its people. In being a role model for the young women of this premier institution, she has helped countless individuals strive to fulfill their sincere potential in this world, making the aims of Spelman College become realized.

HONORING PUERTAS ABIERTAS COMMUNITY RESOURCE CENTER

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Puertas Abiertas

Community Resource Center as it celebrates its 10th Anniversary of offering educational programs and advocacy services to support personal growth and family stability in the Latino community throughout Napa County.

Ten years ago, the Center opened its doors on Napa Street as an independent non-profit organization dedicated to helping provide culturally sensitive intake and referral services in order to bridge the gap between community service providers and the Latino community. In fact, the Center's services are available to anyone in the community—regardless of ethnicity, race, or language. In achieving these goals, the Center partners with numerous other organizations in the area and its programs range from Case Mentoring and ESL training to Free Tax Preparation and Zumba. The Puertas Abiertas Center serves over 500 families a year.

The Center's focus on helping connect residents and services through a culturally sensitive intake and referral process helps make Napa County's diverse population stronger and better prepared to take advantage of our community's resources.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we recognize the Puertas Abiertas Community Resource Center for all they do to increase access to vital community services. On behalf of a grateful community, we honor and thank the Puertas Abiertas Community Resource Center today.

KARA McCONNELL

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Kara McConnell for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Kara McConnell is an 8th grader at North Arvada Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Kara McConnell is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Kara McConnell for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

KINGWOOD HIGH SCHOOL OBSERVES NATIONAL CRIME VICTIMS' RIGHTS WEEK

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this week is National Crime Victims' Rights Week. In Congress, we observed this week by hosting the Victims' Rights Caucus Awards.

The Congressional Victims' Rights Caucus, founded by JIM COSTA from California and me from Texas, came together to form the bipartisan caucus.

This week, the Victims' Rights Caucus recognized the tenacious individuals who dedicate their time and efforts in supporting crime victims.

But this week was also commemorated back in Texas. Kingwood High School observed National Crime Victims' Rights Week for the first time.

Under their fearless leader, criminal justice teacher Janet Collins, a former Dallas County probation officer, Kingwood High School heard from community warriors who work every day to protect and support victims.

My good friend, Sheriff Adrian Garcia, was Monday's headline speaker (who just so happened to receive our Victims' Rights Award at last year's Victims' Rights Caucus Awards). Kingwood High School students heard the best testimonies straight from the source.

Exposing our students to real-life situations in combination with education is so important. Teaching our students how prevalent crime is and ways to prevent it can only benefit our communities. What a great way to start a young group of victims' advocates.

It makes me proud to know that our school students are building good character and learning more about the Crime Victims Movement. Supporting victims is something that Americans can do at any age.

Janet Collins should be commended for her leadership and pioneering of National Crime Victims' Rights Week in our schools.

It is encouraging to see National Crimes Victims' Rights Week being observed not only in Congress, but in our education system throughout the Nation.

And that is just the way it is.

JULIA VAZQUEZ-PETERSON

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Julia Vazquez-Peterson for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Julia Vazquez-Peterson is an 8th grader at Mandalay Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Julia Vazquez-Peterson is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Julia Vazquez-Peterson for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING ANIMAL EDUCATION AND RESCUE

HON. ROBERT J. DOLD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, April is Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Month, so I would like to take this opportunity to rise in recognition of Animal Education and Rescue, a humane society in the 10th District. Founder and director Sandy Wisniewski has dedicated herself to improving the lives of both animals and people in our community.

Ms. Wisniewski works to prevent cruelty to animals by educating the public through school and community center visits. Her curriculum emphasizes the need to properly care for pets. She understands the strong correlation between animal abuse and other violent crimes, and she seeks to break the cycle of violence through education. As a humane investigator, Ms. Wisniewski responds to reports of animal abuse and neglect. She often rescues these neglected animals and places them with foster families until they find permanent homes. Her work is vital to our community.

Mr. Speaker, in honor of Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Month, I am pleased to recognize AEAR and Ms. Wisniewski. I am grateful for their work and wish them continued success.

HONORING MURRAY JANOFF

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Murray Janoff of Boca Raton, Florida, who turns 100 years old on April 26, 2015.

Murray was born in Bronx, New York in 1915. He graduated from New York University with a degree in journalism and had a long and distinguished career writing for the Long Island Press's sports section, the Associated Press, U.P.I., and Reuters. Murray served in the Navy during World War II receiving several merits with the highest being a Bronze Star medal. Murray was married 52 years to his late wife and is proud of his three children, five grandchildren, and six great grandchildren.

Murray is an exceptional man, and one who I am proud to represent in Florida's 22nd District. I know I join with his friends and family in celebrating this wonderful milestone. I wish him good health and continued success in the coming year.

JORDAN DELITZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Jordan Delitz for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Jordan Delitz

is a 12th grader at Wheat Ridge High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Jordan Delitz is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Jordan Delitz for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF TRITON COLLEGE

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the competitive workplace of today, higher education is more important than ever. I rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of Triton College in River Grove, Illinois.

Since opening its doors in September of 1965, Triton has been one of the nation's premier two year colleges. Every semester, Triton provides over 12,000 students with the tools they need to be successful at a 4 year school, their careers, and in life.

Since its inception, Triton has provided over 50,000 degrees and certificates helping to create a more educated workforce. With tuition rates on the rise, 2 year institutions have become one of our most important assets in self advancement. By offering quality education at an affordable rate, students have opportunities they would not otherwise have. As a former professor, I can appreciate the outstanding work Triton has done preparing its students for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the 50th anniversary of Triton College. I am truly honored to have such an exceptional institution of higher education in my district.

INTRODUCTION OF THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST GRAY WOLF MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2015

HON. DAN NEWHOUSE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce my legislation, the Pacific Northwest Gray Wolf Management Act of 2015. This legislation would remove the Gray Wolf from the "List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife" under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and return management authority for the species back to our Pacific Northwest states. A proposed rule released by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) in June of 2013 found that the Gray Wolf population has grown substantially and is now considered to be recovered, and therefore, does not merit protection under the Endangered Species Act.

State governments are fully qualified to responsibly manage Gray Wolf populations and are better to meet the needs of local communities, ranchers, livestock, and wildlife populations. Delisting the Gray Wolf would allow state wildlife officials to more effectively manage wolf populations. We have seen that this is possible in states such as Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan and we should allow Pacific Northwest States the same flexibility to manage these populations. This commonsense and straightforward bill would allow states to provide a more practical management program than the one currently in place by the federal government. I urge all members to join me in supporting this legislation.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN METROPOLITAN AIRPORT

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and applaud Rocky Mountain Metropolitan Airport for their leadership and commitment to Jefferson County.

Rocky Mountain Metropolitan Airport (RMMA), located between downtown Denver and Boulder, serves as a major economic engine for the region's aviation industry. The airport supports 2,670 jobs with an annual payroll of more than $153 million, and creates $460 million in economic activity each year. RMMA serves as a reliever airport for Denver International Airport (DIA) and international travelers at the airport have access to an onsite U.S. customs office that operates 24-hours per day. The absence of landing fees at the airport makes clearing U.S. customs easy and cost effective. RMMA houses many corporate aviation facilities, flight schools, and government offices, including: Pilatus Business Aircraft, HeliOps, and HeliQwest.

Rocky Mountain Metropolitan Airport also has plans to expand their operation in the Verve Innovation Park, a site which sits strategically between downtown Denver and Boulder and is a perfect location near a highly educated workforce and with airport runway access and hangar space for corporate jets.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Rocky Mountain Metropolitan Airport for their well-deserved Chairman's Choice Award and their continued contribution to Jefferson County.

HONORING AL TAUBMAN

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this week, Michigan lost a true giant.

Alfred Taubman was a great businessman who revolutionized the way America shops, but he will forever be remembered as a passionate philanthropist whose generosity touched lives in our state and around the world.

Al Taubman cared deeply about Michigan. He cared about people. And his contributions made our communities stronger and more vibrant, our schools and universities more innovative, and our research institutes more prepared to find cures for the most devastating diseases we face.

His generosity made possible the Taubman Medical Research Institute at the University of Michigan. He supported the Detroit Institute of Arts and helped improve design education at Detroit's College for Creative Studies. And he contributed actively to schools and universities across our region, including Wayne State University and his alma mater Lawrence Technological University, among many others.

Al Taubman changed Michigan for the better, and while he will be greatly missed, his vision and generosity will live on in the many lives he touched.

In the words of his son, Robert, Al Taubman was a "great American story." He is right. And all of us in Michigan are so glad that he was ours.

JONALYNN SELL

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Jonalynn Sell for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Jonalynn Sell is an 11th grader at Standley Lake High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Jonalynn Sell is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Jonalynn Sell for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

IN RECOGNITION OF ZION HILL MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH'S 134TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and pleasure to extend my sincere congratulations to the congregation of Zion Hill Missionary Baptist Church in Cusseta, Georgia as the church's membership and leadership celebrate a remarkable 134 years. The congregation of Zion Hill Missionary Baptist Church, in conjunction with Green Hill Missionary Baptist Church, will celebrate this very significant anniversary with a celebration on Sunday, April 26, 2015 at 2:30 p.m. at the Church in Cusseta, Georgia.

Zion Hill Missionary Baptist Church's remarkable journey and growth as a church

began in 1882 on the intersecting county lines of Marion and Chattahoochee Counties in Southwest Georgia. Reverend Shed Thornton is the first known pastor to lead Zion Hill. Other pastors to follow would include Reverend Jackson, Reverend Mathis, Reverend Davis, Reverend Chinn, Reverend Gates, and Reverend Campbell. Reverend Carter then pastored the church for thirty-six years, followed by Reverend Baker, who pastored for over sixteen years.

Reverend Willie E. Neal then became the Pastor of Zion Hill Missionary Baptist Church and in his twenty-two years of leadership, he worked tirelessly to expand the church. Under his careful eye, the current Fellowship Hall was built, and new pulpit furnishings, new pews, and the indoor baptismal pool were installed.

In 1987, the church was incorporated and attendance continued to grow. The church added classes for children and young adults to its Sunday school program. After the church established a youth choir ministry and youth usher ministry, it became a full-time Gospel church, holding services every Sunday.

After the Reverend Frederick D. Harris took over the leadership, the church began making some structural improvements. New carpet was installed in the sanctuary, the pews were covered, the fellowship hall was outfitted with new tile, and new tables, chairs, and kitchen appliances were added. A new sound system was installed and finally, a steeple was added to the top of the sanctuary, inviting members of the community to come praise and worship the Lord at Zion Hill.

It was during this time that Rev. Harris also implemented a new Wednesday class to increase spiritual growth. After Rev. Harris was called to relocate to Maryland, the Reverend Clarence R. Barnes then took over the leadership of Zion Hill. Sadly, due to medical reasons, Rev. Barnes had to resign in November 2014.

Along with pastors, there have also been many deacons who influenced and guided the church. Some of the most notable include Deacon James Williams, who contributed the church flags, and Deacon Willie J. Short, who built the current Sanctuary.

Throughout the past 134 years, Zion Hill Missionary Baptist has become a spiritual home for many. Advancements in both the actual structure of the church building as well as the church body were made to better accommodate the divine growth emanating from the hearts and spirits of many pastors, deacons, and church members. The story of Zion Hill Missionary Baptist Church is truly an inspiring one of the dedication and perseverance of a faithful congregation of people who put all their love and trust in the Lord.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Zion Hill Missionary Baptist Church in Cusseta, Georgia for their long history of coming together through the good and difficult times to praise and worship our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

JOSEPH BOULANGER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Joseph Boulanger for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Joseph Boulanger is an 8th grader at Arvada K–8 and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Joseph Boulanger is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Joseph Boulanger for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RICHARD M. NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I was detained for votes on Tuesday, April 21st. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted AYE on Roll Call #162, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers Memorial Service and the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, due to the passing of my mother on April 21, 2015 I had to remain in Texas and was unable to vote on April 21 and April 22, 2015.

On roll call no. 162, had I been present, I would have voted Yea.

On roll call no. 163, had I been present, I would have voted Yea.

On roll call no. 164, had I been present, I would have voted Yea.

On roll call no. 165, had I been present, I would have voted Yea.

On roll call no. 166, had I been present, I would have voted Nay.

On roll call no. 167, had I been present, I would have voted Yea.

On roll call no. 168, had I been present, I would have voted Yea.

On roll call no. 169, had I been present, I would have voted Nay.

On roll call no. 170, had I been present, I would have voted Yea.

JOSEPH BERGMAN

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Joseph Bergman for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Joseph Bergman is a 12th grader at Standley Lake High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Joseph Bergman is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Joseph Bergman for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

IN HONOR OF UNITED STATES ARMY SERGEANT MATTHEW COOKE, RECIPIENT OF THE PURPLE HEART

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor United States Army Sergeant Matthew Cooke, a recipient of the Purple Heart from North Carolina's 8th Congressional District.

Sergeant Cooke was one of thirty-two wounded during the 2009 shooting at Fort Hood in Killeen, Texas. On November 5, 2009, Nidal Hasan opened fire at the Soldier Readiness Center at Fort Hood, killing 13 people and wounding 32 and without the courageous actions of Sergeant Cooke, the death toll would likely have been higher.

When Sergeant Cooke saw a non-commissioned officer shot in the torso, he draped himself on the higher-ranking soldier to shield him from Hasan. He was shot five times in the act of protecting another's life.

Recovering physically and mentally from the massacre at Fort Hood has been a continuing struggle for Sergeant Cooke. Despite serving two deployments in Iraq, Sergeant Cooke's greatest injuries and selflessness took place on home soil. I am overjoyed that Sergeant Cooke is finally receiving the Purple Heart and well-deserved recognition for his heroic actions.

It is an honor to extend these remarks today to congratulate United States Army Sergeant Matthew Cooke for receiving the Purple Heart and to thank him for his brave and selfless service.

HONORING COMMUNITY PARTNERS FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING

HON. ROBERT J. DOLD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Community Partners for Affordable Housing for the exceptional progress they have made in providing the basic human need of housing to those struggling to afford its rising costs.

Partnering with the cities of Highland Park, Evanston and Lake Forest, CPAH addresses

affordable housing collaboratively, operating the first community land trust program in Illinois.

CPAH preserves communities' existing housing stock by rehabilitating problematic or blighted properties. This maximizes the cost-effectiveness of public and private investment for long-term community benefit.

In short, CPAH synthesizes safe, clean housing with affordability. CPAH is an incredible asset that the cities of Highland Park, Evanston, and Lake Forest are fortunate to benefit from. I am proud to represent Community Partners for Affordable Housing.

HONORING DAVID AND PATRICIA NIERENBERG

HON. JAIME HERRERA BEUTLER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize David and Patricia Nierenberg for the honor of receiving PeaceHealth's Nat Giustina Philanthropy Award. This award was created to honor individuals who have advanced the well-being of our community through the generous donation of their time, talent and resources over many years through support of PeachHealth Medical Centers.

Their generous support and collective service on the PeachHealth Southwest Foundation Board for nearly two decades, has given the Vancouver hospital the opportunity to expand its capacity and serve more residents of Southwest Washington. Their contribution, which focuses primarily on maternal and infant health, helped establish the Holtzman Twins Neonatal Intensive Care Unit and the Patricia Nierenberg Childcare and Early Learning Center. Their generosity has helped construct world-class facilities and establish a scholarship for low-income families to help offset the cost of care at the new center, leading to a more healthy and vibrant community.

I want to thank David and Patricia for their tireless involvement and support of our community. Their contribution is one that will positively impact Southwest Washington for generations to come.

HONORING MR. WIN SHAW

HON. EARL L. "BUDDY" CARTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Win Shaw for his long service to the country and to General Dynamics' Gulfstream Aerospace, the largest private employer in the First District of Georgia.

Mr. Win Shaw represented the hard working people of Gulfstream for 20 years beginning in March, 1993. Prior to his career with Gulfstream, Mr. Shaw graduated from Norwich University and was commissioned into the U.S. Army as an Armor officer. Dedicating 29 years of his life to military service, Mr. Shaw served two tours of duty in Vietnam and one tour in Korea. In his last active duty assignment, Mr. Shaw served as Chief of the Army's Senate Liaison Office for four and a half years. Mr. Shaw retired as a Colonel with many deserved decorations including the Distinguished Service Medal, Silver Star, Soldiers Medal and 3 Bronze Stars with the V device. He is also a graduate of the Army War College. Following his retirement from the U.S. Army, Mr. Shaw joined Westinghouse Electric Corporation for two and a half years.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join Mr. Win Shaw's colleagues, family and friends in celebrating many years of hard work and dedication to our community and our Country.

HONORING DR. RUTH B. LOVE

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary career of Dr. Ruth B. Love.

Dr. Love was born in Lawton, Oklahoma, and grew up in Bakersfield, California, where she attended public schools. From a young age, Dr. Love displayed a deep passion for reading, which she transformed into a career in education. Dr. Love received her B.A. in education from San Jose State University, her M.A. in Guidance and Counseling from San Francisco State University, and her Ph.D. in Human Behavior and Psychology from the United States International University.

Dr. Love began her teaching career in Oakland, California. In addition to teaching, which she enjoyed immensely, Dr. Love worked on various projects, at the local, national, and international levels. She served as the Project Director for Operation Crossroads Africa in Ghana. She was also selected for the National Fulbright Program in England, where she taught for a year and was able to travel the world.

Dr. Love also took on various roles at the California State Education Department, where she served in a statewide role as Bureau Chief for Program Development. She went on to join the Federal Office of Education as National Director of the Right to Read Program, and worked with Congress to enact the National Reading Program and other important pieces of legislation.

Eventually, Dr. Love was recruited to serve as Superintendent of the Oakland Unified School District, where her teaching career had begun. She served for nearly seven years, pioneering innovative programs and helping Oakland students achieve national norms on standardized tests. After much consideration, Dr. Love accepted the position of General Superintendent for the Chicago Board of Education, where she oversaw one of the largest school districts in the nation—comprising over 500 schools, 44,000 employees, and a $2 billion budget.

Prior to her retirement in 2014, Dr. Love was the Founder and President of RBL Enterprises, an education consulting company. Dr. Love traveled the world extensively in this capacity, lecturing and advising on education policy. She also worked for many years as a professor in the Doctorate Programs at San Francisco State University and the University of California, Berkeley.

On a personal note, I have had the privilege to be with Dr. Love in Ghana and witness the respect and love Ghanaians have for her. She is truly a citizen of the world, and has shared her knowledge and experiences with those who have not had the chance to visit Africa. Many years ago, I met Dr. Love's late mother. I will always remember the love, kindness, and selfless caregiving Dr. Love provided her mother in spite of her busy schedule. She was an inspiration to me as I had the honor to care for my late mother in her golden years.

On behalf of the residents of California's 13th Congressional District, Dr. Ruth B. Love, I salute you. I thank you for a lifetime of service and congratulate you on your many achievements. I wish you and your loved ones the very best.

RECOGNIZING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BAY STREET PLAYERS

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to recognize the 40th anniversary of the Bay Street Players at the Historic State Theatre in Eustis, Florida.

Construction on the Historic State Theatre began in 1916, and included one of the largest "photo play" pipe organs in the Southeast to accommodate the latest entertainment of "moving pictures." Throughout the Great Depression, the Theatre also provided chorale and orchestral music programs to help lift the spirits of the community.

By 1975, the building had become vacant and fallen into disrepair, but was rediscovered by local theatre enthusiasts. This group, composed of Deborah Carpenter, Dale Carpenter, Charlene Smith, Lou Tally, Mary Jane Mitenius, and Ed Mitenius became the founding members of the Bay Street Players, which has remained an active part of the community for the past forty years.

It is my pleasure to join the Bay Street Players in commemorating their 40th anniversary and recognizing their founding members. It is truly an honor to serve the residents of Central Florida in the U.S. House of Representatives.

IN RECOGNITION OF ST. PAUL AME CHURCH'S 113TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and pleasure to extend my sincere congratulations to the congregation of St. Paul African Methodist Episcopal Church in Columbus, Georgia as the church's membership and leadership celebrate a remarkable 113 years. The congregation of St. Paul AME Church will celebrate this very significant anniversary with a celebration on Sunday, April 26, 2015 at the Church in Columbus, Georgia.

Tracing its roots back to the turn of the twentieth century, the church's first cornerstone was laid on April 27, 1902 at Meeler's Hill, a historic neighborhood in Columbus,

Georgia. Under the leadership of Reverend A.C. Linton, a new church family was born. This edifice served as the congregation's place of worship until 1957, when Reverend Fedd and the congregation relinquished control of St. Paul at Meeler's Hill to the City of Columbus for urban renewal. During this time, Mt. Tabor AME Church, Grant Chapel AME Church and Galilee Baptist Church allowed the St. Paul family to hold Sunday services at their locations two Sundays a month.

God answered the congregation members' many prayers on May 25, 1960, when St. Paul broke ground at 1508 South Street in Columbus. Under the leadership of Reverend R. L. Coachman, Sister Callie Jackson turned the first spade of dirt. The church was completed and dedicated on October 9, 1960.

In 1981, God again called St. Paul to relinquish control of the South Street location to the City of Columbus. In October of that year, a groundbreaking ceremony was held at 4900 St. Mary's Road in Columbus. On April 11, 1982, a dedication service for the new location was held under the leadership of Reverend Frank C. Maddox.

Throughout the years, the church would be remodeled and renovated, with new technologies installed. With these aesthetic changes came changes to the church's ministry through the creation of several new committees, programs, and outreach ministries. Moreover, the church has had the honor of hosting several sessions of the Southwest Georgia Annual Conference. The Church takes pride in being a ''dangerous'' church, for they are armed with the Word of God.

The story of St. Paul AME Church, which began 113 years ago, is truly an inspiring one of the dedication and perseverance of a faithful congregation of people who put all their love and trust in the Lord.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to St. Paul AME in Columbus, Georgia for their long history of coming together through the good and difficult times to praise and worship our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

HONORING SENATOR ROBERT GRIFFIN

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, last week Michigan lost a true statesman: former Senator and State Supreme Court Justice, Robert P. Griffin.

Senator Griffin represented Michigan in the U.S. Senate for more than 20 years, where he set an extraordinary example of honesty and integrity, and held himself and those around him to the highest level of ethical standards.

As his son Judge Richard Griffin said, he always strove to do the right thing—whether no one was watching or the nation was watching—that was simply the kind of person he was.

That quality made Senator Griffin an effective and respected leader, and I was honored to have the opportunity to learn from him firsthand.

Senator Griffin was my first boss, and he taught me the importance of integrity in the political process, of keeping your word and working with members on both sides of the aisle.

He inspired me and countless others, and he spent his life trying to instill in young people the value and importance of serving.

Senator Griffin was a champion for Michigan. He loved our state. And we can all pay tribute to his legacy by striving to serve our state as well as he did.

HONORING PASTOR H. LEE JORDAN FOR 5 YEARS IN SERVICE TO THE GREATER FAITH CHURCH

HON. ROBERT J. DOLD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 2015

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Pastor H. Lee Jordan on his 5th anniversary as Pastor at the Greater Faith Church in Waukegan, Illinois. Pastor Jordan became Pastor of the Greater Faith Church on January 20, 2010 after initially beginning his pilgrimage on June 20, 1993.

Since joining the Greater Faith Church 5 years ago, Mr. Speaker, Pastor Jordan has worked tirelessly to serve the Waukegan community. In addition to his service to The Greater Faith Church, Pastor Jordan is a loving father and husband, a community leader, recipient of numerous awards, and sits on the boards of multiple local community organizations.

Mr. Speaker, Pastor Jordan enhances the legacy and integrity of the nationally known church, dedicating himself to promoting spiritual growth. I offer my most sincere congratulations to the Pastor for passing this milestone and faithfully serving the Waukegan community.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate confirmed the nomination of Loretta E. Lynch, of New York, to be Attorney General.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2361–S2417

Measures Introduced: Twenty-two bills and six resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1064–1085, S.J. Res. 12–13, and S. Res. 148–151. **Pages S2400–01**

Measures Reported:

Report to accompany H.R. 203, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of annual evaluations of mental health care and suicide prevention programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs. (S. Rept. No. 114–34) **Page S2400**

Measures Passed:

Authorizing Use of Capitol Grounds: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 21, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby. **Page S2417**

Authorizing Use of Capitol Grounds: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 25, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers Memorial Service and the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition. **Page S2417**

Authorizing Use of Emancipation Hall: Committee on Rules and Administration was discharged from further consideration of S. Con. Res. 3, authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S2417**

Hubble Space Telescope: Senate agreed to S. Res. 149, recognizing the importance and inspiration of the Hubble Space Telescope. **Page S2417**

Civic and Government Education Programs: Senate agreed to S. Res. 150, expressing the sense of the Senate about the importance of effective civic and government education programs in schools in the United States. **Page S2417**

National Safe Digging Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 151, supporting the goals and ideals of National Safe Digging Month. **Page S2417**

Measures Considered:

Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act—Agreement: Senate began consideration of H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, after agreeing to the motion to proceed, and taking action on the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S2371–72, S2381–89**

Pending:

Corker/Cardin Amendment No. 1140, in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S2381–89**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that following Leader remarks on Tuesday, April 28, 2015, Senator Corker be recognized to offer an amendment to the pending substitute. **Page S2371**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 3 p.m., on Monday, April 27, 2015, Senate resume consideration of the bill. **Page S2417**

Newman Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at 5 p.m., on Monday, April 27, 2015, Senate begin consideration of the nomination of Dava J. Newman, of Massachusetts, to be Deputy Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, that there be 30 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or

yielding back of time, Senate vote, without intervening action or debate, on confirmation of the nomination; and that no further motion be in order.

Page S2417

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By 56 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. EX. 165), Loretta E. Lynch, of New York, to be Attorney General.

Pages S2363–78

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 66 yeas to 34 nays (Vote No. 164), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. Page S2371

Messages from the House: Page S2398

Measures Referred: Page S2398

Enrolled Bills Presented: Page S2398

Executive Communications: Page S2399

Petitions and Memorials: Pages S2399–S2400

Executive Reports of Committees: Page S2400

Additional Cosponsors: Pages S2401–03

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S2403–07

Additional Statements: Pages S2396–98

Amendments Submitted: Pages S2407–16

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Pages S2416–17

Privileges of the Floor: Page S2417

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—165) Pages S2371, H2378

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 5:48 p.m., until 3 p.m. on Monday, April 27, 2015. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S2417.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Health and Human Services, after receiving testimony from Sylvia Burwell, Secretary of Health and Human Services.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee met to consider matters related to markup of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION REAUTHORIZATION

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine surface transportation reauthorization, focusing on building on the successes of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP–21) to deliver safe, efficient, and effective public transportation services and projects, after receiving testimony from Michael P. Melaniphy, American Public Transportation Association, Janet Kavinoky, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and Harry Lombardo, Transport Workers Union of America, all of Washington, D.C.; and Barbara K. Cline, Community Transportation Association of America, Spearfish, South Dakota.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION REAUTHORIZATION

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Federal Aviation Administration reauthorization, focusing on airport issues and infrastructure financing, after receiving testimony from Gerald L. Dillingham, Director, Physical Infrastructure Issues, Government Accountability Office; Sharon Pinkerton, Airlines for America, and Michael J. Minerva, American Airlines, both of Washington, D.C.; Todd Hauptli, American Association of Airport Executives, Alexandria, Virginia; and Mark M. Reis, Seattle-Tacoma International Airport, Seattle, Washington.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Finance: On Wednesday, April 22, 2015, Committee ordered favorably reported:

S. 995, to establish congressional trade negotiating objectives and enhanced consultation requirements for trade negotiations, to provide for consideration of trade agreements, with amendments;

An original bill relating to extension of the trade adjustment assistance program, and amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the credit for health insurance costs of certain eligible individuals;

An original bill to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti; and

An original bill to reauthorize trade facilitation and trade enforcement functions and activities.

IMPACT OF THE MEDICAL DEVICE TAX ON JOBS

Committee on Finance: Subcommittee on Health Care concluded a hearing to examine the impact of the medical device tax on jobs, innovation, and patients, after receiving testimony from Bruce A. Heugel, BBraun of America, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania; Quinton J. Farrar, West Surry Strategies, LLC, Keene, New Hampshire; Alyra Donisvitch, Manchester, Maine; and Mark Judge, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Anne Elizabeth Wall, of Illinois, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury, Brodi L. Fontenot, of Louisiana, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of the Treasury, and Rafael J. Lopez, of California, to be Commissioner on Children, Youth, and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

AFRICA GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA), after receiving testimony from Thomas H. Hart, ONE Campaign, Scott Eisner, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Walker A. Williams, Leadership Africa USA, and Cathy Feingold, AFL–CIO, all of Washington, D.C.; and William McRaith, PVH Corp., New York, New York.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Sally Quillian Yates, of Georgia, to be Deputy Attorney General, Department of Justice, Kara Farnandez Stoll, of Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit, and Roseann A. Ketchmark, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Missouri.

CENTRAL AMERICAN MINORS REFUGEE/PAROLE PROGRAM

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Immigration and the National Interest concluded a hearing to examine the Administration's Central American minors refugee/parole program, after receiving testimony from Joseph Langlois, Associate Director, Refugee, Asylum and International Operations Directorate, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security; Simon Henshaw, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration; Doris Meissner, Migration Policy Institute, Igor V. Timofeyev, former Director of Immigration Policy and Special Advisor for Refugee and Asylum Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, Paul Hastings, Anastasia Brown, U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops' Migration and Refugee Services, Jessica M. Vaughan, Center for Immigration Studies, all of Washington, D.C.; and Jan C. Ting, Temple University Beasley School of Law, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 552, to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to provide for increased limitations on leverage for multiple licenses under common control;

S. 957, to increase access to capital for veteran entrepreneurs to help create jobs;

S. 958, to amend the Small Business Act to provide for team and joint venture offers for certain contracts, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 966, to extend the low-interest refinancing provisions under the Local Development Business Loan Program of the Small Business Administration, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 967, to require the Small Business Administration to make information relating to lenders making covered loans publicly available, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 999, to amend the Small Business Act to provide for improvements to small business development centers, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1000, to strengthen resources for entrepreneurs by improving the SCORE program, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

S. 1001, to establish authorization levels for general business loans for fiscal years 2015 and 2016.

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: 47 public bills, H.R. 1981–2027; and 4 resolutions, H.J. Res. 47; H. Con. Res. 41; and H. Res. 220–221, were introduced. **Pages H2462–65**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H2466–67**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 172, to designate the United States courthouse located at 501 East Court Street in Jackson, Mississippi, as the "R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse" (H. Rept. 114–89); and

H.R. 1690, to designate the United States courthouse located at 700 Grant Street in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, as the "Joseph F. Weis Jr. United States Courthouse" (Rept. 114–90). **Page H2462**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Woodall to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H2421**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Reverend Terry Ribble, Grace Bible Church, Dunmore, Pennsylvania. **Page H2421**

National Cybersecurity Protection Advancement Act of 2015: The House passed H.R. 1731, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to enhance multi-directional sharing of information related to cybersecurity risks and strengthen privacy and civil liberties protections, by a recorded vote of 355 ayes to 63 noes, Roll No. 173. **Pages H2423–26, H2426–46**

Pursuant to the Rule, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Homeland Security, the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114–12 shall be considered as read. **Page H2428**

Rejected the Israel motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Homeland Security with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 180 ayes to 238 noes, Roll No. 172. **Pages H2443–44**

Agreed to:

McCaul amendment (No. 1 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–88) that makes technical corrections and further clarifies the provisions of the bill; **Pages H2433–34**

Ratcliffe amendment (No. 2 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–88) that amends Section 226 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 by refining the definition of cyber "incident" to explicitly restrict information sharing to incidents that are directly related to protecting information systems; **Page H2434**

Langevin amendment (No. 3 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–88) that clarifies that the term "cybersecurity risk" does not apply to actions solely involving violations of consumer terms of service or consumer licensing agreements; **Pages H2434–35**

Jackson Lee amendment (No. 4 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–88) that ensures that federal agencies supporting cybersecurity efforts of private sector entities remain current on innovation, industry adoption of new technologies, and industry best practices as they relate to industrial control systems; **Pages H2435–37**

Castro amendment (No. 5 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–88) that makes self-assessment tools available to small and medium-sized businesses to determine their level of cybersecurity readiness; **Page H2437**

Castro amendment (No. 6 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–88) that codifies the establishment of the National Cybersecurity Preparedness Consortium (NCPC) made up of university partners and other stakeholders who proactively coordinate to assist state and local officials in cyber security preparation and prevention of cyber attacks; **Pages H2437–38**

Hurd amendment (No. 7 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–88) that authorizes the existing Einstein 3A (E3A) program; **Pages H2438–39**

Mulvaney amendment (No. 8 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–88) that sunsets the provisions of the bill after 7 years; **Pages H2439–40**

Hahn amendment (No. 9 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–88) that directs the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit a report to Congress containing assessments of risks and shortfalls along with recommendations regarding cybersecurity at most at risk ports; **Pages H2440–41**

Jackson Lee amendment (No. 11 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–88) that requires a report to Congress on the best means for aligning federally funded cybersecurity research and development with private sector efforts to protect privacy and civil liberties while assuring security and resilience of the Nation's critical infrastructure; and **Page H2442**

Jackson Lee amendment (No. 10 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–88) that provides for a Government Accountability Office (GAO) report to Congress 5 years after enactment to assess the impact of this act on privacy and civil liberties (by a recorded vote of 405 ayes to 8 noes, Roll No. 171). **Pages H2441–42, H2442–43**

H. Res. 212, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 1560) and (H.R. 1731) was agreed to yesterday, April 22nd.

Pursuant to section 3 of H. Res. 212, in the engrossment of H.R. 1560 the Clerk shall: (1) add the text of H.R. 1731, as passed by the House, as new matter at the end of H.R. 1560; (2) conform the title of H.R. 1560 to reflect the addition of H.R. 1731, as passed by the House, to the engrossment; (3) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment; and (4) conform cross-references and provisions for short titles within the engrossment. Upon the addition of the text of H.R. 1731, as passed by the House, to the engrossment of H.R. 1560, H.R. 1731 shall be laid on the table.

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 8 p.m. on Monday, April 27th. **Page H2448**

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Tuesday, April 28, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. on Wednesday, April 29. **Page H2448**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today and appears on page H2426.

Senate Referrals: S. 178 was held at the desk.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2442–43, H2444–45, and H2445–46. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

Committee Meetings

APPROPRIATIONS—CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Homeland Security held a hearing on Customs and Border Protection budget. Testimony was heard from R. Gil Kerlikowske, Commissioner, Customs and Border Protection.

APPROPRIATIONS—FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Homeland Security held a hearing on Federal Emergency Management Agency budget. Testimony was heard from W. Craig Fugate, Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency.

APPROPRIATIONS—PROGRAMS SUPPORTING NATIVE AMERICANS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education held a hearing on Programs Supporting Native Americans budget. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a markup on appropriations bill, FY 2016. The Legislative Branch appropriations bill for FY 2016 was forwarded to the full committee, without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a markup on H.R. 1735, the ''National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016''. H.R. 1735 was forwarded to the full committee, without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a markup on H.R. 1735, the ''National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016''. H.R. 1735 was forwarded to the full committee, without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces held a markup on H.R. 1735, the ''National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016''. H.R. 1735 was forwarded to the full committee, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a markup on H.R. 1735, the ''National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016''. H.R. 1735 was forwarded to the full committee, as amended.

PROTECTING AMERICA'S WORKERS: AN ENFORCEMENT UPDATE FROM THE MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Workforce Protections held a hearing entitled ''Protecting America's Workers: An Enforcement Update from the Mine Safety and Health Administration''. Testimony was heard from Joseph A. Main, Assistant Secretary of Labor for Mine Safety and Health, Department of Labor.

TITLE II: 21ST CENTURY WORKFORCE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power held a hearing entitled ''Title II: 21st Century Workforce''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

COMBATTING THE OPIOID ABUSE EPIDEMIC: PROFESSIONAL AND ACADEMIC PERSPECTIVES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled ''Combatting the Opioid Abuse Epidemic: Professional and Academic Perspectives''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EXAMINING REGULATORY BURDENS—REGULATOR PERSPECTIVE

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit held a hearing entitled ''Examining Regulatory Burdens—Regulator Perspective''. Testimony was heard from Doreen Eberley, Director, Division of Risk Management Supervision, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; Maryann Hunter, Deputy Director, Division of Banking Supervision and Regulation, Federal Reserve Board; Toney Bland, Senior Deputy Comptroller, Office of the Comptroller of Currency; Larry Fazio, Director, Office of Examination and Insurance, National Credit Union Administration; David Silberman, Associate Director, Office of Research, Markets and Regulations, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau; and a public witness.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 237, the ''FTO Passport Revocation Act of 2015''; H.R. 500, the ''Survivors of Human Trafficking Empowerment Act''; H.R. 907, the ''United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015''; H.R. 1493, the ''Protect and Preserve International Cultural Property Act''; H.R. 1567, the ''Global Food Security Act of 2015''; H. Res. 50, calling for the release of Ukrainian fighter pilot Nadiya Savchenko, who was captured by Russian forces in Eastern Ukraine and has been held illegally in a Russian prison since July 2014; and H. Con. Res. 40, encouraging reunions of divided Korean American families. The following legislation was ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 237, H.R. 500, H.R. 907, H.R. 1567, and H. Res. 50. The following legislation was ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 1493 and H. Con. Res. 40.

THE U.S. REBALANCE IN EAST ASIA: BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR FY 2016

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific held a hearing entitled ''The U.S. Rebalance in East Asia: Budget Priorities for FY 2016''. Testimony was heard from Daniel R. Russel, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Department of State; and Jonathan Stivers, Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Asia, U.S. Agency for International Development.

THE DEVASTATING IMPACTS OF WILDLAND FIRES AND THE NEED TO BETTER MANAGE OUR OVERGROWN, FIRE-PRONE NATIONAL FORESTS

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Federal Lands held a hearing entitled ''The Devastating Impacts of Wildland Fires and the Need to Better Manage our Overgrown, Fire-prone National Forests''. Andy Fecko, Administrator, Placer County Water Agency, Placer County, California; and public witnesses.

HYDRAULIC FRACTURING: BANNING PROVEN TECHNOLOGIES ON POSSIBILITIES INSTEAD OF PROBABILITIES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Hydraulic Fracturing: Banning Proven Technologies on Possibilities Instead of Probabilities''. Testimony was heard from Christi Craddick, Chairman, Railroad Commission of Texas; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing on draft legislation to improve reproductive treatment provided to certain disabled veterans; draft legislation to direct the Department of Veterans Affairs to submit an annual report on the Veterans Health Administration; H.R. 1769, the ''Toxic Exposure Research Act of 2015''; H.R. 271, the ''COVER Act''; H.R. 627, to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the definition of homeless veteran for purposes of benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; H.R. 1369, the ''Veterans Access to Extended Care Act of 2015''; and H.R. 1575, to amend title 38, United States Code, to make permanent the pilot program on counseling in retreat settings for women veterans newly separated from service in the Armed Forces. Testimony was heard from Representatives Bilirakis; Hahn; and Walorski; Rajiv Jain, M.D., Assistant Deputy Under Secretary for Health for Patient Care Services, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 1891, to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes; H.R. 1890, the ''Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015''; H.R. 1892, to extend the trade adjustment assistance program, and for other purposes; H.R. 1907, to reauthorize trade

facilitation and trade enforcement functions and activities, and for other purposes. H.R. 1891 was ordered reported, without amendment. The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 1890, H.R. 1892, and H.R. 1907.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY BUDGETS

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Subcommittee on Emerging Threats held a hearing on Department of Energy and Department of Homeland Security budgets. This hearing was closed.

Joint Meetings

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Commission concluded a hearing to examine the Armenian genocide and the ongoing quest for justice, after receiving testimony from Taner Akcam, Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts; Kenneth V. Hachikian, Armenian National Committee of America, and Van Z. Krikorian, Board of Trustees of the Armenian Assembly of America, both of Washington, D.C.; Elizabeth H. Prodromou, Tufts University Fletcher School, Medford, Massachusetts; and Karine Shnorhokian, Genocide Education Project, Teaneck, New Jersey.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, APRIL 24, 2015

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

3 p.m., Monday, April 27

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1191, Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act.

At 5 p.m., Senate will begin consideration of the nomination of Dava J. Newman, of Massachusetts, to be Deputy Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. At approximately 5:30 p.m., Senate will vote on confirmation of the nomination.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

8 p.m., Monday, April 27

House Chamber

Program for Monday: House will meet in pro forma session at 8 p.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Aderholt, Robert B., Ala., E575
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E569, E572, E575, E579, E581, E583
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E568
Brady, Kevin, Tex., E582
Capps, Lois, Calif., E565
Carter, Earl L. ''Buddy'', Ga., E583
Costa, Jim, Calif., E573
Davis, Rodney, Ill., E578
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E568
Diaz-Balart, Mario, Fla., E579
Dingell, Debbie, Mich., E581, E584
Dold, Robert J., Ill., E570, E580, E582, E584
Engel, Eliot L., N.Y., E571
Farr, Sam, Calif., E564, E567
Fincher, Stephen Lee, Tenn., E565
Frankel, Lois, Fla., E580
Gibson, Christopher P., N.Y., E573
Graves, Tom, Ga., E568
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E578
Herrera Beutler, Jaime, Wash., E583
Hudson, Richard, N.C., E582
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E571
Kato, John, N.Y., E564
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E583
Levin, Sander M., Mich., E573
Long, Billy, Mo., E577
Lowey, Nita M., N.Y., E569
Luetkemeyer, Blaine, Mo., E565
Lujan Grisham, Michelle, N.M., E577
McGovern, James P., Mass., E575
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E571
Newhouse, Dan, Wash., E581
Nolan, Richard M., Minn. E582
Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E578, E578, E579, E580, E580, E580, E581, E581, E582, E582
Poe, Ted, Tex., E580
Price, David E., N.C., E564
Quigley, Mike, Ill., E581
Rice, Kathleen M., N.Y., E565
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E578
Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E567, E568, E570, E572, E574, E577
Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E563, E566
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E579
Vargas, Juan, Calif., E574
Vela, Filemon, Tex., E566
Webster, Daniel, Fla., E583

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.